OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

6-7 EDWARD VII., 1906-7

VOL. LXXVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF NOVEMBER TO THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF JANUARY, INCLUSIVE.



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

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906-7

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir F. W. BORDEN, K.C.M.G., B.A., M.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. SYDNEY A. FISHER, B.A.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Customs	Hon. WM. PATERSON.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. L. P. BRODEUR.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. H. R. EMMERSON.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. C. S. HYMAN.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. F. OLIVER.
Minister of Justice	Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH, K.C.
Postmaster General	Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., LL.B.
Solicitor General (not in the Cabinet)	Hon. J. BUREAU.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... R. BOUDREAU.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. R. F. SUTHERLAND	Speaker.
Mr. CHARLES MARCIL, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. FLINT	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. LAPLANTE	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON ..... Chief Reporter.

STEPHEN ABBOTT
E. JOSEPH DUGGAN
J. O. MARCEAU
THOS. P. OWENS
ALPHONSE DESJARDINS
A. C. CAMPBELL
GEORGE SIMPSON
R. C. DUNBAR
} Reporters.

CHAS. W. BOYCE ..... Assistant to Chief Reporter.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906-7

ADAMSON, A. J.—Humboldt.
ALCORN, GEORGE OSCAR—Prince Edward.
AMES, HERBERT B.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH ELOI—Berthier.
ARMSTRONG, Joseph E.—Lambton, E.R.
AVERY, MELZAR—Frontenac.
AYLESWORTH, HON. ALLEN B.—York, Ont., N.R.

BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARR, JOHN—Dufferin.
BEAUPARLANT, AIMÉ M.—St. Hyacinthe.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELCOURT, HON. NAPOLÉON ANTOINE—Ottawa.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERGERON, JOSEPH G. H.—Beauharnois.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLACK, JUD-ON BURPEE—Hants.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BOLE, DAVID WESLEY—Winnipeg.
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT LAIRD—Carleton, Ont.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRABAZON, Gerald H.—Pontiac.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURROWS, THEODORE ARTHUR—Dauphin.

CALDWELL, THOMAS BOYD—Lanark, N.R.
CALVERT, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Middlesex, W.R.
CAMPBELL, ARCHIBALD—York, Ont., C.R.
CARNEY, MICHAEL—Halifax.
CARRIERE, LOUIS A.—Lévis.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, E. L.—Mackenzie.
CHISHOLM, THOMAS—Huron, E.R.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CHRISTIE, PETER—Ontario, S.R.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, ALFRED H.—Essex, S.R.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT S.—Kent, W.R.
COCHRANE, EDWARD—Northumberland, Ont., E.R.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM F.—Brantford.
CONMEE, JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy River.
COPP, ALBERT J. S.—Digby.
COSTIGAN, HON. JOHN—Victoria, N.B.
CRAWFORD, JOHN—Portage la Prairie.
CROCKET, OSWALD S.—York, N.B.
CYR, JOSEPH ERNEST—Provencher.

DANIEL, JOHN WATERHOUSE—St. John (City).
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DERBYSHIRE, DANIEL—Brockville.
DESJARDINS, SAMUEL—Terrebonne.
DEVLIN, C. R.—Nicolet.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DUBEAU, JOSEPH ADELARD—Joliette.
DUGAS, FRANÇOIS O.—Montcalm.
DYMENT, ALBERT EDWARD—Algoma East.

ELSON, PETER—Middlesex, E.R.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY R.—Westmoreland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.
FINLAY, JOHN—Peterborough, E.R.
FINLAYSON, DUNCAN—Richmond, N.S.
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FORGET, RODOLPHE—Charlevoix.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North.
FOWLER, GEORGE W.—King's and Albert, N.B.

GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Kootenay.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GERVAIS, HONORÉ—Montreal, St. James.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLADU, JOSEPH E. O.—Yamaska.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent. E.R.
GRANT, GEORGE D.—Ontario, N.R.
GREENWAY, THOMAS—Lisgar.

GUNN, BENJAMIN B.—Huron, S.R.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HALL, R. R.—Peterborough, W.R.
HARTY, WILLIAM—Kingston.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HERRON, JOHN—Alberta.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria and Haliburton.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.
HYMAN, HON. CHARLES S.—London.

JACKSON, SAMUEL JACOB—Selkirk.
JACKSON, WILLIAM—Elgin, W.R.
JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER—Cape Breton, South.

KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENNEDY, JAMES BUCKHAM—New Westminster.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Assiniboia, West.

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAKE, RICHARD STUART—Qu'Appelle.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAURENCE, FREDERICK A.—Colchester.
LAURIER, R. C. E.—L'Assomption.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVERGNE, ARMAND—Montmagny.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth, N.S.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEFURGEY, ALFRED A.—Prince, P.E.I.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, S.R.
LEONARD, J. E. EMILE—Laval.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W.R.
LOGAN, HANCE J.—Cumberland.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.
LOVELL, HENRY—Stanstead.

MACDONALD, EDWARD M.—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Lunenburg.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., S.R.
MACPHERSON, ROBERT GEORGE—Vancouver City.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCARTHY, MAITLAND STEWART—Calgary.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE EWAN—Saskatchewan.
MCINTYRE, GILBERT H.—Perth, S.R.
MCINTYRE, WILBERT—Strathcona.
MCKENZIE, PETER H.—Bruce, S.R.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queen's, P.E.I.
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, ALEXANDER—Queen's, P.E.I.
MARTIN, M.—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MARTIN, THOMAS—Wellington, N.R.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGS, DANIEL BISHOP—Missisquoi.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, N.B.
MILLER, HENRY HORTON—Grey, S.R.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, EDMUND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FRED. F.—Lambton, W.R.
PARENT, GEORGE—Montmorency.
PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Brant.
PERLEY, GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
PICKUP, SAMUEL W. W.—Annapolis.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Stormont.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

RATZ, VALENTINE—Middlesex, N.R.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville.
RIVET, LOUIS ALFRED ADHÉMAR—Hochelaga.
ROBITAILLE, LORENZO—Quebec County.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
ROSS, A. C.—N. C. Breton and Victoria.
ROSS, DUNCAN—Yale-Cariboo.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.

SAVOIE, FRANÇOIS THÉODORE—Mégantic.
SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SCHELL, JACOB T.—Glengarry.
SCHELL, MALCOLM S.—Oxford, S.R.
SEAGRAM, JOSEPH E.—Waterloo, N.R.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SLOAN, WILLIAM—Comox-Atlin.
SMITH, ERNEST D.—Wentworth.
SMITH, GEORGE—Oxford, N.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Nanaimo.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STAPLES, WILLIAM D.—Macdonald.
STEWART, ROBERT—Ottawa.
STOCKTON, ALFRED AUGUSTUS—St. John City and County.
SUTHERLAND, HON. ROBT. FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds.
TELFORD, WILLIAM PATTESON—Grey, N.R.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria City, B.C.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, N. Riding.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN G.—Assiniboia, East.
VERVILLE, A.—Maisonneuve.
WALSH, J. C.—Montreal, St. Ann's
WALSH, ROBERT NELSON—Huntingdon.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham.
WATSON, ROBERT JAMES—Parry Sound.
WHITE, GERALD V.—Renfrew, N.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, NORMAN FRANK—Russell.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox and Addington.
WORTHINGTON, ARTHUR NORREYS—Sherbrooke.
WRIGHT, AARON ABEL—Renfrew, S.R.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.
ZIMMERMAN, ADAM—Hamilton, West.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906-7

ALBERTA—John Herron.
ALGOMA, EAST—Albert Edward Dyment.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Samuel W. W. Pickup.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—George H. Perley.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—John G. Turriff.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—William E. Knowles.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BEAUCE—Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Joseph Eloi Archambault.
BONAVENTURE—Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT—Hon. William Paterson.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—Daniel Derbyshire.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—John Tolmie.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Peter H. McKenzie.

CALGARY—Maitland Stewart McCarthy.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—A. C. Ross.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—Alexander Johnston.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON (O.)—Robert Laird Borden.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Jeffrey Alexandre Rousseau.
CHARLEVOIX—Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—Frederick A. Laurence.
COMOX-ATLIN—William Sloan.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DAUPHIN—Theodore Arthur Burrows.
DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUFFERIN—John Barr.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Henry Alfred Ward.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—William Jackson.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Hon. Robert Franklin Sutherland
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—Melzar Avery.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Jacob T. Schell.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Patteson Telford.
GREY, S. RIDING—Henry Horton Miller.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—{William Roche. Michael Carney.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON, EAST—Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON, WEST—Adam Zimmerman.
HANTS—Judson Burpee Black.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Alfred Adhémar Rivet.
HUMBOLDT—A. J. Adamson.
HUNTINGDON—Robert Nelson Walsh.
HURON, E. RIDING—Thomas Chisholm.
HURON, S. RIDING—Benjamin B. Gunn.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk
JOLIETTE—Joseph Adélard Dubeau.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.), E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT (O.), W. RIDING—Herbert S. Clements.
KING'S AND ALBERT (N.B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Sir Frederick W. Borden K.C.M.G.

King's (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
Kingston—William Harty.
Kootenay—William Alfred Galliher.

Labelle—Henri Bourassa.
Lambton, E. Riding—Joseph E. Armstrong.
Lambton, W. Riding—Fred. F. Pardee.
Lanark, N. Riding—Thomas Boyd Caldwell.
Lanark, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
Laprairie-Napierville—Roch Lanctôt.
L'Assomption—R. C. E. Laurier.
Laval—J. E. Emile Leonard.
Leeds—George Taylor.
Lennox and Addington—Uriah Wilson.
Lévis—Louis A. Carrier.
Lincoln—Edward A. Lancaster.
Lisgar—Thomas Greenway.
L'Islet—Eugène Paquet.
London—Hon. Charles S. Hyman.
Lotbinière—Edmond Fortier.
Lunenburg—Alexander Kenneth Maclean.

Macdonald—William D. Staples.
Mackenzie—E. L. Cash.
Maisonneuve—A. Verville.
Marquette—William J. Roche.
Maskinongé—Hormisdas Mayrand.
Megantic—François Théodore Savoie.
Middlesex, E. Riding—Peter Elson.
Middlesex, N. Riding—Valentine Ratz.
Middlesex, W. Riding—William Samuel Calvert.
Missisquoi—Daniel B. Meigs.
Montcalm—François Octave Dugas.
Montmagny—Armand Lavergne.
Montmorency—George Parent.
Montreal, St. Ann's—J. C. Walsh.
Montreal, St. Antoine—Herbert B. Ames.
Montreal, St. James—Honoré Gervais.
Montreal, St. Lawrence—Robert Bickerdike.
Montreal, St. Mary—M. Martin.
Muskoka—William Wright.

Nanaimo—Ralph Smith.
New Westminster—James B. Kennedy.
Nicolet—C. R. Devlin.
Nipissing—Charles Arthur McCool.
Norfolk—Hon. David Tisdale.
Northumberland (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
Northumberland (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
Northumberland (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

Ontario, N. Riding—George D. Grant.
Ontario, S. Riding—Peter Christie.
Ottawa City { Hon. Napoléon Antoine Belcourt. / Robert Stewart.
Oxford, N. Riding—George Smith.
Oxford, S. Riding—Malcolm S. Schell.

Parry Sound—Robert James Watson.
Peel—Richard Blain.
Perth, N. Riding—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
Perth, S. Riding—Gilbert H. McIntyre.
Peterborough, E. Riding—John Finlay.
Peterborough, W. Riding—R. R. Hall.
Pictou—Edward M. Macdonald.
Pontiac—Gerald H. Brabazon.
Portage la Prairie—John Crawford.
Portneuf—Michel Siméon Delisle.
Prescott—Edmond Proulx.
Prince, (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
Prince Edward—George Oscar Alcorn.
Provencher—Joseph Ernest Cyr.

Qu'Appelle—Richard Stuart Lake.
Quebec, Centre—Arthur Lachance.
Quebec, East—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
Quebec, West—William Power.
Quebec (County)—Lorenzo Robitaille.
Queen's, (P.E.I.)— { Alexander Martin. / Angus A McLean.

Renfrew, N. Riding—Gerald V. White.
Renfrew, S. Riding—Aaron Abel Wright.
Restigouche—James Reid.
Richelieu—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
Richmond (N.S.)—Duncan Finlayson.
Richmond and Wolfe (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin
Rimouski—Jean Auguste Ross.
Rouville—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
Russell—Norman Frank Wilson.

St. Hyacinthe—Aimé M. Beauparlant.
St. John (N.B.), City—John Waterhouse Daniel.
St. John (N.B.), City and Co.—Alfred Augustus Stockton.
St. John and Iberville—Joseph Demers.
Saskatchewan—George E. McCraney.
Selkirk—Samuel Jacob Jackson.
Shefford—Charles H. Parmelee.
Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
Sherbrooke—Arthur Norreys Worthington.
Simcoe, E. Riding—William H. Bennett.
Simcoe, N. Riding—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
Simcoe, S. Riding—Haughton Lennox.
Soulanges—Augustin Bourbonnais.
Souris—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
Stanstead—Henry Lovell.
Stormont—Robert A. Pringle.
Strathcona—Wilbert McIntyre.
Sunbury and Queen's (N.B.)—Robert D. Wilmot.

Temiscouata—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
Terrebonne—Samuel Desjardins.
Three Rivers and St. Maurice—Jacques Bureau.
Thunder Bay and Rainy River—James Conmee.
Toronto, Centre—Edmund Bristol.
Toronto, East—Albert E. Kemp.
Toronto, North—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
Toronto, South—Angus Claude Macdonell.
Toronto, West—Edmund Boyd Osler.
Two Mountains—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

Vancouver (City)—Robert George Macpherson.
Vaudreuil—Gustave Boyer

VICTORIA CITY, (B.C.)—Hon. William Templeman.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, (O.)—Samuel Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Thomas Martin.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Ernest D. Smith.
WESTMORELAND—Hon. Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—David Wesley Bole.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.
YALE-CARIBOO—Duncan Ross.
YAMASKA—Joseph E. O. Gladu.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Oswald S. Crocket.
YORK (O.), C. RIDING—Archibald Campbell.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. Allen Bristol Aylesworth.
YORK (O.), S. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

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

BERGERON, J. G. H.—Beauharnois.
BUREAU, J.—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
CLARKE, A. H.—Essex, S.
ETHIER, J. A. C.—Two Mountains.
GERVAIS, H.—Montreal, St. James.
GUTHRIE, H.—Wellington, S.
HUGHES, S.—Victoria and Haliburton.
JOHNSTON, A.—Cape Breton, S.
KNOWLES, W. E.—Assiniboia, W.
LOGAN, H. J.—Cumberland.
MACPHERSON, R. G.—Vancouver City.
MCCARTHY, M. S.—Calgary.
ROCHE, W. J.—Marquette.
SCHAFFNER, F. L.—Souris.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds.

Chairman:—H. GERVAIS—Montreal, St. James.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

Col. 1719, 21st line from bottom, '40th parallel,' should read '49th parallel.'
Col. 1720, 25th line from top, '54° 49′,' should read '54° 40′.'

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 22, 1906.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time to the 22nd day of November, 1906, met this day for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General.

Ottawa, November 21, 1906.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to open the third session of the Tenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, on Thursday, the 22nd instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) J. HANBURY-WILLIAMS, Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker. His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

ELECTION CASES—JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment and report of the said court in the election appeal for the electoral district of Shelburne and Queen's and also the report of the Hon. Sir Robert L. Weatherbe and the Hon. Benjamin Russell, the trial judges in the court below, in the said matter, by which the said election was declared void.

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

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments and decisions of the said court in the matter of the appeals made from the decisions of the trial judges in the lower courts relating to the electoral district of Halifax, by which the said appeals were allowed and the decisions of the trial judges in the lower courts reversed and set aside.

VACANCIES.

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

Of Camille Piché, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Montreal, St. Mary's, by resignation.

Of Leonard T. Bland, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Bruce, by decease.

Of Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, member for the Electoral District of Quebec County, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit: the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Of L. Phillipe Demers, Esq., member for the Electoral District of St. John and Iberville, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

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

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication from the Hon. C. S. Hyman announcing his resignation as a member of the House for the elcetoral district of the city of London. I may say to the House that the resignation is not perhaps quite in form, but I thought it desirable to communicate it to the House.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have further the honour to inform the House that during the recess

the Clerk of the House received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificates of the election and return of the following members, namely :—

Of David Marshall, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Elgin.

Of Gerald Verner White, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Renfrew.

Of Joseph Demers, Esq., for the Electoral District of St. John and Iberville.

Of Lorenzo Robitaille, Esq., for the Electoral District of Quebec County.

Of Hon. W. S. Fielding, for the Electoral District of Shelburne and Queen's.

Of John Tolmie, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Bruce.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. William Stevens Fielding, member for the Electoral District of Shelburne and Queen's; introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Sir Frederick Borden.

John Tolmie, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of Bruce ; introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. A. B. Aylesworth.

Joseph Demers, Esq., member for the Electoral District of St. John and Iberville ; introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

David Marshall, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the East Riding of Elgin ; introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Richard Blain.

Gerald V. White, Esq., member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of Renfrew; introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Taylor.

Lorenzo Robitaille, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Quebec County ; introduced by Mr. Henri Bourassa and Mr. Armand Lavergne.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Offices.—Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In opening the third session of the Tenth Parliament of Canada, I avail myself of the opportunity to offer you my congratulations on the unparalleled prosperity prevailing in all parts of the Dominion. The harvest has been abundant, and the trade with both British and foreign nations continues to expand in annually increasing volume, with every prospect of continued growth for many years to come.

The number of immigrants seeking homes in Canada continues yearly to increase, and it is very satisfactory to observe that a larger proportion than in any former year has in the past season come from the British Isles.

During the recess following the last session, I visited the four western provinces, and was much gratified to note the great advance that is being made in the development of the vast resources of those highly favoured sections of the Dominion. I found the people of the west rejoicing in their prosperity, and full of hope and confidence in the future growth of its agricultural and industrial wealth.

The quinquennial census recently taken in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan shows that those provinces are now entitled to an increase in their representation in the House of Commons. A Bill giving effect to that provision will be submitted for your approval.

In accordance with the announcement made in a previous session, you will be asked to consider a Bill for the revision of the Customs tariff.

The sanction of parliament will be required to give legal effect to the treaty made with the Empire of Japan. A Bill for that purpose will be submitted for your approval.

The products and manufactures of Canada shown at the recent International Exhibition held in the city of Milan proved a great attraction, and as a result it is confidently believed our trade with central and southern Europe can be materially increased.

The Naval authorities having relinquished the use of the dockyard at Halifax, a proposal was made to transfer it to the government of Canada. The offer has been accepted and the dockyard will now be used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries as a base for its operations in connection with aids to navigation.

Many immigrants having in recent years been induced to come to Canada by false representations made in the United Kingdom, at the request of the Minister of Labour a clause has been added to the Merchants Shipping Bill, now before the Imperial parliament, for the punishment of any person who may be found guilty of that offence.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The accounts of the past year will be laid before you. I am glad to say that the revenue has shown a large expansion, and has not only provided for ordinary expenditure, but has also, to a great extent, provided for the outlay on capital account.

The estimates for the coming year will be laid before you at an early date.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

A united application having been received by my ministers from the governments of the several provinces asking for an increase in the provincial subsidies, a conference was recently held when the reasons for granting additional aid were fully set forth and discussed. Resolutions, based on the conclusions reached by my government, will be submitted for your consideration.

Bills will be laid before you amending the Election Acts, the Post Office Act, the Dominion Lands Act, a Bill for the more effective supervision and inspection of Canadian canned food products, meats and fish, a Bill relating to the sale and manufacture of patent medicines ; and also a Bill to make better provision for dealing with juvenile delinquents.

It is hoped that the report of the Commission appointed to inquire into the working of insurance companies will shortly be completed, when it will be laid on the Table.

The subjects I have mentioned will, I hope, receive your best consideration and the measures to be submitted for your approval will, I trust, tend to the well-being and good government of our fair Dominion.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That Select Standing Committees of the House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes :—1. On Privileges and Elections. 2. On Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. 3. On Miscellaneous Private Bills. 4. On Standing Orders. 5. On Printing. 6. On Public Accounts. 7. On Banking and Commerce. 8. On Agriculture and Colonization. 9. On the Debates of the House. 10. On the Library of Parliament, which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House ; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions ; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament for 1906.—Mr. Speaker.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 23, 1906.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

That a special committee of five members composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. R. L. Borden (Carleton), Mr. Paterson, Mr. Fielding, and Mr. Haggart, be appointed to prepare a report with all convenient speed of a list of the members to compose the select standing committees of the House under rule No. 10.

Motion agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, the bill of fare before us to-day is confined to one order, namely, the consideration of His Excellency's speech at the opening of the session. I wish to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister why it is that the members of the House have not been supplied with a copy of His Excellency's speech. This is my twenty-fifth session here and I have never yet attended a session but that immediately on our return from the Senate Chamber, we would find in our post office boxes a copy of His Excellency's speech. I have just come from the post office now and there is no copy there. Perhaps the government at this late date have commenced to practise economy and have not had the speech printed. If it has been printed it has not been distributed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is aware, not only at this late day, but from the very earliest days has the government practised economy. It is not at all with a view of dispensing with that very salutary rule of printing the speech from the Throne that my hon. friend has not been supplied with a copy of it. But the hon. gentleman knows that the government has nothing to do with that matter ; it is for Mr. Speaker or the officers of the House.

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I ask the Minister of Customs when we may expect the Trade and Navigation returns to be laid on the table. I understand they are ready for distribution and if so the members might as well have them.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). For the past few years it has been customary to hand out the Trade and Navigation tables prior to the opening of the House. I think that has been done this year. I have a copy in my desk and I in-

tend to lay it on the table when the address is passed. Meanwhile, if the hon. gentleman will send upstairs he will get a copy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did apply and was refused.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what their rule may be, but I think the tables have been sent from the department.

RESIGNATION OF THE HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask what is the effect of the resignation as a member of this House of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, which was referred to but not read yesterday? Is it or is it not in due legal form; has it the effect of rendering the seat of the hon. gentleman vacant? I would also like to ask whether or not the Hon. Mr. Hyman retains his portfolio?

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment the resignation is not in proper form and is not therefore complete.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that Mr. Hyman has asked to be relieved as Minister of Public Works, but under the circumstances I have not thought it advisable to place his resignation in the hands of His Excellency yet. I have asked Mr. Hyman to reconsider his determination.

WRECKS OUTSIDE TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has seen in the newspapers an account of the appalling marine disaster that occurred quite recently just outside Toronto harbour, and which resulted in the wrecking of three vessels and the loss of at least six lives. That loss of life and property was due to the insufficient depth of water in the two entrances to the harbour and to the lack of life saving appliances. From time to time I myself in this House and others who have preceded me in the representation of Toronto have called the attention of the government to this matter. Now, in view of the lateness of the season and as the ports are still open on Lake Ontario and many vessels are yet plying on the lakes, I wish to know from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he has given consideration to any measures which the government may take to prevent the repetition of such a disaster? If immediate steps are taken there will be no difficulty in providing against such a recurrence of such casualties during the remainder of the navigation season.

Mr. PATERSON.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I do not think any report has reached the department in connection with the accident, and I have not had my attention called to the report in the newspapers. I am under the impression that there are proper life saving appliances on the island.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. No, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am quite sure there are life saving appliances on the island.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. There is a small life boat with a volunteer crew.

Mr. BRODEUR. A few days ago it was brought to my attention that the crew of the life saving station there had saved some lives. Perhaps my hon. friend is not aware of that; I think it was published in the papers. As to the depth of the water that matter does not appertain to my department and I am not able to give the hon. gentleman information as to it.

COAL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to direct the attention of the government to an item which appeared in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of yesterday. It is headed 'Coal Famine in Saskatchewan,' and it reads:

> Montreal, November 22.—Hon. Walter Scott said to-day that the people of Saskatchewan are facing the question of freezing to death. 'There is not a ton of coal in the province,' he says, 'owing to the Lethbridge strike. Coal is used for private houses as well as factories and the misery will be great unless the strike is settled right away. We must get fuel no matter what it costs. Imagine, last week snow came and it will lie. We must have coal and will have to get it from Fernie, from the Canadian Pacific Railway, or wherever we can.'

I may supplement that by saying that a large proportion of the farming community of the Northwest is dependent upon a supply of coal for their fuel, and in my opinion the situation is extremely critical. A heavy snow storm has just visited that country and it has already created a most pressing demand for fuel. In the Regina 'Leader' if the 17th inst., the provincial Minister of Agriculture is reported as saying:

> Not a point in the province but finds the supply far below the demand and many places are absolutely without fuel.

The Dominion parliament has seen fit to retain the ownership and control of the fuel supply of Saskatchewan and Alberta in their own hands, and in view of the responsibility thus imposed I trust the government will be able to assure this House that immediate and strenuous action will be taken to avert what might develop into a national calamity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government is alive to the situation which exists in the Northwest and it only regrets that it has not more power to deal with it. The Department of Labour, which is the only department which can deal with the matter, has sent Mr. Mackenzie King to try if possible to bring about a settlement of the strike.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government if they can state at what date the public accounts and the Auditor General's Report will be brought down. I understand, of course, that we are meeting after a considerably less delay than that which usually intervenes, and there may be some difficulty in having the reports as soon as we could desire. At the same time, I would like to know what we may expect.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). When the change in the fiscal year was made we hardly anticipated that at this early stage of the session we should be able to bring down any of the reports. However, knowing that hon. gentlemen are very desirous of having them as early as possible, we have made extra efforts to have them put into shape, and we expect to have them much earlier than we anticipated. The public accounts are ready, and the Auditor General's Report will be brought down at a very early date.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could it be brought down in sections ?

Mr. FIELDING. If that is necessary to facilitate the business of the House; but I fully expect that it will be brought down at a much earlier date than was anticipated last session.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). Mr. Speaker, in reading over the speech from the Throne, one cannot of course fail to be gratified at the fact that the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada continues to be as great as it was before, that the harvest has been bountiful, that times are good, that in every way the Dominion of Canada is perhaps more prosperous to-day than she ever was before. That is a subject for mutual congratulation on the part of all the members of this House and all the people of Canada, for none of us can wish anything but prosperity for this fair Canada of ours. I cannot help associating in my mind the prosperity which Canada enjoys to-day with the fact—although in this no doubt the whole House will not agree—that the prosperity now enjoyed by Canada is partly due to the wise expenditure of the present government. It has been said and reiterated time and again, both in the House and in the country, that because we are spending many times more dollars to-day than we did in 1895, therefore the Liberal party is recreant to its principles and is not carrying out the programme which it promised to carry out prior to the time it was returned to power. There can be no gainsaying the fact the expenditure of to-day amounts to many million dollars more than it did in 1895. As a matter of fact, the government is expending to-day about 83¾ per cent more than was expended in 1895. But I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, that although the expenditure is that much larger, the business of the country is in every way greater than it was at that time. Although the expenditure in 1895 amounted to $42,000,000, whereas in 1905 it amounted to $78,000,000, yet the net debt per head is $3 per head less to-day than it was prior to 1896. During the years the Conservative government were in power, the annual surplus averaged about $500,000. Since the Reform party has been in power it has averaged about $7,500,000. This shows that although we are expending more money, yet the people are not subjected to greater debt than they had before. In comparing the progress of the Dominion of Canada with the percentage of increase in the debt since 1895, I may invite the attention of the House to a few figures, but very few. I said in the beginning that we were now spending 83¾ per cent more money than we spent in 1895 ; but although we are spending more money, our trade is increasing in every way. Our total imports in 1895 were $110,000,000, as against $266,000,000 in 1905; our total exports were $113,000,000 in 1895 as against $203,000,000 in 1905; our total trade was $224,000,000 in 1895 as against $470,000,000 in 1905; our deposits in chartered banks in 1895 were $182,000,000 as against $468,000,000 in 1905; the miles of railway in operation in 1895 were 15,000 miles as against 20,000 miles in 1906; the railway tons carried—and this I think is a fair criterion of the progress of the country —in 1895 was 21,500,000 tons as against 50,800,000 tons in 1906. If these figures bear any relation to the progress of the country, then I say the country has been amply repaid for the expenditures which this government has made. As against the percentage of increase in the expenditure since 1895, I would say that since that time the total trade of the country has increased 109½ per cent, the consolidated revenue fund 109½ per cent, the deposits in chartered banks 156 per cent, the discounts in chartered banks 114 per cent, the tons of traffic carried by railways 136 per cent. In view of the growth of the country which these

figures show, I am bound to say as a Canadian that I have the very greatest faith in Canada. Although some may be pessimistic and may say that we are spending more money than we ought, I say that the time is at hand when Canada must go forward in her national life if she ever intends to do so, that if Canada does not put her best foot forward, and Canadian statesmen do not seize the opportunities at hand, we shall find that by parismony and bad economic policy we shall have let chances go by that may not return again for many years, and thereby inflict lasting injury upon Canada and the Canadian people. As a young country we must realize that to a very great extent our history is before us. We are on the threshold of being a nation. We have yet to be opened up vast areas of land which have not yet been touched by the plough; and if we are to grow into a nation, we must provide all the facilities necessary to encourage immigration to our shores, and when that immigration does come, we must see that it is properly taken care of. So long as our expenditure is wise and prudent, so long as it is honest—and honest it is without a doubt under this government—I am satisfied that it will redound to the credit of the government and of Canada.

This session has been called, Sir, I understand, largely in connection with the tariff. The tariff is a great question—perhaps the greatest and most far reaching question that this House has to deal with, undoubtedly the one that affects more largely the Canadian people than any other. Sir, when we come to consider that tariff we must consider it, I take it, solely from a non-partisan point of view, solely with a view of taking care of the various industries and the various other interests of the people of Canada. We have had a propaganda carried on for many months by the Manufacturers' Association. That propaganda has been carried far and near, it has been carried on by means of both pamphlets and meetings and these manufacturers say one and all: We must have the tariff built up, we must have such a tariff practically as will absolutely protect us from everybody else. That is what the manufacturers ask. On the other hand the farmers, through the various farmers' associations, the Dominion Grange and others, have their propaganda also, and it is this that so far as the government is able it must let down the bars to as great an extent as possible. The population of Canada is composed principally of manufacturers and agriculturists and those dependent on those two great branches of industry. Therefore, it is, I think, that no one would willingly, knowingly advocate a policy which might bear too heavily upon one class or upon another and therefore the government should approach this question of the tariff with the greatest possible caution and the people both in the province of Ontario and in the other provinces should realize this fact that the duty is upon this House to enact a proper measure and that in order to secure a tariff measure that would be good for a country such as ours, with our diverse interests, the manufacturers in the east and the farmers in the west, the duty is laid upon the government to hold the scales equally balanced as between the various interests and that the measure can only be a measure of compromise in order that it may benefit the greatest possible number of people. But, Sir, when approaching this question we ought to bear in mind the fact that Canada is essentially an agricultural country and that therefore so far as is possible the claims of the agriculturists ought to be predominant.

Mention is made in the speech of the question of new electoral laws. There is no doubt about the fact that both sides have made laws and there is no doubt that both sides have broken the laws that have been made. It does appear to me that there is no man who does not desire, if possible, to have clean elections waged in order that an honest expression of the opinion of the people of the country should be given at the polls and that their representatives should truly represent them both in this House and in other Houses of Parliament. It has occurred to me that it does little or no good for us to say: You have done so and so, and for the other side to say to us, You have done so and so. It does not appear to me that the 'tu quoque' argument any longer applies, but it does appear to me that it is the absolute duty of men in high position, men occupying seats on the floor of this House by their example, by their acts, and by their words to show the country that in their opinion clean elections must be had, righteous elections must be held and by their example and by their precept they will show to their followers that nothing else will be tolerated either by themselves or by their party. They must show henceforth, if we are to go on as we ought to, so far as our popular representation is concerned, that they will not in the least degree countenance one single bit of dishonesty in elections but will on the other hand frown it down and in the event of dishonesty or corruption in elections being shown will not desire to represent the constituency in which such conditions have prevailed. These, Sir, are my views. I think it will do little good for either side of the House as I said to use the 'thou also' argument. It does not appear to me that the time is now proper to do that, but it does appear to me that the time is very proper as I said before, for every man in this House, for every representative man in the Dominion of Canada to so frown down electoral corruption that it may in the future be something that has passed and gone. We must remember this fact that if it is continued it means that we will have an array of labour against capital, that you have capital against labour, wealth

against poverty and poverty against wealth; it means that you simply undermine all free institutions, that you take away that love for order and that love for law which are absolutely essential to true justice and to true freedom in the Dominion of Canada. These are the things, and I speak sincerely, Sir, that we have to bring home to the people of this country and to bear upon our own minds, and if we do that I am satisfied that in the future things will be conducted in a proper way by both political parties and that henceforth political scandal may be a thing of the past. These are my views upon that question and I think it is the duty of every man here to so lend his mind to the consideration of any measure that is introduced into this House in the way of electoral reform, that the election laws may be put in the best possible condition. To my mind there is a doubt as to whether or not reform of that sort is a matter of legislation or of education. You may legislate in various ways and in reference to various things and yet these laws may be broken every day and no punishment be meted out to those who break them, and it does appear to me that this and other great questions are in fact matters of education absolutely, and I believe that by example, by showing what those do who are in authority, such legislation will be more effective in the way of education than anything else that this House can possibly bring down.

Since the last session of this House an investigation has been held into the question of insurance. Various matters have been brought before the commission appointed for that purpose and have been threshed out. The more one thinks of it the more one is satisfied that insurance companies are perhaps more than any other monetary concerns that do business, absolutely in the shape of trust companies to the people. There are not a great many men or women who take out insurance as a matter of business, in the way of an investment in the proper or technical sense of the word. An insurance policy is taken out wholly and solely that the families of those taking out the policy may be protected in the event of death or if an endowment policy that the insurer may himself be protected when getting on in years and not as well able to engage in active life as before. Therefore I say that in the highest sense of the word an insurance company is as a trust company of the people's money; it is more than that, it is a company which is an absolute trust company especially for widows and orphans and those who are left behind and therefore it is that the greatest amount of care should be exercised in the investments which are made by these insurance companies and that the very greatest possible care should be exercised in the inspection of such companies. I think that at this session some measure should be brought in to this House, whereby it can be enacted that every insurance company doing business in the Dominion of Canada shall be so inspected that the government will know exactly its income and its outgo, and the exact state of its investments. To do that in the case of chartered banks, with their many branches, would be an impossibility but with an insurance company having one central head office, the difficulties in the way of such an inspection could be very easily overcome and the insurance inspector or inspectors should be clothed with such powers and such rights that every transaction of an insurance company might be made the subject of an investigation if thought desirable and if necessary the results of such investigation should be laid before this House.

We heard from the chair yesterday that the seat for London was vacant. No one who knows Hon. Mr. Hyman to be the honest, manly and straightforward man he is, could possibly think that he would have done right either by himself or by those who honour him had he pursued any other course than that which he has taken. I think it redounds to his credit that he has followed this course. For, I wish to point out to this House, no necessity rested upon him of taking such action at this time. If an election petition had been lodged, the first thing to be proved in order to vacate the seat would be bribery or corruption on the part of the candidate or his agents. That has not been proven. Only one side of the case has been gone into, but as for proving that any bribery by the candidate or his accredited agents existed, that has not been done. Therefore, I say, the course which Hon. Mr. Hyman has taken was the manly, creditable course for him to pursue, and one which proves Mr. Hyman to be just the man that this House, certainly this side of the House, always knew him to be.

I cannot resume my seat without congratulating the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon the sixty-fifth birthday which he has so recently passed. When a man has sat in this House continuously for a period of thirty-three years under the eye of the public all that time, and to-day stands before the people of the Dominion of Canada with a clean and unsullied record, that fact is something for him and his friends to be proud of. The Prime Minister has brought honour and credit to Canada: and my own wish, and the wish of the members on this side of the House at least, is that he may be spared long to go on with the programme he has so successfully and magnificently carried out for the last ten years. If he does that, as I am satisfied he will, his record will be a brighter page in the history of Canada than any that has yet been written.

Sir, I beg leave to move than an humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Mr. J. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I rise with some degree of diffidence and no ordinary degree of emotion to perform the task which now devolves on me in seconding the resolution of my hon. friend in reply to the speech from the Throne. I must confess at the outset, that when asked by the leader of the government to accept that very honourable task, I did somewhat hesitate to assume the onerous responsibility of the duty devolving upon me. But I realized after further consideration that in being asked to perform that duty, a compliment was being paid to the constitutency I have the honour to represent here, and under those circumstances I could not do otherwise than showing my appreciation by accepting—even though that acceptance brought with it an obligation which, deeply conscious as I am of my inability and inexperience, I could hardly hope to satisfactorily fulfil. I am encouraged, however, by the thought that a new member, speaking for the first time in this House, under such circumstances, is always assured of the indulgence and kind attention of all members on both sides of the House. I may add that the novelty of the situation is the more embarrassing to me as yesterday for the first time in my life I had the privilege of attending the proceedings of this House. I wish I had the splendid gift of facile expression shown by the hon. member whom we have just heard and applauded. Let him allow me to congratulate him on the remarkable way in which he has discharged his duty and I can do no better than walking in his footsteps. The speech from the Throne deals with many important matters which all tend to show the remarkable prosperity with which the country is blessed. His Excellency tells us that the newly created provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are now entitled to an increase in their representation in the House of Commons. The British North America Act provides that the province of Quebec shall have the fixed number of 65 members, and that each of the other provinces shall be assigned such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population, ascertained at each decennial census, as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec. But in the case of the newly created provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the matter is governed by special provisions, until the termination of the present parliament. Thanks to the era of progress and prosperity which the country is now enjoying, Canada's population has increased considerably, to such a point that the quinquennial census recently taken in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan shows that those provinces have no longer the representation to which they are entitled in the House of Commons, and we are invited by His Excellency to give effect to the provisions of the constitution of those provinces concerning their representation.

Reference is also made in the speech from the Throne to the amending of the Election Acts. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we are all anxious to have our elections conducted with all the desirable purity; we are all anxious to bring about in our country a cleaner and fairer trial of public opinion by means of elections, but in my humble opinion, the evil complained of is to be found not so much in the insufficiency of the existing election law as in the infringement of its provisions. As a matter of fact, the present law is very drastic. Need I adduce any other proof, in support of my contention, than the clause which provides for the invalidation of an election for a few solitary acts of bribery or a few corrupt practices unknown to the candidate and perpetrated without his consent, and which could in no way affect the result of the election ? I am free to say, Sir, that the present election law is far from being perfect and that it should be made more efficacious by the amendments which the government is going to introduce. It may even be necessary for the government to consider the question of compulsory voting. In my humble opinion, although I do not wish to go into any details on that matter, such a measure would undoubtedly tend to remedy, in a large measure at least, the evils complained of, and would largely make up for the drawbacks likely to result from its adoption. This House, I am sure, was glad to find a reference in the speech from the Throne to our bursting granaries and the bountiful harvest with which the country has been blessed by a kind Providence. With the remunerative prices secured for our farm products, I make bold to say that this is another record year and that the country is still upon the high road to prosperity, and that there is a conspiracy of events to make Canada a happy people. The farming community being the cornerstone of our national structure, the prosperity and the happiness of the other classes depend, to a large degree, on the prosperity of the agricultural class.

Reference is made in the speech to tariff revision. That is one of the most important measures which we are invited to discuss during this session. The readjustment of the tariff is one of the most arduous problems to solve in a country like Canada, where so many different interests being at stake, it is of the highest importance that no measures be adopted for the relief of certain industries that may injure and cripple other industries. The interests of the west must be taken into consideration, together with those of the east, and when you give manufacturers adequate protection, care must be taken that the price of commodities be not increased by the action of the tariff, and that protection do not result

in too high prices; for, then protection would be a burden upon the consumer, and the consumers are the masses of our population. Up to 1896, an out and out protective policy has obtained in Canada, and I may say that it has almost resulted in failure. Since the coming into power of the present government, we have a tariff revenue. I hope that, in view of the results secured under the new regime, that tariff will not be interfered with. As we all know, the commission appointed to study that important problem has consulted every class of the community, and the commissioners have made an exhaustive and conscientious investigation into that matter. Their report will soon be brought down. However, I do not think there is anything that warrants us anticipating any radical changes in the present tariff which has, so far, met with the approval of the country. For my part, Sir, I do express the hope that nothing may be done to impair the principle underlying the present tariff. Reference is also made in the speech from the Throne, to the interprovincial conference which has just been held in Ottawa. It is not the first time that provincial ministers meet together in order to frame and vote resolutions with the object of claiming better terms from the federal government. In 1887, the question of the readjustment of provincial subsidies came up before the interprovincial conference, where important questions were discussed and resolutions adopted. Later on, in 1902, it was again taken up; but at that conference, as well as the conference held this year, the debate was almost exclusively confined within the limits of the question of provincial subsidies. The argument put forward by the provinces in support of their application for a readjustment of the provincial subsidies, is this : that on the one hand, the increase of their revenues is insufficient to meet the increased cost of the administration of justice and public education; while on the other hand, the revenue of the Dominion government is expanding by leaps and bounds. At the inception of confederation, owing to the establishment of a central government, the provinces were deprived of a portion of their chief sources of revenue, such as the customs and excise duties. In 1868, the province of Quebec was allowed 7¾ per cent of the customs and excise duties; and in 1902 she received only 2½ per cent, that proportion being still smaller to-day. If the provinces are no longer able to properly administer public affairs, on account of their inadequate revenues, being given the development of the country and the needs of an increased population, the Dominion government, I think, ought to come to their aid and make them participate more liberally in their ever-increasing revenue. The idea conceived by the provincial ministers of meeting together and debating those important matters of public policy, is certainly one that should commend itself to public attention. The Dominion government, I hope, will give that question their best consideration, and I have no doubt they will find a just and fair solution.

Reference is made in the speech from the Throne to the prosperity and progress of Canada, and I think it is a gratifying fact that this chamber is able to answer, irrespective of party affiliations, that the country during the last year has certainly progressed. Upon that point, we are all agreed. Signs of prosperity are now visible on every side ; and although, in 1896, many people had not very sanguine hopes, nobody can dispute the evidence of a fact as clear as the light of the sun. New industries are being built up as if by magic; while in the older industrial establishments the works are running up to their full capacity, and considerable development is taking place. The salaries paid to wage-earners are higher than ever before, and in the labour market the supply is unequal to the demand. Mortgages, with which formerly farm lands were encumbered, are now on the decrease. The immigration tide is rising fast and immigrants are flocking by the thousands into the country; in a word, the greatest activity prevails everywhere. Our trade is increasing by leaps and bounds. In 1896, the trade of Canada, which amounted to $240,000,000, had reached on July 1 last, the five hundred million mark ($550,000,000). If we consider separately our imports and exports, the mining industry, the output of our manufacturing industries, the products of the farm, and if we compare them with the figures of 1896, the result will be the same as that shown by the comparison between the trade of 1896 and that of 1906. Now, Sir, the same abundant prosperity that is enjoyed by the people of western Canada permeates also the eastern provinces and every section of the country. To sum up, I may say that, within the last few years. Canada has developed into a magnificent country with the brightest future before her. The prosperity of Canada may be ascribed to various causes, but to speak out my mind, I think that the prosperity we are now enjoying is the result of a bountiful Providence and of the good government of the past few years. The era of our prosperity dates from the day when peace and harmony began to prevail in this country. Mr. Speaker, I need not dwell upon the condition of the country prior to 1896, nor to the sombre picture of that period when race and creed wrangles between Protestants and Catholics, between people of French origin and the English-speaking people had been going on for years and led the country to the verge of civil war. Now, thanks to a policy of harmony and conciliation and the patriotism of the government now in power, peace and quiet were restored, amicable relations were established between the differ-

ent sections of the people; bitter enemies were turned into friends; and it so happens that nowadays the hatreds and conflicts of the past have given place to a gospel of toleration; and the citizens of this country, willing to sink their opinions for the sake of harmony, and remembering that they are Canadians first, devote all their energies to the patriotic task of making this Canada of ours a great and prosperous country.

It is with the greatest pleasure I second the motion before us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker. I desire most sincerely to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of this address upon the very eloquent speeches which have just been delivered. It is true that perhaps we would not be altogether inclined to agree with everything that was suggested by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee), more especially with regard to the public expenditure of this country. My hon. friend who moved the address is very comprehensive in his justification of the public expenditure, because I recollect very well that last year he stood up stoutly in this House and defended what we thought a very improper expenditure with regard to the steamship 'Arctic.' When he suggests that all this expenditure has been wise, economical and for the benefit of the country, we cannot but feel inclined to picture to ourselves the tremendous disaster that would have befallen this fair Dominion of ours if that expedition had never been sent, and if the three or four hundred thousand dollars spent upon it had remained in the public treasury. It would have been a national calamity against which I am sure my hon. friend who has just spoken would have raised his voice.

He has spoken also in very proper terms of the prosperity of the country. We, on this side of the House, rejoice with him that the country is prosperous, that present conditions obtain in Canada to-day. He has referred to the marvellous increase in the railway tonnage and in the amount of freight carried by the railways of this country. He very judiciously thought proper to omit the statement which he well might have made, that although the Intercolonial has participated very largely in that increased tonnage, it has been rolling up larger deficits during the last four or five years than were ever before known in its history. With similar prudence he refrained from any reference to the fact that although we have large tracts of public land in this country, the present administration seem inclined to get rid of it at the very earliest possible moment, and at prices which are very beneficial to the gentlemen who are fortunate enough to secure these grants.

I congratulate the hon. gentleman most heartily on what he has said with regard to electoral reform. I could not help noticing that that portion of his speech received much less applause from his friends than any other portion of it. I do not know whether there is any significance in that. I am glad indeed that the government have promised, in the speech from the Throne, to give us legislation on that question this year. I brought the matter to the attention of parliament last session. I introduced certain Bills, I moved that they be referred to a special committee. The then Minister of Justice was also prepared with one or more Bills, and all the proposed legislation went to that committee to be dealt with at that time. I note the course which the hon. gentleman has just now proposed, and which seems to me a very desirable one to follow under such circumstances. I made no partisan reference, I made no attack upon any hon. gentleman or upon the Liberal party of this country with regard to such matters; I simply brought to the attention of the House what I conceived to be very serious defects in the law with regard to elections, and in the law with regard to procedure for investigating those elections. Unfortunately, through causes for which I do not in the least reproach the government, the researches of that committee and the report of that committee were not as full as I could have wished. If a measure is brought down, as I believe one will be brought down, this session, doing that which the hon. gentleman has advocated, I am sure the government will find on this side of the House every disposition to deal with that matter from a non-partisan standpoint, and to put upon the statute-book of this country such enactments as will be sufficient to bring about a reform of the evils which have been alluded to by the hon. gentleman who moved this address. So far as I am concerned, I agree very much with what was stated by the Minister of Justice of the day in his remarks last year. The law which we have upon the statute-book at the present time is a fairly good law if we could always be sure of its enforcement. But, unfortunately, we cannot always be sure of its enforcement, and I am inclined to adhere to the attitude which I then took, that one important amendment, and perhaps the most important amendment that is necessary in that regard, is one which will establish in this country a public prosecutor beyond the reach of either political party, whether government or opposition, whose duty it would be to deal with these matters, and investigate those cases which, for any reason, it may not be the intention of one party or the other to deal with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning again to a subject which was alluded to by my hon. friend who moved this address, let me say that when he speaks of the prosperity of this country we agree with him; when he speaks of all the expenditure of this country as having been wise and judicious we are not much disposed to agree with him; and we are supported by the statement of a public servant of this country

who has just retired from the Department of Finance, and who has had an experience unique in its character. He has served under every Prime Minister of Canada since confederation, he has served under every Minister of Finance from confederation to the present time with one exception; and that public servant finds himself no sooner relieved from the duties of his office than he makes haste to sound a warning note to the people of Canada and to the government of Canada. He says :

A little swagger and extravagance might be conceded, but Canada is spending too much.

Any man who knows Mr. J. M. Courtney, who knows the moderation which always characterizes his statements, will understand that when words of that character fall from his lips it is well for the government and for the people of this country to consider whether some heed should not be given to his warning, and whether some of the expenditure of which we have complained in the past should not be brought to an end. Mr. Courtney also said :

Every effort should be made to save, and a halt should be called in many instances.

Does my hon. friend the mover of this address realize that during the last four years we have spent yearly on an average, $73,700,000, including both capital expenditure and expenditure on current account, or nearly $300,000,000 in the last four years. Yet my hon. friend is prepared to say that this expenditure should go on, not only that it should go on, but that it should be of the character, the undesirable character, of some of the expenditures to which we have called attention in past sessions.

My hon. friend alluded to the tariff; and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has dealt with that subject in a somewhat indefinite way in a recent speech which he made in the city of Montreal. He seemed to complain a little that the government were somewhat embarrassed, as my hon. friend from Lambton says in effect that they are embarrassed, by the demands of the manufacturers on the one hand and the demands of the farmers on the other. Well, I have been observing the demands of the farmers as reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of a late date, and I find that they are couched almost exactly in the words of these hon. gentlemen themselves in the Ottawa convention of 1893, and in the language used by them over and over again on the public platforms of this country. Reference has been made to the rate of taxation, I think, by the hon. gentleman who seconded the address. The farmers declare that the rate of customs duties on dutiable goods was raised in 1879 to 21 per cent, was raised in 1882, I think, to 26 per cent, and that it is at the present time, 27½ per cent. They desire, in the concluding words of their resolution, this :

We therefore ask, in the coming revision of the tariff, that the protective principle be wholly eliminated.

Who taught these gentlemen to make these demands? I will not go over the quotations which have been made so many times in this House, and notably made by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Com- the records of 'Hansard' for the year 1902. when he sat where my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) now sits, and when he turned and read a lecture to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister quoting the words of the right hon. gentleman at Winnipeg in 1894. I will not go over these again. They may be found in the records of 'Hansard' for the year 1902. I will not go over the story of protection, slavery and bondage which was repeated by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in the House in quoting from the utterances of the right hon. Prime Minister. I will not even allude to what the right hon. Prime Minister declared in Quebec when he said that protection was the sole bane and curse of Canada, but I will allude to one thing and that is that we were told in 1897 by the right hon. Prime Minister, and, if I remember right, by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that the ships head was pointed towards the open sea of free trade, that a step had been made in the right direction and that the Liberal party had to a certain extent fulfilled its pledges made to the people of the country. Let me quote some of my right hon. friend's words which were not quoted by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1902 ; let me quote a pledge, expressed in as solemn language as it could be expressed, by the present Prime Minister of this country and let me give these words to the farmers of Canada as setting forth what they may reasonably expect from the government if they are true to their pledges :

When the Liberals are in power——

Said the present right hon. the Prime Minister, then in opposition :

When the Liberals are in power they will at once give a measure of freedom of trade——

They say they have done that. They say they did that in 1897.

When the Liberals are in power they will at once give a measure of freedom of trade and step by step they will follow it up, and if God spares our lives we shall progress steadily until we have it as full as Great Britain has it.

Well, it was in view of this that the farmers of this country couched their demand to the government in the language to which I have just referred.

Let me say also that the farmers should find consolation in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance, at Yarmouth, in 1902, because, in dealing with the question of bounties at that time, he informed the people of the constituency of Yarmouth,

who were supposed to be strongly free trade in opinion, to this effect:

> The Conservatives will tell you that the policy of bounties were granted by the former government. So it was. We shall do some more business under that bounty system. I myself do not object to it. It is a good thing sometimes. We took up that bounty system and readjusted it and we intend in five or six years to wipe out the bounty system. In five or six years there will be no bounty paid to those iron and steel industries.

Now, these no doubt may be very consoling words to those who are opposed to the principle of protection, whether expressed in a customs tariff or in a policy of bounties, but they will not be very reassuring words at this juncture, when we are on the eve of the expiration of those five years, to the persons who are engaged in the business of manufacturing iron and steel, and who, in some respects, are struggling, I believe, at the present time against difficulties of an unusual character.

But, the Minister of Finance, at Montreal, referred to more than the tariff. He referred to the proceedings which had been taken against him in the courts and more particularly to the observations of the Conservative press and Conservative speakers in regard to it, charging us all with a gross exaggeration of the circumstances and facts. I do not know whether my hon. friend intended to include me in the very comprehensive remarks which he made on that occasion, but I desire to tell him that on the two or three different occasions on which I did allude to the revelations in the trial of the election petition against him I took particular care to keep myself within the record and to say not one single word which was not justified by the evidence. Indeed I took the pains to read that evidence before I uttered one word on the subject and I challenge my hon. friend, in so far as I am concerned, to point to one single word of exaggeration or unjust criticism in regard to this matter. I might retort upon my hon. friend ; I might be inclined to say, and I think I might very justly say, that his representation of the facts of the case to the people who had the pleasure of listening to him at Montreal was, to say the least, not a very full one.

> It was inevitable, he said, that in an election some indiscreet partisan should occasionally exceed the bounds of the law and do things which the election law did not contemplate.

My hon. friend altogether forgets the record when he puts the case in that way. In the first place my hon. friend forgot the provisions of the law himself in the elections of 1900. Upon the matter to which allusion has been made we have a plain statute, section 143 of the Election Act which declares that no man in this country, being a candidate at an election, shall make any payment in respect to that election except through an agent duly appointed by him in writing. That is the plain provision of the law. What did my hon. friend do ? My hon. friend, after his account had been presented, after his statement had been made by his agent and after it had been handed in, and when certain bills were presented to him by a man who was not his agent, by a certain gentleman by the name of Farrell, a member of the legislative assembly in the province of Nova Scotia, reluctantly, he says and upon the condition that he should never be called upon to do anything of the kind again, gave the amount of these bills, whatever it was, for the purpose of paying these bills. I have under my hand his evidence given upon the trial and examination; I have it here and I challenge contradiction of what I say. He stated that he made no inquiry as to the purpose for which this money had been expended when he handed this amount over to Farrell and it was in respect to that that the appeal was taken to the Supreme Court and it was in respect to that that the judgment of the Supreme Court was invoked. There is a penalty for doing that which my hon. friend did in this case. I have no doubt that he must have overlooked the provision of the law. I have no doubt that he did what he did inadvertently in so far as this statute is concerned. But let us not minimize this too much, let us remember that the statute law of this country provides that any man who shall make a payment otherwise than through his duly authorized agent is guilty of an indictable offence and that the statute has made provision exactly for the case which he has detailed in his evidence. If these bills were legitimate bills, if they were proper bills, if these disbursements were for proper purposes all my hon. friend had to do was to apply to a judge of the court for permission to pay them at that time. The provisions of section 145 of the statute are explicit in that regard. I will not deal further with this matter. I am prepared to deal further with it if it shall be necessary, because I have the evidence and the examination of my hon. friend under my hand.

I have spoken of this for two reasons: first, because I think the hon. gentleman has unjustly accused the Conservative party as a whole of unfair criticism in respect to that public matter, and second, because I think he did not state the case fairly and fully in his remarks at Montreal. Let me add one word further. This gentleman, Mr. Farrell, who brought these bills to the Minister of Finance is not only a member of the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia, but he is actually the Speaker of that Assembly. Some weeks before the trial came on; some weeks before he could be subpœnaed. Mr. Farrel's health suddenly failed and he sought seclusion in the neighbouring republic. By a remarkable coincidence his health was restored a day or two after

the conclusion of the trial and he returned to the province of Nova Scotia and engaged once more in his customary avocation of editing a Liberal newspaper in the county of Queen's. But the Minister of Finance in his speech at Montreal did not allude to another matter which I think might very well have engaged his attention. In the session of 1905 there was a resolution moved in this House by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) forbidding active interference of public officials in elections; a resolution couched so exactly in the language which the Prime Minister had used over and over again in this House that the government for very shame's sake were compelled to accept it and did accept it. After that resolution had been passed unanimously it was shamelessly disregarded by the Minister of the Interior, but we did expect better things from the Minister of Finance. Nevertheless, in the recent election in Shelburne and Queen's we find that many federal government officials have been working for the Minister of Finance; and working openly and boldy and unblushingly, and so far as we are able to judge with the minister's full consent and approval. Am I going too far in saying that? I think not. I do not desire to be unjust to the hon. gentleman, but let me say that a Mr. Bain who in the last fiscal year drew as salary and allowance from this government as fishery inspector a sum of $971.10, and Mr. Oscar Campbell, who drew a somewhat smaller salary, were appointed by the Minister of Finance to be his agents at two polls.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, they were appointed by the Minister of Finance by writing under his own hand to be his agents at two polls in the recent election in Shelburne and Queen's. Well, we have the language of the Prime Minister in regard to that conduct. This very practice was brought to the attention of the government during the session of 1905, and the Prime Minister had no hesitation in condemning it in these words :

> If he (referring to the official charged), if he was acting as a scrutineer he was going further than I would permit him to go. I do not think that an officer of the government should act as a scrutineer or as an agent.

Yet in face of the unanimous resolution of this House, in face of the declaration of the leader of this House, the Minister of Finance not only had officials of this government working openly for him in that election, but we find him approving and confirming their acts by appointing two men who are paid by the public money of this country to be his agents at the polls. Now, Mr. Chairman, ladies and——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for thus unwittingly breaking the rule of the House which requires me to address the Chair, but I trust, Sir, you will excuse me if I decline to apologize for addressing the ladies on any occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, her.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago we heard echoes of the London election. It has been alluded to to-day by the hon. gentleman who moved the address. It is a matter to which I did not intend to refer in this House until the proceedings in the courts had been closed and it is a matter to which I shall make but slight allusion now notwithstanding that there is a resignation or an attempted resignation in the hands of Mr. Speaker, and notwithstanding that my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) has seen fit to draw the attention of Parliament to it. There were shouts of victory on a memorable evening in this House last year, and certain hon. gentlemen—gentlemen on the other side of the House I presume—were good enough on that occasion to fasten upon the door of my room in this building and upon the door of the room occupied by the chief whip of the Conservatice party and upon the door of room No. 6 a very ribald inscription with a piece of crape attached to it. Mr. Speaker, who is wearing the crape to-day ? I shall make no further allusion to that except to say that I believe that crape has been preserved and it is now at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite.

And it was in connection with this very election that the mere appearance of the Hon. Mr. Haultain upon the public platform was thought sufficient to cause him to be put to one side although he had been Prime Minister of the Territories, now constituting the two new provinces, for a period of about thirteen years. I made a brief reference to this matter last year. I did not then know the inner history of it. It had been disclosed, but I was not aware of it, by the present Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, and it had been disclosed in this way. In a letter quoted in this House last year—quoted after I had spoken and after the Prime Minister had spoken—by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, it appears that Mr. Walter Scott gave this version of the transaction :

> I may say that Laurier all along has seemed to be of opinion that Haultain ought to be called as premier in one of the provinces. Had Haultain acted with any approach to propriety under the circumstances I believe that Laurier would have absolutely refused to pass him over.

What has the Prime Minister of Canada to do with passing over Mr. Haultain ? Is that not the business of the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan ? Have we not a constitution in this country under which we are supposed to have lieutenant governors

who act independently of the federal authority ? Is not the whole basis of our constitution dependent upon that principle ? What has the Prime Minister of Canada to do with the selection by the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan of the man who shall be Prime Minister of that province ? But that is not all. Mr. Scott continues :

> Had Haultain acted with any approach to propriety under the circumstances I believe that Laurier would have absolutely refused to pass him over. His whole conduct, however, from first to last in this business has been execrable. His going into Oxford and London, combined with the threat he made at Woodstock on the night of the election to stir up a school question in one of the new provinces if he obtained control, compelled Laurier to change his mind.

What is the duty of the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan ? It is understood by Mr. Scott at least that the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan has nothing at all to do with the selection of his Prime Minister, but that it is a question to be properly and rightly determined, under our constitution, by the Prime Minister of Canada. Well, that was not the doctrine of my right hon. friend years ago. Before I was a member of this House I can recollect motions made by the late Hon. David Mills propounding the theory (and it is the right and proper theory) that the lieutenant governor of a province must act independently of federal authority ; that he must not be made subservient to federal authority; that his is an office of dignity and importance under the constitution and that there should be no attempt on the part of the federal authority to coerce or to influence the judgment of a lieutenant governor. The lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, as the lieutenant governor of any other province of Canada, represents the Crown in respect of provincial matters just in the same way as the Governor General represents the Crown in respect of federal matters. He is not an officer of the federal government; he is the direct representative of the Crown, and any attempt to undermine the dignity and the independence of such an officer is in my opinion a blow aimed against the spirit and indeed against the letter of the constitution.

There are one or two other matters to which I desire briefly to allude. One is the crisis which it appears has developed in the county of Quebec. I was not aware that any crisis had developed in that county until I was informed of the fact by reading in the Toronto 'Globe' a report of some remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who I regret is not in his place to-day. There has been an election in Quebec county, and it appears that an hon. member of this House, who was not the choice of the Prime Minister or of the leaders of the Liberal party, has been returned. This event seems to have excited my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to an unusual extent. I had followed the debates upon the public platform a little, but I had not heard that there was any sectarian question raised in that fight, and I appeal to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for confirmation, if he desires to give it, of the statement of the Minister of Justice. I am quoting from a report of a speech made by the Minister of Justice at Wiarton on the 24th of October, contained in the Toronto 'Globe' of the following day :

> Only yesterday in the county of Quebec the fires of sectarian hatred have been lighted, on the ground that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too British for his political opponents there. If he is too British for them he should be British enough for the province of Ontario.

And further on :

> And just as those in Quebec who wish his downfall are to-day having the victory they say they have won on the plains of Quebec, those in Ontario who are exulting in the victory over Sir Wilfrid Laurier are, if they but knew it, digging the very grave of British institutions in Canada, and seeking to put us in the position in which we were fifty or sixty years ago, when one province was arrayed against the other and there seemed to be no hope of a solution of the difficulties of our struggling country.

Well, the member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Robitaille) is very young ; he is, I believe, only 24 years of age ; and he made a very good fight in that county, as is evident from the fact that he was returned ; but I was not aware that he had put forward any programme which was likely to result in digging the grave of British institutions in Canada. I would appeal to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister with the hope that he will declare to us that these apprehensions of the Minister of Justice are entirely unfounded. If they are not unfounded, then it seems to me that we are on the eve of a great crisis in this country, and it is a remarkable evidence of the ability of this young gentleman, the youngest member of the House, whom we had the honour of congratulating yesterday when he was introduced, that at so early an age, he has been able to prepare the grave of British institutions in Canada. It may not be a tribute to his good judgment, but I am sure that we shall all agree that it is a remarkable tribute to his energy and ability and capacity. If we can only turn the energy and capacity of that young gentleman in the right direction, what may we not expect from him in the near future? My hon. friend the mover of the address has referred to the great work done by the Prime Minister. He did not refer to his work in opposition, but only to his work since he came into power. I do not know whether there was any significance in that; perhaps my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) will inform us on some future occasion.

But if the Prime Minister has been able to perform a great work in this country, what may we not expect of the young member from Quebec county, if we can get him on the right track ?

But it appears that he is not the only guilty party. I observe a little further, that the member for Quebec county is accused of having one very wicked ally ; for the Minister of Justice says :

> To whom but Sir Wilfrid was Canada indebted for the measure that made him the mark of the outcry in the province by false friends such as Mr. Bourassa, who pretended to be his allies ?

Perhaps that is intended by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice as in some measure taking the responsibility away from the new member for the county of Quebec and transferring it to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). At all events, in view of the crisis pointed out by the Minister of Justice, I think it would be well for us to have some words of explanation from the Prime Minister, and to be reassured upon this matter at as early a date as possible.

Any preference by Great Britain to Canadian products was repudiated by the Prime Minister of Canada in 1897 and also by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture afterwards on at least two occasions. We have heard through the press, but only through the press, that negotiations have taken place between this government and the government of Australia, and that there has has been some negligence on the part of this government in replying to comunications from the government of the Australian Commonwealth. I think it would be well for the Prime Minister to inform us whether there have been such negotiations and whether there has been neglect on the part of his government to answer communications made by the Australian government in reference to this important matter, and I trust that he will do so when he comes to address the House.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior professes to be a stout defender of the public domain of Canada ; I do not allude to utterances that he may have made in private, but to his public utterances. It would appear from an abridged prospectus of the Southern Alberta Land Company, which I have in my hand, that some 390,000, acres of land in Southern Alberta are the property of that company, and that 380,575 acres have been acquired by that company under agreement with the Crown bearing date the 26th of June, 1906, at the price of $3 per acre, of which $2 per acre is to be handed back when paid by expenditure in irrigation works. It appears further that this land when irrigated can be sold for from $20 to $25 per acre, and that the cost of irrigation is from $6 to $10 per acre ; and that the rate charged by the company for water supply to the settlers will pay for the maintenance of the work. Under these circumstances it would appear that the gentlemen interested in this company will gain a very handsome profit out of these 380,000 acres of land.

I would venture respectfully to inquire whether the government took into consideration before entering into that agreement the desirability of undertaking irrigation works themselves, by commission or otherwise, and of retaining for the people of this country the increment in value which, under present conditions, will go to the fortunate speculators who are members of this company. The Minister of the Interior (Mr Oliver) hardly seems to justify the promises which he made last session, or at least the attitude he took last session, in entering into an agreement of the kind, and we ought to have full information later on.

I would like also to know the present position of W. T. R. Preston in the public service. Last year a certain motion was made with regard to him. Some interest in that resolution, which called for Mr. Preston's dismissal, was taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and notably by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who insisted with great persistency upon obtaining the explicit promise of the Minister of the Interior that there would be a thorough investigation into matters about which Mr. Preston had at that time been giving evidence before two of the committees of this House for several weeks. Well, we do not know what investigation has been held. We shall hear of that I presume later on, from either the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but there are rumours that although Mr. Preston is not now in the public service in the capacity he formerly held, he has been promoted to another position and is to represent the people of this country in the far east. I have no information upon this subject, I am referring to it in order to obtain information, and I trust the Prime Minister before he takes his seat to-day will inform the House whether an investigation has been held, what the result is, and whether Mr. Preston is now in the public service and if so in what capacity.

There is one other matter to which I would like to call attention. When the Hon. D. C. Fraser, formerly a member of this House and afterwards a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was appointed to be Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, I think in February last, a vacancy upon the bench of that province was created. As far as I am aware that vacancy has not been filled. I would like to ask the Prime Minister to-day why it is that an important position of that character has been left unoccupied until this day. The bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia should con-

sist of seven judges, but for nearly a year it has consisted of only six. What is the reason for this ? Are there not members of the bar of the province of Nova Scotia capable of filling the position ? I know something of the bar of that province and for the present I shall speak only of Liberal members of that bar. I know there is a member of this House, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Laurence), a man who has had an honourable career at that bar, an able lawyer, a gentleman who occupies a high position at the bar, and, Sir, well capable of filling that office. It was expected in the month of June or July last that that hon. member would be elevated to that position; he has not been so elevated. It is understood that he would not be unwilling to accept promotion to that high office, and I am saying that not by way of reproach to that hon. gentleman because it would be a very laudable ambition on his part after having an honourable career at the bar for twenty-five or thirty years to fill the position of judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. What is the reason that no member of the Nova Scotia bar has been found worthy to be appointed to that office which has stood vacant for nearly a year? Is not the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, another gentleman of high position at the bar in that province, worthy to fill that position ? For what reason has that vacancy been left unfilled ? Could not any of those gentlemen have been spared from their service to the country ? Could not Mr. W. E. Roscoe, of Kentville, who was elected as one of the commissioners to revise the Dominion statutes, have been appointed? I have mentioned the names of different gentlemen, who are all Liberals, only to indicate that there are men in Nova Scotia capable of filling that position, of filling it with dignity and of bringing to the discharge of that office all the learning that could be desired. There are others whose names I need not mention, but who are also worthy. And in that connection it might also be well for the Prime Minister to inform us whether the interests of the country have suffered materially during the past six or eight months by reason of the fact that we have had no Solicitor General. I do not know precisely the practical duties of that office. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) did not lose any flesh while performing the duties as far as I am aware, and I do not know whether the interests of the country have suffered. Is there not a wealth of material on the other side of the House ? I will not shock the modesty of any of those gentlemen by pointing first to one and then the other and assuring the Prime Minister as I could that, not only in the opinion of those gentlemen themselves but of the House as well, they are eminently capable of discharging all the duties incumbent on the Solicitor General. Is there an embarrassment of riches ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the difficulty, they are all so worthy, that the Prime Minister finds it difficult to make a choice. Let me suggest to him that he establish the office in commission, put the office of Solicitor General in commission and appoint six of these gentlemen and then we will be sure that none of them will be overworked and they can arrange salary matters as they deem best. But at all events, let not the interests of the country be longer prejudiced by the fact that we are going on in Canada from day to day, to the imminent peril of this country, without a Solicitor General. I tell my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in all seriousness, that the fact that we have no Solicitor General in Canada to-day is in my opinion as grave a crisis as that referred to by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth).

Various subjects have been mentioned in the speech from the Throne to which perhaps allusion might be made, but most of them will be subjects for discussion in this House when the measures to which reference is made have been introduced. There are some matters not mentioned. There is no suggestion of any attempt on the part of the government of this country to bring about cheaper means of communication and transport in this country. We in Canada occupy a remarkable position in that respect. We have six milions of people or thereabouts in this country, scattered over an enormous area, with great powers of production, and marvellous resources. My hon. friend who moved the address (Mr. Pardee), did not go too far to-day when he spoke of the wonderful possibilities of this country. But the very fact that we have some enormous resources, the very fact that we have a sparse population scattered over this vast country, makes the question of transportation in Canada a vital one, more vital to the people of Canada than to the people of any other country in the world, more vital to the people of Canada than any other question. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) spoke very truly, and I was deeply impressed by his remarks some three or four years ago when he stated that the problem of transportation in Canada begins in the factory or at the farm and ends with the market, at home or abroad, to which our products must be consigned. That is the problem that confronts the government and to which attention must be given. There is not one word in the speech from the Throne with regard to the equipment of our great national ports. And further than that there is not one word in the speech from the Throne with regard to any legislation looking to a better mode of dealing with disputes between capital and labour in this country.

We have had some object lessons with regard to that within the past few weeks. There have been violence, bloodshed and death, and not so very far from the capital of this country. The measure introduced by the government some few years ago, introduced I believe, at the instance of Sir William Mulock, and by him, was directed in a certain way along which it was expected to find a remedy for difficult conditions. But it does not appear to have gone far enough or to have afforded a very effective remedy. We must not suffer such a condition in this country that there shall be these armed bands confronting each other in cases of disputes of this kind. It will not do. In connection with a private enterprise, such a condition is bad enough, but should such a condition face us with regard to any of our great national undertakings, with regard to the operation of any of our public utilities, it might paralyse the business of the country. I am not speaking of one party or of the other as being at fault, I am not pronouncing judgment on that point; but I say that the attention of the government and of the people of Canada must be turned in the direction of devising some means by which violence, bloodshed and death shall be prevented in cases of this kind. The situation is a very serious one and is brought immediately to our attention by what has occurred within the last few weeks in the immediate vicinity of the capital; and I should be glad indeed if the government had announced, and I shall be glad if later on in the House they shall announce, that this matter has been taken into consideration and some measure looking to a better mode of dealing with these questions will be introduced, and, at least, discussed in parliament.

So far as other measures referred to in the speech from the Throne are concerned, we will give them our best consideration when they are introduced. I have said nothing with regard to the resolutions passed by the conference of provincial premiers. We shall have these presented to us with the resolutions that the government propose to base upon them. So far as these are concerned, we will give them our best consideration. And especially, as I have said, we will give our best and more careful attention and consideration, and support, to any measure which may be introduced by the government which will have for its effect the bettering of conditions in Canada with regard to the holding of elections, which will tend to the elimination of bribery, corruption and coercion from our electoral system and will bring about in our country a cleaner, and fairer trial of public opinion by means of elections than that which has sometimes been afforded in the past.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the tone of the speech to which we have just listened, though not, on the whole unpleasant or illnatured, is such as to cause me doubt that it will be my privilege during the present session to have many opportunities of agreeing with my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). Upon this occasion there appears to be only one point upon which I can agree with him, and that is in offering my humble congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the address which is now in your hands. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has, long ere this, during the last session of parliament, established his reputation upon the floor of this House, and, to-day, the sound and vigour of his expression give us a further illustration of what we may expect from him in the future and show the stuff he is made of. But it is a peculiar pleasure for me to say that I welcome to the floor of this House my young and hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Joseph Demers). He takes the place of a gentleman of very high reputation, one who is remembered in this House for abilities of the first order and for a character in keeping with those abilities. Those who came in contact with Mr. L. P. Demers while a member of this House have already accepted the conclusion the government reached some time ago, that he would be an ornament and credit to the bench to which he has been called.

I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) agrees with me, though he did not mention it, that we meet under peculiarly auspicious circumstances. This year in which we are and which is now fast reaching its close, this year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and six, has been for Canada, in many respects, a record year. Even the elements seem to have conspired to make it phenomenal. It opened with a winter which turned out to be remarkable for its benignity. In fact, if winter can err at all, this one erred on the side of mildness; if winter could have a fault, the fault of last winter was that it did not come up to the standard of what we regard as climatic orthodoxy. For we Canadians are apt to believe that winter does not give us our due if it fails to pile the snow high upon the ground and send the mercury below zero. Winter was followed by a genial spring and this with a glorious summer, and the year was crowned with an autumn the like of which has not been seen within the memory of living men. The Canadian autumn is famous and deservedly famous. The autumn of this year was of even unusual beauty. And it lingered for days, for weeks, even for months, as if unwilling to depart this much favoured land. In many other and more substantial respects the elements were equally propitious. Except a small section of the country in the lower St. Lawrence, every part of Canada was blessed with a most abundant harvest. The wheat fields in the new provinces gave a generous return, even though that return did not come up to the expectations, the too-ambitious expectations of some over-confident prophets of the earlier part

of the season. Prices were remunerative, and, in some commodities almost extravagantly remunerative. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that our trade increased by leaps and bounds. On the first of July last, it had reached the five-hundred-million mark, and now it is on a fair way to the goal of six hundred millions. These figures, in themselves, do not tell us much. But if we make comparison of the trade of Canada, man for man, with the trade of some of the most highly civilized nations of the earth, we shall realize the extent to which we have made progress. England, which is the mother of trade as it is the mother of freedom, has a trade amounting to about $100 per head of the population. The trade of Germany, of which we have heard so much of late years, and which has made such substantial progress, is only about $50 per head. The trade of the United States, large as it is, and prosperous as that country is, is less than $40 per head of the people. The trade of Canada, being a total of about $500,000,000, amounted to no less than $90 per head of the population. I know that I shall be told that these figures do not tell the whole story, as they give the record of the foreign trade only—the exports and imports—of the countries referred to, and take no account of the internal trade, there being no statistics of that internal commerce for any nation. And, as I wish to speak with fairness, I am prepared to say, as for my part I believe that, had we the full statistics of the trade of the United States and of Canada it would probably be shown that the United States has a greater trade per head of population than we have. But I also believe that it would be shown that we are a close, and ever closer, second. But, Sir, there is another feature in the case. No nation can live by itself, every nation must have a trade abroad, for it must seek to sell elsewhere the surplus of its products to those nations that, in respect of these products, have a deficiency.

In that respect, therefore, and since all nations look for foreign trade, I say with legitimate pride that we stand far ahead of the great American republic. The trade has expanded, the revenue has expanded, and we have just been told by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that the expenditure has also expanded. Of course it has. We are not flies on the wheel; we are alive to the situation and to the requirements of our country; and though the expenditure has expanded, it has been kept well in check and always within the revenue. The hon. gentleman said that in his opinion the expendtiure was excessive, and he gave the opinion of Mr. Courtney in that respect. Mr. Courtney's opinion is one which no one can despise, on the contrary everybody must respect it. But it seems to me that the friend of the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Mr. Foster) must have felt rather uncomfortable when the opinion of Mr. Courtney was cited, because if, in this glorious present time when we have an abundant revenue, Mr. Courtney thinks that perhaps we should put a brake upon the wheel and check the expenditure, I think the hon. gentleman's desk mate must have felt very uncomfortable when he was in control of the finances, when there was a contracted revenue, and the expenditure was far beyond the possibilities of the revenue. There is the difference between us. It is not sufficient simply to compare the expenditure of one period with that of another period and to say, as we have been told very often that in the old days, under the old regime they spent less than $40,000,000, whereas we at the present time spend almost $70,000,000. It is not sufficient to put these facts opposite each other, because they give no accurate idea of the circumstances. An expenditure of $40,000,000 may be an extravagant one, and an expenditure of $70,000,000 may be a moderate one. It all depends upon the means of the people to bear the expenditure and that is a circumstance which was overlooked by my hon. friend a moment ago.

May I, Mr. Speaker, recall to my hon. fried a principle of economy which I am sure he is acquainted with, because it was formulated by a famous character of Dickens, one Micawber. Micawber, as depicted by Dickens, was not a model for a finance minister, still he sometimes had good ideas, though he did not put them into practice. This was his maxim: Annual income, twenty pounds; annual expendtiure, nineteen, nineteen and six, result, happiness; annual income, twenty pounds and six, result, misery.

If this principle is true, I wonder what was the feeling of my hon. friend for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he had charge of the finances of this country, and year after year had millions upon millions of deficits. We are living now in happier days, we are putting into practice the principle of Micawber which, if it was sound in his days, is sound in our days. We do not expend all we collect, and therefore we have constant happiness. My hon. friend also referred to the character of our expenditure. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of telling us that we have no great public works to show for the money we have expended. 'No great public works'—I hear the echo. Well, Sir, if hon. gentlemen will only open their eyes and look about the country they will see that at this very moment there is, so far as a scarcity of labour will permit, a transcontinental railway being constructed to connect the waters of the Pacific with the waters of the Atlantic. Nay, if he will look over this country he will find scores of railways which have been constructed and which have added immensely to the welfare of the community. If

he will look a little abroad he will see that at the mouth of the Welland canal there are gigantic works going on at this moment in order to capture and to direct the grain trade of the Northwest by the way of the St. Lawrence. If he will go to the other end of the St. Lawrence, he will find in the vicinity of Quebec city that the St. Lawrence is spanned by a bridge which, in some respects, will be the largest in the world. Sir, are those not big works—if that is what he wants ? If the trascontinental railway, if the Quebec bridge, if the works at the mouth of the Welland canal cannot be denominated great public works by these hypercritics opposite, would they give us a definition of what they understand by great public works ? Do they expect us to build Egyptian pyramids, or something like the Colossus of Rhodes ? It seems to me that in these modern days the building of railways, and bridges, and accommodation for the grain trade are the class of public works which we should expect to have. We have abundance of those works to show for the expenditure that has been made wholly or partially out of the public treasury. So far as that goes, I think the expenditure we have made is a wise one. But there is more than that, we have not only these public works but we have the satisfaction of knowing that they have been of great benefit and advantage to the community. They can go all over the country and they will find post offices and public buildings which are a necessity in our present civilization ; they will find wharfs, piers, lighthouses and buoys, all necessary to our system of navigation. Do they object to that expenditure ? If they do object now they did not when they were in office, because they made a similar expenditure then. But I care not to take refuge behind an argument of that kind. The works which we have built, be they big or small, have developed trade and commerce, and benefited the toilers of the sea and the toilers on the soil.

I do not know that I care to follow my hon. friend in the details of the discursive speech which he has just made ; he has gone outside the speech from the Throne in several respects. He said he had no intention to say much with regard to the London election, and he insisted that we should have a more stringent election law. With regard to the London election I have only this to say at the present time, perhaps the matter will come up again. My hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) has thought it advisable to resign his seat in consequence of what occurred in that election. Sir, in the investigation which has taken place in Toronto, after all that has been developed there, everybody is glad to say, and I am proud to say, that not one word has been said against Mr. Hyman. The friends of Mr. Hyman know that he has taken that matter very much to heart, and after weeks of anxious consideration he came to the conclusion that his sense of honour required him to resign his seat. To the conclusion which he thus reached I, for my part, offered no exception, I thought he acted wisely in doing so. Mr. Hyman was not satisfied with that. As I may inform my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, some few hours ago Mr. Hyman also tendered me his resignation as a member of the cabinet. But I was not prepared to accept it. As he had been a victim, and not an agent, and could not be reproached with any dishonourable act, I felt that he was carrying the thing too far in asking to be relieved of the duties which he was performing, and performing to the great satisfaction of his friends, and I think also to the satisfaction of those who are not his political friends. Therefore I asked Mr. Hyman to consider his determination, the matter is before him, and I expect to have an answer from him before very long.

But, Sir, let us look into this matter a little more. I do not know that much can be said on one side or the other, but I will allude to the examination of Mr. Gibbons. Mr. Gibbons, in his evidence, threw a flood of light upon the whole question of the London election. We know first of all that an election was held which, according to the evidence given in the Toronto police court, was tainted with corruption, and it is somewhat remarkable that no protest was entered against it. What was the reason? Was it because the other side could not go on the election court clean-handed? Was it because they thought it better to have the hatchet buried and not have the matter probed?

I do not know, but Mr. Gibbons told us that the friends of Mr. Hyman having fought two elections and won fairly and having been deprived of the seat by unfair and fraudulent methods came to the conclusion that they would fight the enemy with the devil's fire. Well, no great mistake could be made if the Grits should undertake to fight the enemy with the devil's fire. I do not know how it is, but it appears that the Tories can always use the devil's fire. They seem to have been made for it. It seems to be congenial to them ; they can do it almost with impunity, but when a poor misguided Grit undertakes to deal with the devil's fire, he burns his fingers every time. That is actually what happened in London. The poor Grits undertook to deal with the devil's fire and what do we see to-day? Therefore, it is better for our friends, I say it in all sincerity, that they should not follow those Tory methods, but that they should fight an honest battle. Honesty is the best policy. It is the only policy that will tell. It has been stated by my hon. friend and stated also by other hon. gentlemen on the floor of the House to-day that the election law

is pretty severe as it is. I do not know that it can be improved, and yet it must be improved. We must make it severer than it is, but it is of no use having severe laws unless there is behind them a strong public opinion to back up and enforce them. All that we have seen in the past is an ample justification of what I say. Though public opinion may not be in this respect as strong as it ought to be, still the duty remains upon us just the same. We have to improve the law and to make wrong-doing as difficult as it is possible to make it in order to have pure elections. There is a great difference between the classes of offences which we find by late developments to have taken place. Bribery is bad, but ballot switching is ten times worse, and although it is impossible to have any sympathy with bribery or the briber, still there is not for them the same contempt that there is for the ballot switcher, and if the law is to be effective it must be made absolutely severe and provide the severest penalty possible for any one attempting to tamper with the ballots. That is the view that I think ought to be taken when we come to deal with this matter.

Now, I must say to my hon. friend that I was surprised that in the course of the discursive remarks which he made he should have referred at all to the election in Shelburne and Queen's. The less said by our hon. friends of the Conservative party about this matter the better. The attempt which was made to fasten upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the penalty for an offence which he had not committed, I think was not creditable at all to the Conservative party, or at least to those who had the management of this election. I shall not say more upon this. My hon. friend has been vindicated and fully vindicated by the electors of Shelburne and Queen's, in which he has received the support not only of his political friends, but of a large body of his political opponents also. They wanted to testify to him that they had confidence in his integrity and honesty. But I was more surprised a moment ago when I heard my hon. friend the leader of the opposition refer to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in his last election had given powers of attorney to public officers to represent him at the polls. My hon. friend has been too long in public life not to know how this happened. Everybody has done the same thing. My hon. friend, myself, and everybody else—everybody who has been a candidate—has signed powers of attorney in blank to be filled up and distributed and in probably nine cases out of ten, nay, ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he does not know to whom these powers of attorney have been given. My hon. friend would convey the impression that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance deliberately and voluntarily had given a power of attorney to a public officer to represent him at the polls. It is sufficient for me to say that upon this occasion my hon. friend did what has been done all over; he signed his powers of attorney in blank knowing nothing as to the names with which they would be filled up. That is what took place upon that occasion, nothing more and nothing less, and I say in sincerity to my hon. friend that I think he would have been better advised if he had not touched this matter at all.

My hon. friend was not better advised when a moment ago he tried to create the impression upon the floor of this House to be spread broadcast all over the country, that I had attempted to dictate to the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan as to whom he should call to his council and as to whether he should call Mr. Scott, Mr. Haultain or anybody else. The hon. gentleman, if he had read the letter of Mr. Scott as it was written, would not have taken such a construction from the tenor of that letter. He took from that letter the construction that I had at some time or other communicated with the lieutenant governor and advised him to call, not Mr. Haultain, but Mr. Scott. I declare here, and I am sorry that I have to make this statement because I do not like to speak about myself personally, that I never had a word of communication with the Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan as to the party whom he should call to his council. But, the letter of Mr. Scott is very plain, broad and legible and its meaning is not at all obscure. What does Mr. Scott say? Mr. Scott says Laurier had been of the opinion that Haultain should be called as premier as soon as the province was organized, but the conduct of Haultain, taking the partisan position he did in regard to the Autonomy Bill, in the opinion of Laurier disqualified him from such a course as that. That was my opinion. I was not aware of that letter from Mr. Scott until it was read last session by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). Therefore, I can say here that I had been under the impression all along that as Mr. Haultain had been premier of the territories he should be called upon to be first premier of the province of Saskatchewan or of Alberta but when I saw that Mr. Haultain was taking such a partisan position, such a hostile attitude towards the Autonomy Bill and the education clauses of the Autonomy Bill, I came to the conclusion that it would not be wise that Mr. Haultain should become the premier. But, how was that done? Did I give advice to the lieutenant governor? There was no lieutenant governor at that time, but I advised my friends who were going into conventions to select the leaders of their party organization that they could no longer take Mr. Haultain, that they must have another man and that is why that letter was written by Mr. Scott, advising his friends all over the province to forego the attitude which had been taken by them up to that time

that Mr. Haultain should be leader of the party. My political friends in the Northwest had been giving their political allegiance to Mr. Haultain before the organization of the territories into provinces, and I saw no reason why the same thing should not be continued. They discarded their political differences. They agreed to let them go and have simply an administration which would deal with matters provincial, local and municipal, altogether independent of party. I was of the opinion when we first commenced the discussion of the Autonomy Bill that the same thing might go on, but when I found the attitude of Mr. Haultain in this respect much against my own grain, I had to change my view of the matter. But, Sir, this advice of mine was given to Mr. Scott, was given to Senator Ross and was given to all those who were in the political field, but it was not given to the person to whom it should not be given ; that is to say, to the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan with whom I never had a word of communication. The thing is too plain to admit of discussion—what else could I do ? There was a convention called to select a leader for the party and who should be recommended as their standard bearer. It was upon that occasion and upon no other that I ventured to offer any suggestion at all upon this point.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has asked me several questions; some pleasant, some jocose, some serious—the pleasant and jocose I can pass by. It is always well to have a little fun, but to carry it too far would not be consistent with the dignity of this House. My hon. friend wants to know what is the position of Mr. Preston and he has a right to get an answer. Mr. Preston has been in the glare of public life for more than 25 years. Before he became a government employee he had been an active politician. He has always assumed a bold front, asking no quarter and giving none, when he was attacked he gave a Roland for an Oliver. He has been attacked not only when he was in public life, but even after he ceased to be in public life. He was bitterly attacked here last session. But to the credit of Mr. Preston it must be said that nothing was ever proven against him derogatory to his honesty or his honour. He was brought here from England and two witnesses were called against him in the full expectation that Mr. Preston would have been shown to be dishonest or something equally bad. I appeal to the fair sense of every man in this House; I appeal to the members of the Public Accounts Committee; I appeal to those who heard Mr. Preston examined, to say that nothing was proven against him which was in derogation of his dignity or his honour or his honesty. He stood the battle well and he came out triumphant and exonerated from any guilt. He may have been imprudent, he may have been impulsive, his acts may have been inconsistent with what should be the best policy; but at all events his conduct could not be impugned and we came to the conclusion that Mr. Preston was a faithful public servant. It is true that as head of the Department of Immigration in London his services had not been as satisfactory as they might be because he had not managed to keep on good terms with his staff. There had been too much quarrelling amongst them and we thought that if he could not manage his staff properly we should remove him to another sphere of action. It is said there should have been investigation, but the Minister of the Interior went to Europe purposely to see what were the conditions in London and after having looked into it we decided we should remove Mr. Preston from the head of the immigration service in England, but that we should avail ourselves of his services in another capacity, and so he was appointed as commercial agent in Japan and China. No one who knows Mr. Preston can deny his great ability; no one can deny his energy, no one can deny his enthusiasm; he puts his whole soul into every work he undertakes and we have reason to believe that in the new capacity to which he has been called Mr. Preston will be a great success. I have known Mr. Preston for a long time and I must say that if there is one thing which has impressed me more than anything else in his character it is the intensity with which he pursues anything he undertakes.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Particularly money.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That remark is very unfair to Mr. Preston and absolutely uncalled for. I am surprised that my hon. friend should interject that observation. I repeat that my hon. friend cannot point to anything which is derogatory to Mr. Preston in regard to his honesty or in regard to money matters. I know of no such thing, and I therefore think it is unfair that Mr. Preston should be attacked in that way. At all events we have taken the position that nothing has been proved against Mr. Preston so far as his honesty is concerned. If he has done anything wrong in that respect we abide by the consequences and we challenge our opponents upon it. Mr. Preston has been a good and honest and efficient officer. He may not have been as discreet as he should have been in the discharge of his duties in London. He quarrelled with the staff and as we must have harmony among our employees we asked Mr. Preston to surrender the duties which he was performing and to assume other duties which we have full confidence he will discharge well and to the satisfaction and the credit of Canada.

As to the public measures which we have promised in this House we shall deal with them at the proper time. We have promised that parliament would be summoned in November and parliament has been sum-

moned in November. We have promised that the business of parliament will be ready and I am proud to say that the public business is ready. I have the authority of the Minister of Finance for saying that the budget speech will be delivered next week; perhaps Tuesday, but certainly not later than Friday. Plunging at once as we have done into the heart of the business we have to deal with—because the revision of the tariff is the heavy work we have to offer to parliament this session—plunging at once into the heart of this business we have reason to expect and believe that we shall have a reasonable measure of assistance from our friends opposite. I say a reasonable measure of assistance. I do not expect any very enthusiastic measure of assistance from them, but if we have a reasonable measure of assistance there is no reason in the world why we should not end this session early next spring. Last year I had occasion to say at the opening of the session that I thought we would conclude our labours by the time of the maple sap. I was grievously mistaken as to that for the maple sap had gone and the apples were almost ripe when we came to the blessing of prorogation. But this year I venture to say that if we have no undue obstruction from our friends opposite we might perhaps prorogue in the early spring—well, about the time when the robins return home again.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The remarks made by the right hon. gentleman will not call from me any lengthy observations, although there are two or three points I would like to refer to. He will find that His Majesty's loyal opposition will, as they have always done, aid the government. Probably the most effective aid that can be given this present government is that we should not be very enthusiastically in favour of the measures they bring down, but rather that we should endeavour by wise counsel to keep them from making mistakes and to steer them as far as it is possible in the right path. In this respect the opposition will do what is best for the country during the coming session. My right hon. friend says that he promised to call the session in November and he did call it in November. He did; by a very narrow squeak. I thought his promise was that the session would be called in the fall, but if he ever did promise to call it in November he certainly carried out his promise by the very narrowest margin. In fact, the new venture that we have started in does not have a fair chance to commend itself practically to the people of the country so far as this year is concerned. We should have met as near the first day of November as possible instead of as near the last of November as possible, taking into account that there are certain holidays which will interfere with the continuity of the work. If we had met on the first of the month instead of at present, we should have made very substantial progress towards that early termination of the session which my right hon. friend so poetically desires namely, at the time the robin's first note is heard in the land.

Well, my right hon. friend started out with a strange disquisition on natural phenomena. During the past year everything seemed to be abnormal. Last winter was not what winters generally were or in fact ought to be; the summer developed something even more abnormal, and the autumn extended through more than three months of unparalleled weather. I could not help thinking, when my right hon. friend was speaking, that he was making out a case for coming down a little later with a proposal to have a commission apointed to examine into the ways of Providence and find out if possible why last year was such an abnormal year as it turned out to be. But the year was remarkable in a great many other respects. Thus I noticed that my hon. friend who moved the address (Mr. Pardee) and who did it so well from his point of view, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in his speech, both steered clear, very wisely and prudently, of details. My right hon. friend was a little more venturesome than the mover of the address. He pointed out some works which, in the language of the speech, had contributed to the prosperity of this country. To my mind it is only a completed work which can contribute to the prosperity and development of the country. A work in progress may contribute something to the prosperity of the contractors; but a work has to be absolutely finished and in operation before it can be fairly argued that it has an influence on the general progress and prosperity of the country. Every work which my right hon. friend in his short analysis mentioned is a work that has just been begun or is still far from completion; or if one or two have been completed for a short time, that fact can have no appreciable influence on the general progress and prosperity of the country. It is a very delusive idea, as he himself endeavoured to state, that because so much was spent at one time and so much at another time, a simple comparison of the respective amounts goes to the root of the matter. It does not go to the root of the matter. But it is a still more illusory idea for the right hon. gentleman to put forward that because the country has progressed, therefore $78,000,000 spent to-day is no more than what is right in comparison with $40,000,000 spent ten years ago; and, to add to that, what the right hon. gentleman had the temerity to do, that all this expenditure was wisely and economically administered, although a little more detail would have been instructive to this House and the country. There was a public work which with a great flourish of trumpets was begun and carried on and ended in the city of St. John, N.B. For the elevator of that

city, with its fittings and connections, probably $150,000 or $200,000 was spent, and it has stood there ever since for the sun to shine upon and the rains to beat upon and the snow to fall upon in the winter season; and that work has stood practically idle for all these years, having no influence great or small on the prosperity and development of the country. There is a wharf, I believe, somewhere in the vicinity of Hull which has cost a large amount of money. Will the right hon. gentleman inform this House how much business has been done from that wharf or has been stimulated by the expenditure of that money? $60,000 or more was spent in building a wharf for a private party somewhere down in the province of Quebec in order to enable him to sell a timber limit which he had. Has that very greatly developed the prosperity of the general public whose money was thus spent, and does it stand to the account of my right hon. friend as money that was economically expended ? The 'Arctic' expedition, which went, stayed and came back, really performed no service of any moment at all for this country, and cost a large amount of money. Was that a wise expenditure ? Badly conceived, worse managed, and ending in an investigation in this House, it reflected no credit on its originators or those who carried it out. There stands an expenditure which the people of this country have had to foot—how much has it done for the progress and development of this country, how much has it added to the wages of the workers or to the benefit and happiness of the farmers on the western prairies or anywhere else in the country ? So that you have to come down to the items and discuss them one by one. The right hon. gentleman forgot, what was shown last session in the investigations, what is shown in the London investigation as well, that in these expenditures a rake-off goes to the go-between, the party who stands between the government and the work going on or the supplies that are required. Does my hon. friend say that this was all proper expenditure, all economic management? I think these are things which must be gone into before we can come to any general conclusion as to the wisdom and economy of any exepnditure.

A moment with reference to the progress of the country. We all grant this progress; we are all glad of it. We are all glad to know that the outside world is progressing as well as Canada. It would not be difficult to show that all the great countries of the world are enjoying a period of almost unexampled prosperity, and part of Canada's prosperity is due to this world-wide prosperity in which Canada is participating. Happily Canada is so situated that it may last longer here under proper management than it probably will in most of these other countries. I think myself that the future of Canada, economically and industrially considered, is a bright and happy one, and calculated to inspire the greatest confidence in the citizens of Canada and also in the creditors of Canada. But it is folly to compare the per capita foreign commerce of a population of 6,000,000 with that of a people of 80,000,000, for instance, to the south, and from these two items to deduce anything that is of any value at all with reference to their comparative prosperity. The foreign commerce of a great country is but a flea bite in comparison with its commerce among its own people and within its own confines. And that has to be taken into account and the simple per capita illustration while it does not cause us any feeling other than delight is not to be taken as a very strong index either one way or the other.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred to London. He referred also to the election laws. I have a word or two that I would like to say with reference to that. The generalities of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) are not always as true and reliable as they might be. He flies to the defence of his friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for appointing officials under the election law to represent him who were officials of the government and he says: Oh, but the minister did it in blank and therefore is to be excused. If there is any moral to be derived from that it is: You may do evil if you like, but be always careful that you do it in blank. Whether the man who signs be the Minister of Finance or a humble individual like myself, he is responsible, and if there is such a declaration and resolution of parliament the minister was no stranger to the discussion on that very subject last session, and he should have been careful to have given his instructions, as he appears to have been careful to give instructions this time that no illegitimate means should be used, that officials of the government should be kept out of the fray and should not have been appointed as scrutineers and agents. If that had been done the minister would have saved himself any trouble on this score. But there you have the right hon. gentleman's statement, an apology, or rather a defence, that because it is done by many therefore there is no harm in its being done. What did the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) say to the government? One of his most pregnant sentences was that it was from the example of men high in political authority that lessons were learned by the general public, and therefore it was the bounden duty of men high in authority to set an example of perfect obedience to the law and perfect scrupulousness with reference to it. But the Minister of Finance did not seem to do that, and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) apologized on the ground that he did it in blank. That apology will not save him from flying in the face of the declaration of this House and his own declaration in support of the declaration of this House. He says that

with reference to London: When you sum it all up, Oh, well, perhaps it was not so bad after all, because the Liberals had at last to come to the conclusion that they must use the devil's fire. Well, it played, we will say the deuce, with one of them anyway. But after all is that any excuse? I thought that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) treated this matter with some levity rather than with great seriousness, and the gravity which I am sure it demanded at the hands of a premier of this country. It is no light thing, the revelations which have been made in the London elections, taken in connection with the history of election contests in this country and with the debates in this House and the proceedings in the committees in this House—no light thing but rather a grave and serious thing which has resulted in the resignation of one of the ministers of the Crown. That is, Mr. Speaker, if he has resigned, and upon that I cannot form an opinion which is satisfactory to myself. The first commoner says that the resignation is not in form, not legal, therefore is no resignation. I take that as being the inference. The resignation of the seat is one thing, the resignation of the office is another. Granted that the seat has been resigned, the Prime Minister takes it on himself to say that he will not suffer the minister to resign, that is that he will advise him that he ought not to resign his portfolio as Minister of Public Works and although the resignation of that portfolio is in his hands, he does not say that he has yet presented it to the Governor General. How long can the Prime Minister keep back from the Governor General, the representative of the Crown in this country, a resignation plainly put in, of one of his council? And if what took place showed that he had no right to his seat it shows still more that he has no right to administer one dollar of the public money of this country until he has cleared his skirts with reference to that. Until he has made his claim good I sincerely hope that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not continue him in the administration of that department for Mr. Hyman's own benefit if for nothing else, during the period that he is not a member of this House. I think that would be the wise and proper course to pursue. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sympathized with me in some hard times that I must have had or might have had in the past with the deputy minister when surpluses were not as abundant as they are to-day and when times were harder. I have no recollection of those hard passages between the deputy and myself. I did not certainly take Mr. Micawber as my model for finance at that time. If the right hon. gentleman chooses to take Micawber's style of administration for his government and as a model for his Finance Minister he is welcome to that, and it explains a good deal. The fact that the Prime Minister takes the view that the Micawber finance is the proper finance for a great and growing country like this explains many things that have been done in this country, and throws a rather lurid light on what may yet be done. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says the law is good, but you must have public opinion behind it, and he goes really to the point of blaming public opinion in Canada because it permits such things. Here I come again to the lesson which was stated by the mover of the address this afternoon. What was that? That you must look to public opinion. Yes, but that public opinion is largely framed by the example of the government itself which in its administration and in its executive dealings is read and known of all men, and gives the step, so to speak, to the great public. Now sir, where does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stand in this respect? I believe in everything that has been said in reference to the necessity for the franchise of this country being strong, well based, absolutely pure and untrammelled if it is possible to have such a thing in this country, and if it is not possible to have it in perfection to have it to just as great a degree of perfection as possible. But will the right hon. gentleman think over the ten years of stewardship and ask himself what part he has played in forming public opinion with reference to public probity, with reference to public faith, with reference to public purity? The eighteen years that he travelled in the wilderness found him instant in season and out of season preaching the inviolability of the franchise and the purity of public life in this country. No man placed the ideal higher. I myself have listened entranced sometimes,—or if I did not hear him in person I could imagine hearing him in reading the speeches he made in reference to that matter. He got into power and from that time to this what serious, honest step has the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) taken in order to reinforce the integrity of public sentiment, to reinforce the determination to maintain electoral purity in Canada ? You go to a poor devil of an elector and rake him over the coals because he has sold his vote for five dollars. The elector has reasoned with himself ; I have to lose my day if I vote, and I cannot afford to do that without some compensation, and so he makes merchandise of his franchise—a thing that is absolutely wrong, a thing in which no one justifies him. But if this elector is to be so treated, what is to be done in the case of the men in high positions who buy votes by wholesale instead of selling them by retail? You will stop the retail trade by penalty and by process, but you do not prevent the continuance of wholesale corruption such as has gone on for the last ten years and such as was never known in Canada before. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) commenced by purchasing the

support for government measures of one of the members of this House. He did it with a promissory note, said note being not for a thousand dollars, still less for the beggarly ten dollars which seems to be the reigning price paid to electors to support the government now-a-days, but being for a governorship or judgeship in the province of Quebec. And for two years the holder of that promissory note sat in this House and voted in support of the government, though he very often differed with the right hon. Prime Minister's measures. Was that a good example to set to the electorate? Again. A crisis arose in the province of New Brunswick. The right hon. Prime Minister wanted to introduce strength into his cabinet, and to that end to find a place among his colleagues for the premier of the province of New Brunswick. And what did he do? He simply took a governorship and a senatorship and an office here, and by purchase and sale in regular bargain-counter fashion he brought about what he purposed and gave this gentleman a place in the cabinet. He bought him in by that kind of traffic, and he bought him out with $10,000 of the public money given to him as the holder of an office in the Railway Commission. Is this traffic or is it not? The right hon. Prime Minister appoints one of his friends to a judgeship; but a little later on he finds that he needs an organizer in the province of Quebec, and so he calls this judge down from the bench and by a traffic in a Senate seat gives him a place in the Senate, and now has him going throughout the length and breath of Quebec doing the organization work of the party in that province. Is this traffic or is it not? To-day there are two senatorships vacant in the province of New Brunswick. To whom do they belong? Are they simply the pocket-money of the Prime Minister? Are they to count merely as assets of the Liberal party? Or are they the constitutional rights of representation belonging to the people of Canada? What right, under Heaven, has the right hon. Prime Minister to keep these two senatorships unoccupied—one for nearly three years—merely because he wishes to make the proper balance amongst his friends so as to dispose of them to the greatest advatage to his party, using them merely as his pocket-money, or as pawns upon the political chess-board? To-day there is a vacancy, as has already been stated, on the bench in the province of Nova Scotia. Do we need judges on the Supreme Court bench of Nova Scotia or do we not? Are the judgeships also to be treated as the pocket-money of the Prime Minister? Why has this judgeship not been filled? We can find no reason but that the necessities of the party supporting the government make it impossible to choose an occupant for this place with advantage to the party at this particular time.

Now, the people will look at these things, and the elector who traffics in his franchise, who sells his vote for five dollars, will trace a parallel between this traffic in which he engages and that carried on in a wholesale way by the men high in power. It is a wrong, it is an outrage, that these public offices and positions should be treated by any party as mere counters in the game of party advancement, to the denial of the constitutional rights of the people and to the interference with the proper carrying on of the public business.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has had signal warnings in this matter of the election law. Now in the eleventh year of his stewardship he comes down and promises an amendment to the election law. Why leave it to this late day? Has not the need for such an amendment been shown over and over again? Did not the Liberal-Conservative opposition in this House, by its expositions years ago of the wrongs perpetrated in West Huron and in Brockville, make known the need for this amendment? The distinguished position that my right hon. friend occupies, so far as these matters are concerned, is that of a man leading a party whose men burked inquiry and refused to carry it to its legitimate conclusion. Pritchett's challenge, read from this side of the House, rang on the ears of my right hon. friend five or six years ago, and innumerable opportunities have been afforded him for bringing that reform to pass. In his own province of Quebec, the right hon. gentleman had the example of the Brunets and Gallerys. Switching ballots my right hon. friend abhorred. Was there anything more abhorrent than the practices which brought Brunet into this House? And when the courts of law, in the performance of their duty, in the maintenance of justice, put the man who broke the law under punishment, my right hon. friend took the position of the head of the government that hurried to set the criminal at liberty before he had passed the term of punishment to which the courts had condemned him. In all these things the result has been to the profit of the party of my right hon. friend—at least he thought so. The right arm of my right hon. friend, to wit, the province of Ontario, under its former government, paralyzed the processes of law and administration designed to uncover the wrong-doings of Grit officials. And so my right hon. friend was practically immune in that province so far as the force of the provincial government could make him so. But, now, under another regime, the manacles are taken off the hands of the courts of justice, their processes are allowed. The result is that the most complete confirmation of what we alleged and proved in this House years ago has been given. And it has resulted in what? In the announcement yesterday of the dismissal, or not dismissal, but the resignation, of a minister of the Crown.

Query, Mr. Speaker : If the first commoner of the province of Nova Scotia had not found it necessary for the sake of his health to go to a neighbouring country for a certain time, should we have heard another of the pieces of timber in this cabinet pronounced waney and undesirable ? Provided that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia had not been careful to seek temporary retirement in the city of Boston at a certain period when these bailiff microbes infested the air of Nova Scotia, and his case could have been brought to trial for misdeeds in the county of King's, would there have been another piece of timber found waney and unprofitable in this great cabinet structure ? Oh, these chances, one of which was supposed to have happened to the Minister of Public Works, but which was countered by the processes which have taken place, and the chances of covering up what might be very unpleasant things with reference to some other ministers in this cabinet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this late date there is a spasm of virtue with reference to the elections. If the right hon. gentleman does not care to have my opinion with reference to political corruption in this country, I will not ask him to like it ; but if he cares for my opinion with reference to this matter —it is discursive, but I wish to state it—let me say that there is something more in it than laws, and processes of the courts, there is the reinforcement of public opinion, as I have stated. I think there is a great underlying cause of corruption and graft in this country, and it lies in the patronage system which prevails and has prevailed for a long time in this Dominion of Canada. I believe that if we could eliminate the patronage system in a reasonable and sane way from the administration of the government of Canada, you would find one of the most powerful aids given to the purification of the electorate, and to the better tone and strength of public opinion in public matters than any means which could be adopted. To-day you have practically all the offices in the country farmed out by the party in power, you have all the supplies of the country looked upon as perquisites of the party in power, to give to their friends, and to strengthen their organization by giving it to their friends. The public works of this country, in the employment of men, in tender and contract, are almost entirely in the hands of the friends of the government in power, almost entirely at the use of the government for the strengthening, as they say, of their party. Office, emolument, subsidies, franchises, all these things are looked upon and are becoming more and more looked upon as the appurtenances of a party, as belonging to them, and as being used, and possible to be used, entirely in the interest and for, as they say, the upbuilding of the party in power. Now, I want to give prominence to this idea. Is it not possible now, when these things have come to a head, when both parties are seized with the facts, and the facts are not very palatable to the public of Canada, is it not possible in this House to undertake a reasonable and sane method of correcting these evils that I have spoken of with reference to patronage and all that follows from it ? Is it not because there is place, there is emolument, there are franchises, there are subsidies, there are subventions, there are public works, there are all these things which are in the gift of the government, is not that the primal cause which makes for graft and corruption in order, if possible to get on to and after those things and profit pecuniarily by getting them ? If that is so, and I believe it is so, I believe it is possible to devise a system by which the patronage of the country can be administered and its present character almost entirely taken away from it, by which the public supplies of this country can be bought and purchased without a scintilla of the partisan interference or partisan benefit one way or the other, by which the public works of this country can be built by a permanent commission or a permanent board, properly constituted, on a line of principle and not as a matter of pull, which will eliminate almost entierly from them the element which works towards excitement in election and the corruption of public life by men seeking for these things, and the arguments which are based thereupon. That we shall develop a little later, I hope, in this session. But I simply throw out the suggestion. I have believed it for many years, and I believe it more firmly now than I have at any period of my political existence. Everybody knows that the member of parliament would be infinitely more pleased if that could be taken out of the region of patronage and all that pertained thereto. The life of a member of parliament would be made more liveable, the path of the government would be made much more easy, and generally the public life of this country would respond to the absence of that factor by a higher tone and by greater strength.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before recess I was advancing the idea that the influence of members of parliament and especially of members of the government and an administration could not but be felt in the country and have its effect upon the body politic, and I cited some instances of transactions which are well known to this House and which have been debated or cited before to show that these transactions, read by the people who viewed them, pointed in the direction of the formation of public opinion not upon the soundest and best basis and, reasoning by parity. I argued that if such

transactions as these, which were in the nature of buying and selling in the large, were permitted and countenanced and carried on, it was but an easy and natural step from that to individual corruption on the part of the voter himself. I think the instances that I cited are instances which will commend themselves, if not to all the members of the House, to at least a portion of them and to the country. There was one instance which I might have cited which I did not. I think the right hon. Prime Minister will remember that before he became Prime Minister there was a certain transaction and a quasi agreement between himself and the leader in the province of Quebec at that time, a condition of which arrangement, according to the statement of Mr. Mercier, was that Mr. Mercier was to deliver to the leader of the then opposition—the present leader of the government—a majority in the province of Quebec and that as a return for that he was to receive better terms for the province of Quebec. That I remember to have been debated and spread on the records of the House some ten or twelve years ago. Well, it is singular that the promissory note given at that time has remained good ever since and has been, we may say, brought to payment at a late date with interest, I have no doubt, and with extensions to the other provinces. It might very well be that the course of events and the pressure and exigencies of the different provincial governments in the way of revenue may have led to demands for assistance from the Dominion government, but the basis of it all upon which the demand was urged and urged in a manner which could not be denied by the Prime Minister himself was the old agreement which was entered into between Mr. Mercier and the Prime Minister at the present time, then the leader of the opposition. I also advanced the idea that the healthiest and best public opinion would be brought about and a very strong opinion against graft and corruption would be created if the present system of patronage, taking it in the large sense, were done away with, and it were replaced by some more reasonable and sane method. The incentive to party workers, and to party workers not perhaps of the best description or the highest tone, comes from the fact that offices and emoluments and contracts and the opportunity to give supplies at government prices and franchises and the like are what follow as the rewards of a successful party campaign and the establishment of the party in the seats of government. Along with that grows up the idea that these are legitimate party spoils and the best government in the world comes gradually, and it may be almost imperceptibly to itself, to look upon all these things not as something of the people and for the people and the public interest entirely and solely but to be used in the party interest for the sake of strengthening this particular section or that particular county or the party in general. It is the fierce contest for that kind of patronage and that kind of emolument which enters into the heart of the struggle and which makes that struggle result, in order to be successful, in methods which are corrupt, inadvisable and hurtful to the public good. Now, is it not possible for us in Canada to replace this general system which has been abused and which is now being abused by some system which will perform the work much better, much more economically, much more systematically and will induce the general belief through the country that what is done is done and will be done for the country's interest and not simply for the party or the men who are interested in the party ? The whole system of the employment of officials under the government, I think, could be set upon the basis of merit and competitive examination. I do not hold that competitive examination by its results absolutely determines the best party, but other things being equal, it is the best index you can have. Then, place merit and character along with that and let these three be the factors in determining it and you will get the best employees for the public service of the country. Every one knows who belongs to parliament, and especially every one who has been in the government, that a great many unnecessary appointments are made from pressure from the supporters of members of parliament and from them upon members of the government. That could be avoided and a very large surplusage of employees could be cut off absolutely from the public chest if employees were taken into the service according to the need of the service on requisition and on proof that they were necessary for the work of the service for which they were employed. It would be possible to form a permanent board of deputy ministers, or others in connection with the deputy ministers, or in some reasonable way, so that these two points could be made that no employment would be given except it were absolutely necessary, and except that necessity were proved and the employment were requisitioned for. There should be no partisanship in the bestowal of these offices. They should go on the basis of merit and character and competency for the work. The same system could to a certain extent be employed with reference to supplies. The government is a great consumer; it takes supplies of all kinds and from all parts of the country. These supplies are now doled out through party friends and through party pressure; economy in price is not observed, economy in quantity is not observed. If there could be a system by which what is necessary could be ascertained and bought at the best figure and entirely outside of the pressure of party patronage, the public service could be far more economically carried on and we would be rid of a vast amount of

the underhand work which is now constantly present. Could there not be a board by which public works would be carried out on a system and not simply at the solicitation of this section or of that section, of this favoured member or of that member who is under exigency and needs something to help him out politically? With these public works carried out upon a set system, and works that were necessary and profitable undertaken—necessary sometimes although they were not profitable—the country would gain a great deal. The public franchises of the country—such as are not worked or operated by the government—instead of being doled out at the beck of influence and at the solicitation of party friends ought to be put up to public tender under certain conditions and the most possible got out of them for the country in the shape of royalty or bonus or subvention. There should be no possible chance for the underhand methods by which at the present time vast public franchises are put into the hands of friends of the government and are then used for the profit alone of the fortunate gentlemen who are able to get them. This, crude though it be, points to the idea that is in my mind, and I believe that if it could be carried out in a reasonable and sane way it would take the incentive out of the field for corruption and unhealthy methods in public life, and it would speedily show itself in an improved tone and greater integrity in the public sentiment of the country.

With reference to the election law, I feel that a man who looks upon his franchise as a piece of furniture, as a chattel to be put up for sale and bargain has not a correct appreciation of the value of the franchise. The natural consequence should be that this franchise which he treats as a chattel and as an article of merchandise should be taken from him. There should be a punitive period, either longer or shorter, during which the man who proposes to sell his franchise should be deprived of the opportunity of making the sale. I would have an equally severe penalty for the man who buys the franchise; the briber who traffics in the franchise ought to be disqualified just as the voter is, and that penalty should be inflicted on him in addition to the other penalties now provided. If these two things were put in the law and were absolutely enforced—as I believe they can only be well enforced with the aid of a public prosecutor who is entirely outside of the influence of either party—if these two things were put in the law, and enforced, in addition to what I have already stated, I believe it would work a revolution in the public life of Canada. It is perfectly easy for all this to be carried out if the public men of Canada simply set themselves to work to do it. It is not an impossibility; on the contrary it is a possibility easy of accomplishment if we would only set ourselves with a will to accomplish it.

With reference to the tariff all we can do is guess. The Finance Minister in his address at Montreal, which I very carefully read, could not of course go into particulars, but I think he did outline enough to give one a very good opportunity for guessing at what will be done. I judge that the Finance Minister purposes doing some fancy scheduling. That will have to be very carefully done or the complications which may arise from it will in the end be found to be more harmful than the good which may come from it. I am not opposed to certain schedules if they are clearly and fairly defined. We shall have some of this fancy scheduling; we shall have an attempt to hold a sort of fair face to all the different classes and the different sections of the Dominion of Canada. I hope the revision will be made, not with the idea as to how much party strength may be gained, but with the idea of dealing as fairly as possible with all sections and with all classes. I doubt very much if we shall see very many real changes from what the tariff is at the present time. I believe that the tariff legislation of the day is just as important as the tariff legislation of 1879 was. It is true we are in very different conditions. Then it was the initial step strongly fought at the very start by a powerful party in the country; to-day it is the settling of conditions on the basis of which the future prosperity of this country very largely depends. On the coming revision a great deal depends as to what the future prosperity in trade and commerce of Canada shall be. Until the tariff is brought down very little can be said with reference to it, but there are some points which I think are fairly clear and which we can all agree upon. In the first place, it is not possible for any Minister of Finance in any tariff that he may bring down to satisfy the advanced claims of every section and of every class; the man who tries that will have a hard task and will have the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of having failed in doing good work.

It is impossible for a Finance Minister to frame a proper tariff on any other basis than what is for the general good of the whole. Certain interests and certain sections must meet with disability to a greater or less extent for the present, but that will be offset and compensated for by the fact that what is for the general good of Canada will be for the good of every section in the long run. It will conduce to the prosperity of the country, and a prosperous country is reflected upon every class and every section. We do not want, as the Finance Minister said, any division between east and west in this country; we do not want any division between labour and capital; we do not want any division between the industrial artisan and the ordinary or unskilled labourer. All these

are constituent elements in the general condition ; they act and react on each other; they must act in unison ; and the prosperity of one must be the prosperity of all. Another point which is important is this. No tariff to be successful can be framed on a present day basis ; it must be framed for the future as well as for the present ; because, as I said, it is laying down the conditions on which are to be based the lines which this country will pursue in trade and industry, and which consequently bear very strongly on the future. What I mean in a word is this : the worst thing that can be introduced into a tariff is opportunism—the best for the time, to get over the day as easily as possible. A tariff to be useful should be based on lines which are for the general good of the country—not for to-day or for to-morrow, but for all time, as far as that can be done.

Then, I think we cannot too much insist on the theories in the framing of a tariff. Theories have a habit of being very much knocked about by practical conditions and varying circumstances from time to time. The free trader of not many years ago was cock-sure that the thing that was necessary and best in this country was absolute free trade; and from a theoretical standpoint he could bring strong argument to bear for his position. But when you come to the test of practical conditions and the circumstances of the time and the environments of the country, you find that hard and fast theories will not work, and that there have to be modifications and adaptations. I do not like the idea that a tariff has to be a compromise and has to proceed from the first upon that principle ; but certainly a tariff cannot follow any hard and fast theoretic line, but must shape itself according to the conditions and circumstances of the present. If you look abroad and view Canada in comparison with other countries, which you must do when you are framing a tariff for Canada, what do you find ? That there is no such thing as free competition in international trade. It is all very well to say, as it has been said, that the Canadian in brain, in brawn, and may be in skill is the equal of any other man in any other country, and if you will just give him a fair chance he can go into this competitive field and hold his own, and you would not fear the result. Well, Mr. Speaker, no man need fear the result, because it is an absolute impossibility that that can take place. No individual and no corporation in this or any other country is in a position to go into a fair field and meet his opponents without handicaps on the one side or the other. As Secretary Root said in a speech the other day, there is no such thing now as natural competition ; what we have to meet is subsidized competition. There is no such thing to-day, I think, as individual trade, in the sense of international trade. Trade and commerce have become nationalized, and governments have taken a hand in the contest as well as the individual and the trading company. Governments by the incidence of their rates of duty, by customs regulations, by giving weapons to industry in the way of technical education and the like of that, by subdivisions in the way of subsidies, and by helps in the way of internal or external transport, have taken a hand in trade and commerce, and the individual or the corporation has to take that into account. Consequently, this country of ours must have its defences. Commerce to-day is a war in a sense—a peaceful war, I grant you, but quite as important in its ultimate consequences as wars are in their consequences. There is not, I believe, a party to-day in this country which will be prepared to put into action what the Grange and the farmers' deputation have asked of the right hon. gentleman who leads this government, namely that all protection shall be eliminated from the tariff of Canada. To do so would be to raze every defence we have and to place ourselves at the mercy of countries who defend themselves by the most ingenious and powerful defences from assault upon their own commerce, and issue from those fortresses and defences to attack the commerce of the country in which there are few or no defences ; and if I am right in the statement that no party is prepared to take down our defences, I am equally right in this statement, that every party or any party in this country should look to the strengthening of these defences, because other countries are strengthening theirs. If for one period of this great war of commerce one country does nothing while the others strengthen themselves, the parity of strength is disturbed, and consequently the unfairness of the competition is enhanced.

What do we need in this country ? We want population : we want labour : we want a labouring population which gets a fair compensation for its labour. That is all the trouble with Canada to-day. No one now has any thoughts of want of confidence in the resources of Canada. We have not got one-tenth the distance into our proper knowledge of these resources ; but we have got so far that we cannot find an intelligent man in Canada who has not full faith and confidence in the immensity of our resources. What we need is labour and population to develop these resources, and labour and population will neither come nor stay unles the wage and the profit is sufficient to call them here and to keep them here after they have come.

Now, it is plain to me that every dollar's worth of goods manufactured in a foreign country by foreign labour and imported into this country displaces by that much the labour and the wage earners of this country provided those goods can be made in this country. It is not possible that everything

can be made in a country. The United States is a very highly protected country but the United States imports immense quantities of material. It will always be so, but in so far as anything that Canadians need can be made by Canadian capital in Canadian factories it ought to be made in this country, and the incentive and reward to labour ought to inure to the benefit of Canada. Multiply that dollar by millions of dollars and the thing comes to be of tremendous significance, and when the right hon. gentleman was talking about the great advance of our trade he should have thought a little further and compared the great increase in imported articles, manufactured or partly manufactured and the immense quantity of those that are brought in, the large proportion of which under proper conditions could be made in this country by Canadian labour and so keep and attract population to this country. I think sometimes the representation is made that protection is no good to the farmers because it is the foreign market which sets the price. Now that is true and yet it has to be largely modified and limited. Your foreign market, we will say London, fixes the price for your great products, but take your average farmer, and if you take out all the exports to the old country, still the major portion of what the farmer has to sell has to be marketed in this country. It is perishable, or if it is not perishable it gets more easily to a nearer market and if he does not have the home market he cannot have prosperity, and I take it for granted as absolutely true that you may enhance the exports to foreign countries, you may provide the best possible facilities to take advantage of the largest quantity you can from your country to those markets, and to get the greatest profit upon it, but you will not have a prosperous country nor a stable country unless you provide for the other 19-20 of your trade which must take place within the country itself, and which is not very much influenced by the foreign market. And so, I say protection is good for the home market because it attracts population and keeps labour employed, gives it its wages—and that is what buys the produce of the farmer and buys the produce of the small maker through and through this country and that is what we want as an element of prosperity in this country.

I hope therefore that when this tariff does come down, it will not be weak in the matter of keeping the defences of Canada in an industrial sense in their proper relative condition with reference to other countries, and I do hope it will go so far that it will cut a very big hole into the imports of manufactured goods which are now brought into this country and will turn them into our own busy and ever busier factories and places of industrial production.

One thing more I do hope for, that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)

will keep to his declaration at Yarmouth, and that subsides in this country shall disappear just as rapidly as they can disappear. I believe that this is the most uneconomical way of establishing the industrial prosperity and progress of a country that can possibly be devised. Your subsidy helps the individual or the firm for the time being, but you may subsidize for many many years and if you remove the prop the industry is just about where it started unless it has within the country itself a sufficient protection to keep it in competition against like wares which come from other countries, so that in the end it is the cheapest way, the best way, and the only permanent way to build up your interests, your manufacturing or industrial or general interests by a system of protection based upon customs tariff, a cheaper and a better way than to pay out immense sums of money as subsidies which always eat a big hole into the treasury and never have a permanent and lasting effect. As a fillip they may be good and have their use ; as a permanency I believe they are unscientific and uneconomical and that it costs the country more than it is worth to endeavour to secure its manufactures by that means.

I notice that the speech contains no statement that any isurance legislation will be introduced. I do not know whether or not that means that no legislation will be had this year on that important matter but if it does mean that I am sorry for it. That commission was appointed some ten months ago if I am not mistaken, and with the amount of work which was to be done in Canada, it should have covered the ground and should have had its report ready for the ministry at least by the time that parliament met, and if it had done so, then during the recess and before the very busy work of parliament comes on, members would have had an opportunity of perusing the evidence and the report and of making up their minds with reference to what was necessary. As it is, that report cannot possibly be here until January or may be February and then in the midst of a busy session it will be impossible to give to it that amount of thought and attention which is necessary to proper legislation on so important a subject. I am sorry that there has not been more speed and less discursive work before that commission, sorry that it did not confine itself within the borders of its powers and, without so many adjournments, prepare its work and, in the public interest, have these things ready for the members of parliament when they met, so that they could have had some fair and reasonable time to consider these questions and to make up their minds with regard to what will be a very important piece of legislation.

I join my congratulations to the congratulations of the mover of the address (Mr. Pardee) on the 65th birthday of the right

hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Sometimes we do not care to be reminded of how the years are passing and I thought at the time that may be it was a doubtful and delicate subject to bring forward. We are glad to see my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) here after passing his 65th birthday, in good health and strength.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, there are some things referred to in the resolution now before the House and some things referred to by hon. gentlemen who have already addressed the House today, on which I desire to speak for a few moments, and there are also some things not referred to in the address or during the debate to which I wish to refer but I shall be very brief.

With regard to this question of the London election and the resignation, or the alleged resignation, of the Minister of Public Works I have only one thing to say and that is this : I am not here to advocate any new law in regard to those things, although the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) advanced an argument for certain changes to take place in the conduct of public business and indicated certain results to follow but what he suggested was at best palliative. There is only one way to deal with political crimes of this kind and that is to hold the parties in whose interest these crimes are committed responsible for them. And so I place the responsibility for what has been done in London, upon the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) and upon the Liberal party. Crimes of this kind are not committed as burglaries are committed, by the parties who are directly interested in the gains of the crime ; these crimes are committed by men who are retained by others and paid by others. And, if that be the case—and we will all know it to be the case—then the men who profit by these crimes, and the party in whose interest they are committed, must be held responsible. There will be no ending of these crimes unless responsibilty is placed squarely upon the proper shoulders. The mere passing of new laws will not effect a cure. The mover of the address this afternoon suggested that we should have more legislation with regard to these things. I contend that if we enforce the laws we have against these crimes, the crimes will quickly cease. But we have a government, we have a Minister of Justice, we have law officers of the Crown, who will not enforce the laws against the perpetrators of these crimes. If the law were enforced, the guilty parties would be put in penitentiary or driven out of the country as in the case of those who tried to operate the trick ballot-boxes in Hastings some years ago. There was no proper enforcement of the law against these criminals in Hastings; if there had been the men would not have been allowed to escape from the country. But we had then a government in power in Ontario, friendly to hon. gentlemen opposite, that assisted these men to escape. And the very men who assisted these law breakers to escape now come to this House and say : Let us sit down and make new laws against these crimes. No ! Let us enforce the laws we have against those who break the laws, let us drive from public life the men who profit by these crimes, and new laws will be found unnecessary. But if we are to accept apologies for these crimes, if we are to join in praises of the men who profit by them—such praises as we have heard this afternoon—these crimes will never cease. We have been told this afternoon that, though these things are wrong, yet we do not know how it came that they were committed. We do know. The men who perpetrated these crimes were retained by some one who was to reap the profit, and whoever retained the criminals must be held responsible for the crime. And the people of Canada hold the Minister of Public Works responsible for what was done in London; and it is because of that fact that he has seen fit to write the letter of resignation that was referred to in this House yesterday.

This principle of due responsibility is not confined to breaches of the election law. We have other wrongs in this country which are sufficiently provided for so far as the law is concerned. But let me call attention to instances in which the law is not enforced and in which wrongs are left unrighted. In the first place I take those laws for the administration of which the Minister of Finance is responsible. That hon. gentleman is the head of the department that has to do with the insurance laws, the banking laws and the laws relating to trust companies. We have had exposure of wrongs in connection with insurance companies. And it is in evidence that the Minister of Finance knew of most of these wrong-doings. But did he enforce the law and call upon these insurance companies to re-organize their boards and put out of office the men who had done wrong? No, he does not enforce the law, but he says : Let us appoint a commission to investigate, and, when that commission has reported what it is able to learn, perhaps we may propose the passing of a new law. But the present insurance law is sufficient to protect policy-holders, if it were enforced. For that reason, I hold the government and especially the Minister of Finance, responsible for the continuance of those wrongs. If there is anything wrong in connection with the banks of the country, we must hold the Minister of Finance responsible. As to the Trust companies, while it is the law that these concerns shall make an annual return of their business to the governement, when I asked the question last session whether the law in this respect were carried out, the Minister of Finance confessed that it was not. That being the

case, he should have said to these companies as he should have said to the insurance companies: You can no longer carry on business, your license will be cancelled unless you obey the law and respect the rights of those who do business with you. And in this case, also, the remedy proposed is a new law. But so long as we merely pass new laws instead of enforcing the laws we have, there will be election frauds and insurance frauds in Canada. And there is another department to which I might refer—the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. The minister has an immense department, a great staff. He has also the Railway Commission to assist him. But, while the Railway Commission is there to assist him, he is none the less responsible for the administration of the law. Two years ago I called the attention of this House to the fact that in the original charter of the Grand Trunk Railway Company there was no provision compelling the company to have a penny-a-mile third-class passenger service. I asked the government if the law were then on the statute-book. The Minister of Justice was not in his place and the question was passed. A day or two later the Minister of Finance undertook to answer the question, but was only able to say that the government did not know whether the law existed or not—that it would take a lawyer to find that out. But the Minister of Railways must have known that it was the law. At the very least, he should have tried to find out whether it was the law or not, and if the people of Canada were entitled to a penny-a-mile passenger rate on the Grand Trunk, it was his business to see to it that that rate was given. But he took no action in the matter, and so it remained for a private litigant to go to the police court in Toronto to establish his rights in the matter. And, thank God, we have a police court in Toronto where you can get justice if you cannot get it in other courts, where you can get the law vindicated, if you cannot get it vindicated elsewhere. If there is one man who, more than others, deserves the respect of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that man is Colonel Denison. I say, it is left to a private litigant to try to establish his own rights and those of others in this penny-a-mile rate, although we have a Minister of Railways assisted by a Railway Commission by whom the law is supposed to be enforced. And in other respects we find a lack of enforcement of law, though we have laws that will enable us to reach any form of crime. That is the clause in the Criminal Code which provides that disobedience to a statute is a crime, and there is a punishment affixed to it. By that one clause you can reach almost any crime in this country. There is another law against conspiracy in restraint of trade, and if that were enforced you could reach a great many crimes and injustices. But in the old days when you appealed to that law in the province of Ontario, under the former adminstration, you could get no relief. At one time, in connection with election frauds, the people appealed to the Attorney General of Ontaro and the answer was, I am not a constable. The same thing appears to be the argument here, I am not a constable, I am not here to enforce the law, but let us sit down and make a new law.

But a great change has come, and that is the point I wish to make clear to-night—a great change has come in this country by the appearance on the political stage of a new government in the province of Ontario. Now there is this surprising thing in that connection, that if a federal government, or the government we have here in Ottawa, refuses to rectify the grievances of the people of the country at large, there is a sovereign power in the provinces that can rectify them and will rectify them; and it is because we have an attorney general in the province of Ontario who has had the courage to unearth these crimes that were committed in London that the facts are now coming out. We know now how that election was carried in London two years ago. Not only have the people discovered that the provinces, in their sovereign power, are competent to regulate and rectify many of the grievances that exist in this country, but if hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to regulate the railways and to compel them to obey the statutes, there is a power in the provinces that can compel them to do it. If the railways refuse to treat the people fairly, if they continue to exact unjust freights—and unjust freights are the grievances of the people to-day, it is not the customs tariff, but it is the passenger rates and the freight rates from the Atlantic to the Pacific that hamper this country—if this government refuses to cure this grievance in connection with transportation the provinces have discovered a way to do it. They have, by the power of taxation, the right to enforce obedience to all statutes, and by one means or another they can control these railways, they can control these great corporations and compel them to do justice. The government here have proved to be the allies of the Bell Telephone Company in this country, they have assisted them to increase their capital enormously by which means they are trying to overcome the demand for public ownership in regard to telephones. But if this government chose to be the ally of these corporations, there is in the provinces power to secure the people against these monopolies. The province of Ontario has found a way to build a national railway of its own, and own it; it has found a way to build a telephone service of its own, and a telegraph service of its own, and in that way they can bring a great deal of relief to the people of the province of Ontario. If the people of that province chose to nationalize and take possesion of the great waterways

of the Niagara river, by controlling that power and allowing the railways to use it on terms, they can regulate the rates. While I have been taunted in this House at times as being the exponent of a legislative union, I am glad to know that if the people cannot get relief to-day from the grievances they suffer by reason of the fact that this government refuses to administer the law and contents itself by saying: Let us make a new law, the provinces themselves have it in their power to remedy a great many of the grievances under which the people suffer to-day. Therefore, I come to this conclusion, that when hon. gentlemen come here and say: Let us make a new law in this direction. let us make a new law in that direction, they are only talking buncombe. Let them show fidelity to the law we have to-day, let them enforce it, let them enforce that clause in the Criminal Code that whoever disobeys a statute is subject to punishment, and they will have every law in this country respected. There are men in the insurance companies and various other companies who have violated that code, who come under that clause of the statute and could be disciplined in five minutes if it were enforced. In many directions these men could be disciplined, but we have a government which says: We are not policemen, we are not responsible for the law, we do not know how to enforce it, and therefore we are going to make another and a greater law in some way to cure the evils that have been pointed out.

Now, I am disappointed, and more than disappointed, that there is no reference in the address to the intention of the government in regard to the telephone and telegraph service in this country. I believe the people are in favour of the nationalization of these two great public facilities and making them part of the post office system of this country. Instead of that they allow the present condition of things to continue, and what do we see? We find the two great railways in the province of Ontario to-day conspiring to defeat the provincially owned telegraph line in connection with the provincial railway from North Bay on to Hudson Bay. Messages there are unnecessarily detained, just as the Bell Telephone Company detains the messages of rival companies. The Great Northwestern Telegraph Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company said to the Provincial Telegraph Company: Sell out your line to us and we will do the business. And when the provincial company would not sell out to them, they hampered their messages as much as they could and refused to exchange business with the provincial telegraph line. These great companies that were enfranchised by this parliament saw fit, in order to accomplish their own ends, to refuse direct telegraph connection with the wires of the provincial company, and as a consequence the enormous business that is going on between Cobalt and Toronto and Cobalt and New York is improperly hampered. We have a good law on the statute-book that compels these companies to interchange business. There is a third telegraph line starting business in the province of Ontario in connection with the Canadian Northern, and I suppose the same thing will happen in the Northwest, and we will have three telegraph lines in that country. But will they be run for the benefit of the people? No, they will make combinations, they will refuse to make connections, they will double toll wherever they can, and they will charge exorbitant prices to those who wish to use their lines.

Now, I have been through the west twice, and the greatest monopoly in the west to-day is the telegraph monopoly. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charge a dollar for ten words from any place, I think, west of Swift Current to any place in the east, it is the same rate for any distance between 2,000 miles and 3,000 miles that it is for the longest possible distance. That it not fair, that inequality should be removed, and the people of Canada should be given a telegraph system equal to that they have in the old country and in Europe, and they can only have that by a government owned telegraph line. I expected that we would have legislation pointing in that direction this session.

But there is no sign of it. There is no evidence of it, but rather is there evidence that the government has become the ally of these monopolies in connection with telephones and telegraphs and they will not exercise their proper function or perform the duty which has been performed by every government in Europe of nationalizing telegraph and telephone lines and giving the people the cheapest possible service. Now, I spoke a moment ago about Cobalt and I wish to say a word in connection with the tariff. We will, in a few days, be engaged in a tariff discussion. Last session we were engaged in the consideration of a question in which the tariff was concerned, inasmuch as it was proposed by the late Minister of Justice to deal with the question of the export of electricity. Now, I always have been a believer, from a national policy point of view, in export duties in certain cases and if I had my way to-day I would make it the law of this land that not one horse-power of electrical energy generated at Niagara Falls should be allowed to go out of this country to build up a foreign country even if the people of that country happened to be our neighbours. I would keep that power in this country. The then Minister of Justice proposed last session to allow all companies that were in existence at that time to export electrical energy and to allow electrical energy to go to the United States to run their railways and factories and to light the houses of the people. The law of this land ought to be that the electrical

energy must be consumed in Canada, that it must be used to take the place of the coal which we have not in Ontario, and unless we have an export duty and a prohibitive export duty you will find that the Americans will have the benefit of our electrical energy. In fact, a deputation was in Washington yesterday to ask the Washington government to allow them to import 100,000 horse-power produced on the Canadian side. From that I wish to pass to what is transpiring in Cobalt, in Sudbury and in the northern portion of Ontario generally. We have in Sudbury the greatest store of nickel in the world and a very great store of copper and we are by our present law allowing that copper and that nickel to be sent out of the country in the matte instead of having it all smelted and refined in our own country. We are allowing it to go to the United States, to make work for American workmen and high profits for American capitalists. There should be an export duty of some kind in regard to these products. It has been alleged that it cannot be made to apply to nickel. I have not yet been put in possession of any facts that would justify that view. But, there is another thing. Now, I come to Cobalt. The greatest silver mines in the world have been discovered at Cobalt in Northern Ontario. It is now admitted by the greatest mineralogists in the world that there is no other silver mine camp in the world equal to that of Cobalt. What is happening? Because we have no export duty on silver ore going out of our own country, because we have never had a sufficient encouragement through our national policy for the establishment of smelting in our own country, these ores are going out by the car load—$60,000 of value in a car—to smelting works and in the United States being refined there, and in that way Canadians are losing the control of these silver mines. Canadians have been discouraged. They were the original discoverers of the mines; they got assays, but they had difficulty in having their ores smelted and they always had a doubt as to the returns that were made by the smelters. A great silver smelting industry now exists in the United States. It is one of the greatest combinations in the world; it controls the smelting industry of that country, especially the smelting of silver, and the result will be that if we have not a national policy which will prohibit the export of these silver ores and necessitate the smelting of them in this country, Americans, and especially this great smelting trust, will control these silver mines of Ontario and the profits that ought to go to the Canadian people will go to Americans while the mere labour may go to Canadians. So that in regard to our electrical energy, in regard to our copper and nickel land, in regard to our silver products we ought to have a law prohibiting the export of these raw products so that we will have the smelting and use of them in this our own country. Yet there is no reference to that question in the speech from the Throne. It has been urged upon the Minister of Finance time after time and he has not seen his way to do it, but I state to him to-day that the time long ago arrived when our policy should have been changed and when by export duties and other regulations we should have compelled all of that work to be done in this country. As I said before, if we do not do it Americans will control our silver mines; they will control the electrical energy of this country; they will control our nickel and copper deposits and in that way we will be more or less serfs of theirs. There is another thing. We still continue to export our pulp wood. We ought to keep all that at home. We should not allow it to go to the United States. We should have the paper produced in this country. Let us just for a moment go back to the question of silver. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that it has been proved that America is probably the greatest producer of silver of any of the continents. Canada promises to lead them all. Our silver deposits and productions will exceed those of almost any other country, the same may be said of the United States, and the same may be said of Mexico. Another peculiar thing is the rise in the value of silver in the markets of the world to-day. It is predicted that silver may go to a dollar an ounce. In that case it will be necessary for the three governments in North America, of Canada, the United States and Mexico, to originate some kind of a continental policy in favour of this great wealth of silver that they and we have, and I hope, that in view of that, probably the day has arrived when silver, joined with gold, will be the standard of value and not alone gold. That is one of the questions. It is a great economic queston that this government and the Minister of Finance ought to be studying. The government of Mexico is fully alive to it. It has had a conference with the government of the United States and in view of these great discoveries of silver in this country I take the opportunity of directing the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact, and I hope that in shaping up his national policy he will have regard to these things. I hope he will have regard to the fact that these things which are essential to the nation must be owned by the Canadians, that the working of them must be done entirely by Canadians and the production largely kept in this country. So far this matter has been neglected. The Americans are getting the benefit of all these things simply because of our lack of a national policy in regard to them. I re-

member that it was said in this House that there would not be work for one smelting furnace in this country in the production of iron. Now, we see what the production of iron and steel is in this country, and it promises to be much greater. The same thing will happen in regard to nickel, copper and silver if we choose to enforce a national policy in regard to them. Take that one question of copper alone; I believe it is a fact that to-day certain telegraph and telephone lines cannot be built because of the failure to get the right kind of copper wire. We are at the mercy of the great copper wire trust of the United States, whereas if we had a national policy to produce these things in our own country instead of sending our matte and our ores out of the country we would be independent of all the nations that surround us.

I take this early opportunity of telling the Prime Minister and the government that the answer given this afternoon to the exposures in the city of London; that some law will be made in regard to this question is not sufficient. The Prime Minister must enforce the law to protect the people of Canada and he can only enforce the law by insisting that the man who profited by these political crimes in London shall step down and out of political life. These crimes were perpetrated in the interest of that hon. gentleman; they were perpetrated in the interest of the Liberal party during a crisis in its history. The order went out that no matter what the cost a constituency must be got to endorse the autonomy legislation. The right to try contested elections was, I believe, wilfully withheld from the people of the new provinces, and the people there were left without a resort against criminal election methods. The same kind of thing that took place in London took place in the western provinces and no redress was available to the pepole. The government had need of some kind of endorsation from the province of Ontario, the order went out that cost what it might London should be got to justify the Autonomy Bills, and that is why these crimes were perpetrated. The men who committed these crimes are not responsible, the men who profited by the crimes are those whom the people of Canada will hold responsible.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with regard to what I consider as an omission from the address of His Excellency. I will be very brief. I am encouraged to speak to-night by an expression used by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) who said that our agricultural interests should take a prominent and predominant position in this country. I am also encouraged to speak by the statement made by the Prime Minister when he said, that the government are not flies on the wheel, which means, I assume, that they can do something for the agriculturists of Ontario if they so wish. Now, the matter I wish to refer to is in regard to cold storage for the protection and care of our perishable farm products while they are being transported to the markets of the world, and that is a subject to which no reference was made in the speech from the Throne. Nearly two years ago I drew the attention of the House to the fact that a continuous and effective system of cold storage was necessary to meet the changed and changing conditions in the farming industry in the older parts of eastern Canada. I made no reference to this matter last session because I thought that even a Liberal government might possibly wish to act in a Conservative manner in an undertaking which required the expenditure of a great deal of money. But, when I find that this year, at the beginning of the third session of this parliament, there is no reference made to this matter at all, I think I am doing perfectly right in drawing the attention of the government to it at this early stage. I do so, Sir, with the idea that no further time may be lost. When I spoke in the House two years ago I pointed out that the east cannot compete with the free and fertile lands, the enormous product of grain, and the cheap ranch-fed cattle of the west. I showed that the natural result of this was that eastern farmers in the older districts were being compelled more and more to depend on dairying, fruit farming, the raising of tomatoes, poultry, &c. The conditions have not improved in the older districts of Ontario during the past two years. On the contrary they have become still more acute. We are all pleased indeed to know that the west is progressing, but we know too that the west is draining the east of its best blood, of its young men and of its most energetic citizens who are carrying thousands, yes hundreds of thousands of dollars away with them every year to invest in agricultural operations in western Canada. Under these circumstances and knowing this we cannot help but feel that something should be done. Eastern farms deprived of their virgin fertility and in competition with cheap western lands are rapidly depreciating in value. They are difficult to sell; often the eastern homestead has to be mortgaged and the grown-up sons take the money to the west, while the old men, the women, the boys and the girls are left to work the old farms and pay the debts. The agricultural industry in the east cannot be pursued in the old way; those left at home are not strong like those who have gone to the west; labour is scarce and dear, and therefore the farmers of the east are compelled more and more to give their attention to the cul-

tivation of the products I have indicated, because although these require more care, the labour is lighter. They find, however, that they are handicapped because they cannot get these perishable products to the markets of the world in proper condition. Our farmers cannot compete with other countries that have better advantages; bank barns and good stabling were absolute necessities while the Ontario agriculturists were rearing thoroughbred stock for the British market. but something more is required now. That something the farmers cannot provide for themselves and therefore they look to the government for aid. I trust that the government under these circumstances will keep the pledge given by the Prime Minister this afternoon and that they will not be 'flies on the wheel.' Surely something can be done to meet these changed conditions. The east has done a great deal for the west and I am perfectly sure that the west would gladly do something for the east. The governments of Denmark, of New Zealand and of other countries have practically saved their farmers from ruin by grappling with just such questions as these. Denmark, after the war with Germany and after she had lost two of her large provinces, was practically saved from sinking into almost national insignificance by her government taking charge of the agricultural interests of her reduced territory and assisting the farmers to put their butter, and their bacon, and their cheese on the British market in such prime condition that actually for nearly thirty years Denmark has maintained the first place in the markets of Great Britain and has secured the patronage of the wealthy consumers who purchase products of the choicest class. The farmers of eastern Canada should be aided in their efforts to put their more or less perishable goods on the markets of the world in as attractive a form as possible. A thorough and effective system of cold storage with scientifically constructed warehouses would enable them to do this. By a cold storage warehouse I do not mean an ice-house or a building lined with ice, but a regular and properly constructed warehouse with different compartments in each of which the temperature could be separately, scientifically, and accurately regulated by means of mechanical refrigeration; a system similar to that which they use in hot countries for the manufacture of ice.

Fruit and fish require different temperatures, and therefore should be put in different compartments. Fruit recently gathered contains a certain amount of fruit heat, and therefore should be put into a different compartment and subjected to a different temperature from that which it afterwards requires. Other products vary in a similar way, and should have similar treatment. A properly constructed cold storage warehouse would meet all these conditions. Cold storage warehouses of this character should be located at railway stations in every farming district where they are required. Farmers could then gather their tomatoes or fruits or prepare their other products during the heat of the day, and afterwards in the cool of the evening have them conveyed to the nearest cold storage warehouse. There they should be kept in a proper and scientifically regulated temperature until they are transhipped to refrigerator cars and conveyed to an ocean seaport or other destination. Every ocean seaport should also have a cold storage warehouse where these perishable products could be properly kept until they are transferred to the cold storage compartments of an ocean-going steamship. We should have mechanical refrigeration in the steamship while it crosses the ocean; and when the products arrive in Great Britain or wherever they go, there should be a Canadian cold storage warehouse ready to receive them, and they should be kept there until they are disposed of to local dealers, who should be carefully instructed also to keep them in cold storage warehouses until they are distributed to the consumers. Thus there would be a continual chain of cold storage for the products from the time they leave the hand of the producer until they reach the table of the consumer. It may be said that it would cost a large sum of money to construct the cold storage system that I have indicated. No doubt it would. It is estimated that it would cost $5,000,000 or $6,000,000, or probably the amount of one year's surplus. But surely the farmers and fishermen of Canada are worthy of that expenditure. More, I think it could be shown that such a cold storage system as I have outlined would not only pay all running expenses, and if necessary a high rate of interest on the money invested, but put between $20,000,000 and $50,000,000 in the pockets of the farmers and fishermen of Canada every year—money which they could not otherwise receive. Take an eighty-pounds cheese as an example. If this cheese is cured in cold storage instead of on a common drying shelf in a cheese factory, when it comes to be sold it will weigh from two to four pounds more than it otherwise would. Say two pounds at 10 cents a pound means 20 cents, which is equal to a quarter of a cent a pound on the whole cheese. But this is not all. When cheese that has been cured in cold storage reaches the British market it has a better flavour and texture, it has more meaty like it is not so dry and crumbly as it otherwise would be, and therefore it commands the patronage of a wealthier and better class of customers. The result is that it brings a cent and sometimes two cents more per pound. We may therefore infer that if our Canadian cheese were cured and handled entirely in cold storage, it would

bring at least 1¼ cents a pound more than it does at the present time. Now, I do not mean by this that the cheese should be shipped and handled one day in cold storage and the next day in a hot place, and carried back and forth in that way. In that case it would sour. But when we consider that we export about $24,000,000 worth of cheese every year, and that 1¼ cent a pound on that vast amount would mean $3,000,000 to the dairymen and farmers of Canada every year, we can realize the advantage that would be gained by the country from this system. Another thing: the cheese consumed by our own country would be of better quality if cured in cold storage, and would bring a better price.

Next, let us consider what the dairy men and farmers of Canada would gain if we had a really complete system of cold storage by means of which they could handle their butter. When a package of butter is prepared in this country on the farm or in the factory, it is generally conveyed to a railway station where it is placed in a hot freight house among other goods and products of various odours. It is often kept there for days or even weeks in a temperature of from sixty to eighty degrees. Sometimes it is placed on the station platform and allowed to remain there under the rays of the sun until it can be shipped to an ocean seaport. Formerly the cars also were too warm, but thanks to our Minister of Agriculture, ice cars have been provided, and I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the price of our butter has increased since the introduction of that improvement. But even yet when our butter reaches an ocean seaport, it is very likely left on the dock or put into a hot freight house until it can be transferred to the so-called cold storage compartment of an ocean-going steamship. Thermographical records show that even there a temperature of sixt-five or seventy degrees may sometimes be found. This process is repeated at Liverpool and again at different points until our butter reaches the table of the consumer. It is quite unnecessary for me to say that it is impossible that our butter under this treatment can command the highest price or secure the patronage of the best class of customers. English people are very particular about what they eat. If they have the means they will buy no food but the best. Knowing this, and judging by the experience of New Zealand, Denmark and other countries which have adopted cold storage systems, we may assume that our butter would bring at least 5 cents a pound more than it does at the present time if it reached the British consumer with the flavour and freshness that it has when it leaves the hands of the Canadian producer. Now, 5 cents a pound on all the butter made in this country would mean a few millions more to the farmers of Canada. Again, if we could ship our beef to Britain in cold storage instead of sending the cattle alive and on foot, the farmer of Canada would be benefited. While the embargo remains, we are at a great disadvantage, because the cattle have to be slaughtered as soon as they arrive in Great Britain. The cattle generally not only lose in weight, but have to be fed and watered and tended during the journey. If the voyage is rough, they reach their destination in a bruised and exhausted condition, and the meat is not as good as it otherwise would have been. Farmers know well that when slaughtering hogs if one escapes and they have to run it down and it becomes overheated and exhausted before it is killed, the meat is impaired in quality.

It is darker in colour and it has very poor keeping qualities. Besides that by the terms of the embargo the cattle cannot be kept alive and when it happens that two or more shiploads have to be slaughtered in the same port at the same time, it not only greatly lowers the price but it adds uncertainty to the market and to the business. Now, our pork brings much more per pound in the British market than our beef, simply because the hogs are slaughtered and the meat cured in this country and the bacon can be kept here or in Britain until the market demands it. In the United States, Swift and Armour have become multi-millionaires by handling meat in cold storage. Properly to carry out this system we require government abattoirs similar to those in New Zealand. In that case our cattle would be slaughtered in this country, employment would be given and our Canadian people would be benefited in another way. At the present time it costs about 2 cents a pound to send our beef to the English market while it is estimated it could be sent for about one-quarter of a cent a pound if we had a thorough system of cold storage. This would mean a clear profit of 1¾ cents a pound on our beef. We can understand and it would appear from this that if we had a thorough system of cold storage our meat would not only reach the British market in good condition, but it would bring a better price. The market would be relieved of its present uncertainty and our Canadian farmers would receive at least from $8 to $12 more per head for their fat cattle than they do at the present time.

Cold storage would also enable the farmers in our older districts to make large sums of money on poultry. English people are fond of fowl and would gladly buy all we could sell to them at good prices if we were prepared to establish a market and provide a supply all the year around. Now, with incubators, brooders, cold storage, cheap feed, and a very suitable climate, the Canadian farmer should be able to hold this trade against the world. Cold storage should not only increase the price of our

poultry by 5 or 6 cents a pound but it should enable us to export from 10 to 20 times as much as we do now. A poultry yard under these circumstances would certainly be a very suitable and proper adjunct to a fruit or dairy farm. Cold storage would also enable our farmers to make vast sums of money out of fruit which at the present time is fed to hogs or cattle or allowed to rot on the ground. We have an almost unlimited market for fruit. The people of Europe will take all the good, sound, healthy fruit we can send to them. We have also a very extensive market in our own country, one that will soon be very large indeed. New Ontario and the hinterland of Quebec will soon be filled with an immense mining population that will look to older Canada for their fruit and dairy supplies. Our Northwest, a comparatively fruitless country, will soon be filled with an immense multitude of wealthy, prosperous people. The settlers in that country are already looking with longing eyes towards the orchards and fruit farms of Ontario and older Canada. They want good fruit and plenty of it. They care little about the price; they have the money and are ready to pay for it. When in Saskatchewan last summer, I paid 10 cents a pound for early apples, that is at the rate of $6 a bushel. I inquired of the retailer how much he paid for them and he said: $2.50 a bushel. Two weeks after that when I returned to Ontario I saw hundreds, I might say thousands of bushels of these early apples that had become over-ripe during the hot weather and were falling from the trees and rotting on the ground. With proper cold storage these apples should have been worth at least $1 a bushel on the trees and they could have been sent out for 50 cents. That would give us say, $2 on the trees, but we will say $1. Canada produces 53,000,000 bushels of apples during the year, but we export only 5,000,000 bushels and the farmers do not get $1 a bushel; I do not believe the farmers get more than 50 cents a bushel. Of course the farmers at the present time do not take care of their orchards, they do not look after them and you cannot blame them as the fruit is practically valueless. Cold storage and a dollar a bushel would soon change all this, and I venture to say that in a very short time the same trees would be producing not 53,000,000 bushels, but 100,000,000 bushels of fruit of better quality because the trees would be grafted and pruned and cared for. That would mean $100,000,000 to the farmers of Canada each year instead of less than $5,000,000 which they receive at the present time. How long, I would like to know, are the farmers of Canada to be compelled to suffer this fearful loss?

Then there is the question of fish. In every transportation problem the question of return freight is of a great deal of importance. In connection with this we must remember that we will soon have railway communication with James bay, Hudson bay, Lake Athabaska and many other northern and western points where fruit will be scarce and dear but where beautiful large whitefish and other fish will be plentiful and cheap. Now, if we send a train of refrigerator cars to any of these northern points loaded with tomatoes and grapes and peaches and pears and cherries and plums and early apples, the cars will not be suited for bringing back grain or ore, the silver ore which our friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has been telling us about, but would be exactly what would be required to bring back these beautiful, nice whitefish. And more than this these whitefish could be kept in the cold storage warehouse in the farmers' neighbourhood, until the farmers and others were ready to purchase and pay for and use them. Or, if we chose to send a train of cars to Halifax or St. John or the Baie de Chaleur, or any other seaport there also would be found fresh fish in abundance for return freight. I have been told that in these districts sometimes, in the very hot seasons of the year, fish have actually been known to be spread on the ground and ploughed in for manure. They are handicapped in selling their fish nearly as badly as we are with our apples. If cold storage would give our farmers beautiful, nice, fresh, whitefish at 1 cent, 2 cents or even 4 cents a pound, and enable them to sell their beef at 10 cents or 12 cents a pound it would provide them with what is now a dainty a rarity and would also at the very same time put a lot of money into their pockets. Then think of the advantage it would be to our fishermen; they might be benefited to the extent of millions of dollars a year.

This system of cold storage should be constructed and maintained and run in the interest of the people of Canada. The government should either own and control it themselves or should encourage some private company to do so. The difficulty with a private company is that they would have a monopoly and naturally wishing to make money for themselves they might not treat the farmers fairly. There is no difficulty and no doubt whatever about it being a paying investment. The government are at the present time giving money to other industries without any chance or hope of a return.

They have already given $10,000,000 in bounties to the iron and steel and lead manufacturers of Canada. They have given $6,000,000 in bounties to these industries during the last five years—enough to build and equip this whole system of cold storage for which our farmers are asking. We must remember—and it will be well for the government to remember—that three out of five citizens of Canada are connected with the farm, and that three out of four are

connected with our farms and fisheries, while not more than one out of four hundred are directly connected with the manufacture of iron, steel or lead. Now, the farmers do not ask the government to give them a bonus; they do not ask for a bounty. All they ask the government to do is to make a good and profitable investment and to assist the farmers of Canada at the same time.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, dealing with the speech from the Throne for a short time, I regard it as important that every member of this House who wishes to do so should ventilate any grievance that parliament can rectify, draw the attention of the government and the House to any omission in the speech from the Throne, or deal with any question of interest to parliament. To begin with, I must join with those who congratulate the mover and seconder of the address. Those hon. gentlemen performed the task allotted to them in a manner very creditable to themselves and very acceptable to the House. With much of the matter that they gave us we cannot agree, but we can agree with all their representations of the case. We can also agree with a good deal of what appears in the speech from the Throne, and we do so with pleasure. We can all agree with His Excellency in his congratulations upon the good times that now prevail in Canada. We feel as much pride in this as does His Excellency, and we congratulate His Excellency and we congratulate the people of Canada, upon the prosperity which has continued with us for some years. But we cannot agree with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) that a large share of the credit of this prosperity is due to the government. If I were desirous of doing so, I might do what many have done before and ask—and, like the others I should ask in vain—to be told by the government what act of theirs has contributed materially to the prosperity which we to-day enjoy? Is that prosperity due to any large public works that they have built? Is it due to any great lines of communication that they have established? Is it due to any act of far-sighted statesmanship which they have carried into operation? It cannot be, for these things do not exist. We are compelled to believe that the government are trying to take to themselves credit, for what Providence has done, or for influences which operate upon Canada as they operate upon other nations helping to bring about widespread prosperity. Hon. gentleman opposite desire to turn these things to their own credit as politicians and statesmen, that they may convince the people of Canada that it is to this government that the prosperity of our country is due. In no way can they support that contention, either by general reasoning or by particular facts.

We join our congratulations with those of His Excellency on the fact that we have had a larger immigration of late years than before. But it is a regrettable fact patent to every one in this House as well as to every one outside it, that there never was a time we had so large a percentage of useless and undesirable immigrants coming to Canada as during the last two years. And the expenditure for the promotion of that immigration have been very heavy. Last year we spent nearly a million dollars in this service. And the same men who are spending that large amount of money for this purpose, declared, before they came into power, that $120,000 was entirely too much to spend upon immigration. But, notwithstanding our present large expenditure, we have a larger proportion of useless immigrants brought to the country, a greater number who become a charge upon the charity of the people than ever before in the history of Canada. These undesirable immigrants are to be found in every part of Ontario. I found them also in Manitoba and the Northwest. And I have no doubt that in every other province they are to be found in large numbers. Year after year, we on this side have been directing the attention of the government to this fact and pointing out to them the great importance of strict regulation of immigration, so as to prevent the entrance of these undesirable elements of humanity. But the government have never taken warning but have laboured to increase the number of immigrants regardless of their quality and usefulness to the country.

We agree with His Excellency in his congratulations upon the fact that upon the occasion of his visit to the four western provinces he found such evidences of development, such rapid growth of population and such content, happiness and prosperity. We are proud to know that every part of the Dominion is progressing so rapidly. In his visit to the four western provinces, His Excellency found the people rejoicing in their prosperity and full of hope and confidence in the future. But has nothing transpired that might shake the confidence of the people in the future of the glorious domain which they inhabit. I think it a pity that His Excellency did not refer, in this connection, to certain things which tend to sap the foundations of constitutional government, and which are nothing less than heinous crimes against the state, which took place in the last elections in that country. This is a menace to our institutions. It is the cloud no larger than a man's hand upon the horizon of our national career, a cloud which, if not dissipated but allowed to grow, must ultimately destroy the freedom in which the people of the west rejoice to-day. And in view of such things as this, I say that the omissions in the address are even more important than what it contains.

We regret that nothing has been proposed by the government to remedy the great evils to which I have referred. These are crimes against the state, crimes that interfere with the sacred franchise of the people and their rights of free election. They are crimes which attack the very foundations of justice, which sap the roots of constitutional government, and threaten those institutions the establishment of which has cost such labour and sacrifice on the part of the leaders of reform in previous generations.

The request of the Minister of Labour to the imperial parliament to enact a law to punish those who by false representations induce artisans or labourers to come to this country is another subject that engaged the attention of His Excellency. He was pleased to congratulate the House that that was going to be done. But it is important to mention the fact that it becomes desirable to introduce such legislation by virture of the acts of the civil servants of the government themselves, because to them alone was traced home the fact that this system was carried on by their advice and connivance, by the assistance of Mr. Leopold, or Lazarus, whichever you like to call him, and W. T. R. Preston and those associated with him, the Arundel Printing Company, the North Atlantic Trading Company, and that coterie of people employed by the government, or working with the government, and under the agencies of the government. Yet there is no provision to bring them before us and have punishment meted out to them, or those who are their aiders and abettors, while we ask the imperial parliament to pass a law to punish them over there. Why did we not take the law we had and punish them at home? When we come to Preston, who has been one of the aiders and abettors in these crimes, when he is driven from his position there, what punishment is inflicted upon him? Transferred to a higher and nobler sphere where he receives a larger salary.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Has he accepted that job?

Mr. SPROULE. We have no information whether he has or not, but it has been offered to him, and that shows the inclination of the government to frown down this wrong-doing that they ask the imperial parliament to punish, when they have the power in their own hands to inflict the punishment. I say it is regrettable if that is the case.

Then the speech from the Throne tells us that the public accounts will be laid before us. We are pleased and thank His Excellency for the information, because we know that it is a duty of the opposition to take up these public accounts and scrutinize them carefully in order to ascertain whether every dollar of public money has been properly expended, has been honestly expended, and whether proper value has been obtained in return. But we regret to know that when we come to discharge that duty the government comes to the aid of those who have been doing wrong and become their defenders, thus paralyzing the arm of parliament so that the opposition has no chance to discharge those important functions that it is the duty of an opposition to discharge. Take, for example, the inquiries that were carried on last session in the Public Accounts Committee and in the Committe of Agriculture, when we endeavoured to pry into the secrets of that North Atlantic Trading Company to ascertain how Canada's money was spent in such large amounts and where it went, to whom it was paid, and what return we got for it. Parties were brought before that Public Accounts Committee and put upon their oath, and when we desired to bring out the information, what was the result? When we asked the question, To whom was this money paid? they were told by some of the supporters of the government, Don't answer that question, it is none of their business, that is your private business. It was no business for that committee to know who received between $200,000 and $300,000 of Canada's money. How could the opposition discharge the duties our constituents sent us here to discharge under those circumstances? Why, the arm of parliament was paralyzed by the government and their supporters in those committees, who would not allow the information to come out. The witnesses were before us, willing to give this information, but they were not allowed to give it, and the representatives of the people who were sent here for that purpose, were unable to bring out information that was necessary in the interest of the country. Then it is a matter for regret that although the public accounts are laid before us, parliament is unable to do its duty, the opposition cannot find out how Canada's money is being spent. We know it is being frittered away, we know it has been given in large commissions, we know that contractors have got it, we know that North Atlantic Trading Companies have got it, we know that it has been squandered in large quantities, but when we endeavour to find out into what hands the money went the government put obstructions in our way. I say it is regrettable that there is nothing in the speech from the Throne holding out any hope that there will be a chance in the future of doing our duty in this regard.

It is regrettable also that although a reference was made to the work of the insurance commission that has been engaged for over a year in that inquiry there is no hope held out to us in the speech from the Throne that such legislation will be enacted

during the present session as would remedy many of the evils that exist under the insurance system to-day. It is doubly regrettable that the government give us no information in the address that they intend this session to introduce legislation to protect the interests of the people who invest so much money in these companies, which are practically trust corporations, and who fritter away so much of the people's money in ways that are not to their benefit. It is regrettable that so much time was spent by the commission in going from one place to another and turning their attention to subjects that have no direct connection with the purpose for which that commision was appointed. They have been frittering away time in my judgment. If I were to give my honest opinion, I would say the government desire to prevent parliament dealing with that question, either last session or this session. The government seem to be delaying it for their own purposes, for what other purposes no one can tell. I say it is regrettable that although the government themselves, in the speech from the Throne, hope that that report will be laid before parliament during the present session, they have not intimated their intention to introduce some law to regulate and control insurance companies better than has been done in the past. It is a growing evil of immense proportions, and the government suggests no way by which this evil may be remedied. Then we are told that we will have a Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Acts. I congratulate the government on that, but I hope the Bill will contain clauses which will prevent the perpetration of such offences against the state as have been taking place in Canada under the Department of the Interior in late years. I regret it exceedingly in view of the injury that is being done to the country. Here we find that the eminent domain of the state is being frittered away for the benefit of friends and supporters of the government. Some law should be introduced to prevent the Minister of the Interior, or the government as a whole, from disposing of the lands of Canada in the way they have been doing of late years to friends of their own, to an extent that never was heard of before in the history of this country. I say I regret it very much, and would feel more pleased over the information that there will be a Bill introduced to amend the Dominion Lands Act, if I was assured that it will contain some provision which will stop this wholesale abuse.

In connection with this I would like to say one word in regard to public men and their utterances in this country. It was said that while public men might be indicted before the jury of the country we could not complain that they had not been honestly, honourably and truthfully endeavouring to do their duty. Let me give one instance to the House. The question of the sale of eminent domain in large quantities has been the subject of controversy in this House for years. We know what the Saskatchewan Valley land deal meant, we know what the issue of grazing leases of late years meant, we know that large quantities of land for these purposes were allowed to be purchased at one dollar an acre by political friends of the government, and we know that when the question was last session put to the man charged with the administration of that land, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if in the future he intended to dispose of the eminent domain except to actual settlers or in blocks or large quantities he said most assuredly that he would not dispose of it in large quantities and that between then and the next session of parliament, or until the Dominion Lands Act should be amended, there would be no land sold except to actual settlers. That was on the 6th of June. What took place on the 26th of June, 20 days afterwards?—no less than 850,000 acres of land was sold to an irrigation company ostensibly for $3 an acre, but practically for $1 under an arrangement giving them a rebate of $2 an acre whenever certain specified irrigation work was done. What will be thought of the veracity of public men, what confidence will the people have in the words of public men when they make such statements on the floor of parliament and deliberately violate them inside of 20 days? What kind of an example is that to place before the people of the country? It is charged that there is a low grade of political morality in this country to-day. Who is responsible for it if it is not the public men who represent the people in parliament and who set such a bad example to them? Do you wonder that an elector will take $5 or $10 for his vote and then go and perjure himself when he is put on the stand when you find ministers of the Crown deliberately disregarding their own statements inside of that short time not in that way alone but in 50 other ways I might mention and in 50 other instances I might draw the attention of the Houses to ? What an awful example to put before the people of the country ! When a man who ought to be an example of probity, of right, of truthfulness and of integrity will set such an example before the people of the country is it any wonder that we have descended to the low moral status that we have reached in connection with political crimes in this country? I say it is not.

The right hon. First Minister said that he considered it of the very first importance that we should have an honest franchise, a stringent election law that would compel an honest and fair expression of the people's will at the polls. He said that that was desirable and he also said that the meanest

and most despicable kind of corruption that could be practised was the switching of ballots. Yet, we heard from the same high source a few years ago, when the question of the West Huron election was broached in this House and the motion made for the holding of an inquiry, that no more important consideration could engage the attention of parliament than such an inquiry. He said that the stream could not rise higher than its source that the waters of the stream were no better than the worst polluted waters that might proceed from its source, that therefore parliament could be no better than the worst election frauds that were perpetrated and that no measure of greater importance could engage our attention. It was brought out that ballot switching was prevalent in West Huron in one, two, three, four polling subdivisions and these were the only ones that the committee were able to inquire into during that session of parliament; yet, at the next session, in pursuance of the right of this House to proceed with that inquiry, because we were given to understand that it would be continued until it was concluded, when an effort was made to reopen the inquiry the very man in this House who opposed it was the right hon. leader of the government himself, and he refused to let it go on. Yet, the lowest, the meanest, the basest kind of corruption—ballot switching—had been perpetrated there. All his beautiful platitudes about the purity of the stream passed for nothing but the sounds of oratory that were soon forgotten, and the country had not an opportunity of knowing if he desired to fulfil them as he had expressed them in the House.

To-day we have something very much of the same character said in regard to London, but almost in the very next breath he turns around and exonerates the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) saying that he did nothing wrong, that so far nothing had been brought out whatever to show that he ever had any knowledge of or connection with the frauds that took place in London. No, he did not, but he received the stolen goods all the same, he kept them and profited by them and the man who came here and represented that den of thieves up there is looked upon as a man of probity and of honour and he is regarded as a fit emblem of propriety and as a proper adviser of His Excellency or of the Crown. What a parody on parliamentary life it would be in the imperial parliament and how long would the Prime Minister of England allow any adviser of the Crown to retain his portfolio if such disclosures had taken place there? How long? The only wonder is that His Excellency has not drawn the attention of the right hon. First Minister to it in a way that would ensure immediate action or the immediate removal of the person who has been so closely connected with it. Can any one believe for a moment, when we take up the list of those who were purchased, the partial list which is before me, giving the names of no less than ninety-eight persons who have been bought for $10 a head or less to send the Minister of Public Works down here to support the government and when $2,366.50 was paid out for this purpose, that all that took place and that yet the Minister of Public Works knew nothing about it nor where the money came from? Where did the money come from? We found where part of it came from, but there is a lot of it that we have not found out about. We must remember the fact that the few who have been brought out and exposed only represent, we believe, a very small proportion of the number who were guilty and who may yet be exposed. While we have ninety-eight on the list we believe it represents four times ninety-eight and in addition to that we have the fact which was disclosed that no less than, I believe, ninety-five or ninety-six in one polling subdivision had been purchased where there were only 250 votes in the polling subdivision. Under these circumstances is it not to be wondered at that the government did not remove their colleague at an earlier stage and attempt to purge themselves of the odium that must attach to them and which must for ever attach to them because nothing was done to purge parliament of this crime? Even the hon. member for Lambton condemned it to-day and I agree with him and congratulate him upon having done so, but until all the members on the other side of the House shall show the same desire to frown it down and to ostracise those who indulge in such practises they must remain under the same suspicion as the man who perpetrates these frauds. Now, then, London is one affair. After that election was over I remember an incident that took place in this House when some reference was made to that election and I believe it was made by the right hon. leader of the House himself in answer to something that was said on this side of the House.

I point the hon. gentleman to the verdict of London as an evidence of the vindication of the policy of the government and the Autonomy Bill; the large majority rolled up there justified us; I give that as an answer to the member for East Grey as to what the sentiment of public opinion is and which he challenged us to test. Yes, we had public opinion in London bought at $10 a head; that is the kind of public opinion the Prime Minister has to boast of. But a small portion of the curtain has been lifted and it may in future be possible for us to lift it some more. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to talk in beautiful platitudes about honesty in election and the free expression of the people's will, but we want more than that from him and his government; we want to see that they are prepared to carry out in practice what they preach on the floor of this House in that respect. If it is

so desirable to have an honest expression of the people's will why did not the government punish those guilty of the frauds in the Prince Albert election? There the most heinous political crimes were perpetrated and the people are face to face with the fact that there is no law to mete out punishment to the criminals. We find there is no provision in the Autonomy Bills to proceed with the election trials, and for that the government and their Minister of Justice is responsible. Was that omission designedly, was it done so that it might enure to the benefit of the Liberal party? If we were disposed to be over critical I believe the facts would justify us in coming to that conclusion. But put the mildest construction possible upon it and let us say it was an accidental omission and what evidence have we that the Minister of Justice who is supposed to be the fountain of justice in Canada has shown any desire to bring to justice the perpetrators of these frauds. And when one of these men is brought to trial we find that the man who represents the Crown becomes the defender of the criminal; he instructs him to plead guilty and he recommends him to the mercy of the court, and the guilty one is punished with a small fine which we are told is paid by the party, so that practically there is no punishment inflicted. That is what is done by this government which talks in beautiful platitudes of honest and pure elections. We passed in this House a resolution which was endorsed by the government and which said that no official of the government should take part in elections. But, Sir, we have the fact disclosed that three employees of the government are the very parties who went out into that northern country purporting to hold polls when no polls were held and who came back with returns declaring that 150 votes were given for the government candidate, and that the opposition were so unpopular that not one vote was cast for it. And yet not a single one of these three officials has been dismissed from his office. They have been transplanted from one department to another; they have been promoted to better salaries and hence it is that the government encourages these crimes. Then we come to the Manitoba thin red line. The Prime Minister talks about honest elections and yet at the last election in Manitoba the organizer of the Liberal party is sent the voters' list to be revised by him after they have left the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The Liberal organizer takes these lists home and with one stroke of the pen dipped in red ink 9,399 voters are stricken from the lists, nearly every one of whom so far as we can learn were supporters of the Conservative party. And this hero of the thin red line, who was a government official is still in the employ of the government and is receiving a higher reward than he did before. What becomes of the Prime Minister's alleged desire for purity in elections? And what was the result of this criminal conduct in Manitoba? Provencher returned a supporter of the government by a majority of 10; Mr. Leach with his thin red line struck out 560 Conservative voters of that constituency and instead of having a majority of 10 for the Liberal candidate, had there been an honest election he would have been in a minority of 550; and the Conservative would be here to condemn the nefarious conduct of this Liberal organizer. In Portage la Prairie where the Liberal candidate had a majority of 385, no less than 1,395 Conservative voters were disfranchised by the thin red line, and the hon. member to-day represents that constituency seems to enjoy the fact that he is sitting in this House under such circumstances. Is it in consonance with the Prime Minister's desire for an honest election when we see that no effort is made to punish this criminal, but that on the contrary he is promoted to a more remunerative position in the government employ. In Lisgar where the supporter of the government was elected by 180, Mr. Leach disfranchised with his thin red line 1,131 Conservatives. Had these men been allowed to exercise their franchise honestly, instead of the present member for Lisgar being here with a majority of 180 he would have been left at home with a minority of 957. That is a sample of the kind of men who are here supporting the present government which glories in the fact they have such a large majority at their back. In the face of these disclosures, in face of the fact that the government and the Minister of Justice have not moved hand or foot to punish the guilty parties, what are we to think of the talk of the Prime Minster about his desire to secure an honest expression of public opinion.

What confidence can the people of the country have in it? I say it is to be regretted that we have no information of any intention on the part of the government to introduce a stringent law to punish these offenders, and no evidence of any desire to punish them, because they have never raised hand or foot to do it. Then we have the Byron Lott case in connection with the last election and the disclosures in regard to the patent ballot boxes. These men are exiles from the country; they have gone away for their health like many others. Their health suddenly became bad and they went west instead of south. Did the government do anything by word or act to condemn these men? Not at all. What example are they setting to the rising generation of this country as to what should be their position when they reach the status of men and take the places of those now in the parliament of our country? Is it an example calculated to make them men of honesty, probity and truthfulness, such as we desire to have in any community? I need not refer to the case of Brockville where similar things took place and the disclosures in connection with that. Notwithstanding the govern-

ment's professed desire to probe all these matters to the bottom, they call on their servile majority to prevent the evidence being brought out either before parliament or in the courts of the country. How many of these men are languishing in jail to-day for these crimes? Not a single man of them. On the contrary, they have been promoted to higher and more remunerative offices. Then, we come to the case of W. T. R. Preston. It is said that nothing was disclosed to show that he had done anything wrong; that there was any thing wrong in his relations with Leopold or in his connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company. But how can we prove it when the witnesses whom we brought are prevented from answering the question which would have brought out the information? Nothing was proved against Preston to prevent the government sending him to a higher and more honourable position. Yet his own colleague swore that he would not believe him under oath. Did they place any confidence in that evidence of their own employee? What importance did they attach to it? Not any. But had we been allowed to do the duty which as representatives of the people we have been sent here to do, and bring out the information, we believe we could have connected W. T. R. Preston directly with the North Atlantic Trading Company as well as other supporters and employees of the government. Yet the government boast that we were not able to bring out evidence to incriminate these people. Will the world believe that Preston was free from guilt? Will it believe that he had no connection with the Arundel printing contract and that the money for that was wisely and properly spent? Not at all. They cannot believe it. They believe that he was mixed up in this matter in a way not creditable to the government, or else the government would allow the facts to come to light and Preston would not be where he is to-day.

There are other forms of bribery than the expenditure of money for votes. We had recently an election in North Bruce, and I was there for a short time. Just before the election up comes the Minister of Public Works, and he gets hold of the government candidate and goes with him to Southampton to look at the harbour there; and he suddenly finds that there is great need of public expenditure on that harbour. He had been at Southampton many times before, but he never found until that moment that there was great need of the expenditure of public money on that harbour, to assist the people to carry on their trade. In that same election up comes an employee of the government who goes to the town of Wiarton, where the government suddenly find it very desirable to establish a fish hatchery. For what purpose were these men there, and for what reason was that suggestion thrown out? If it was not for the purpose of direct bribery, for what purpose was it? If the government wish to frown down bribery, why do they not show the example themselves, and not allow these flagrant acts of impropriety to be committed right under their noses? I was at Southampton when one of their own friends. Mr. Bowman, told of the money spent in that harbour for dredging, and he wound up, by saying: 'Fellow electors, I want to tell you that it is not Sir Wilfrid Laurier who is the important element in this contest to-day; it is not whether he will be sustained by one more of a majority, because he has an ample majority behind him to enable him to carry out the policy of his government to the fullest extent; but the question for the people of Southampton is how much money we shall have spent here; we need it, and it is for us to get it, and what is the best means we can devise to get that money for the purposes and the advantages and the needs of Southampton; that is what we are going to vote for; remember that when you go to the polls next week; it is for your own personal interest, the interest of your town and your home; that is the question you must keep in view.' That was what was said by a supporter of the government who was, I believe along with the Minister of Public Works and the candidate for the riding when they looked over that harbour. I say you might as well tell the people of Southampton that their interests are so great that it would pay them to raise among themselves $2,000 and buy votes at $10 a head if by that means they could send a supporter of the government and bring back an expenditure in Southampton of $25,000 or $30,000. Is that system any less bribery than to go and buy the votes of poor fellows in London at $10 a head? I say it is no better, and the government and their supporters who do it, and the Minister of Public Works who does it, ought to be condemned by the people of this country just as much as the parties who went to London and bought votes at $10 a head for the government who afterwards boasted of the result as an evidence of public sentiment. These are the reasons the government are retained in power to-day with a large and servile majority at their back; and no evidence is given to the House, either by the voice of the Governor General in the speech from the Throne, or by any member of the cabinet, of a desire on their part to reform in this respect, to give Canada better and purer elections, and to punish some of these criminals. Make the fountain pure and the stream that flows from it will be pure, and the resulting benefit will come to Canada. These things will engage our attention at greater length later on, but we feel it is our opportunity, our right and our duty at the earliest moment to draw the attention of parliament and of the people to them so that they may know what is taking

place in our country and may mete out the proper condemnation, which from time to time is being meted out to this government, for their acts of omission as well as their acts of commission in connection with the administration of the affairs of this country.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Reference was made this afternoon to some subjects in which I have taken some interest, reference was made to the speech of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). I was surprised that the minister was absent during the whole afternoon, and I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wifrid Laurier) if the government would consent to an adjournment of the debate until Monday when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) will be here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is away in Toronto, I do not know whether he will be here on Monday or not, but I have no objection to an adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BOURASSA moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November 26, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INDUSTRIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques-Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies He said : This is a Bill which I introduced last session and which was then advanced only one stage. In the intervening recess I have learned, through correspondence, that this legislation meets with considerable favour throughout the country, that it is required and anxiously looked for. The Chambre de Commerce of Montreal has taken up the question of this legislation, and quite recently, heard a conference on the subject from a gentleman who has been conducting an association of this kind for some years in the town of Lévis with great success. I think it would be advisable, after the second reading of the Bill, and I believe the government will see the wisdom of the suggestion—to refer the measure to a special committee. I believe that, in legislation of this kind which is new and requires careful study probably extending over several days, the Bill cannot be conveniently handled by one of our large committees. This Bill is largely copied from the English legislation. The department which will be particularly interested under the terms of the Bill is the Department of Labour. And I would say here at once, that, if my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) will take up the Bill and give the House the assurance that it will be passed this session, I should be happy to leave it entirely in his hands, believing that with the assistance of the employees of that department, he can take up the measure with greater efficiency than I can, and, possibly, make suggestions which would prove useful in working out the Bill in practice. There is a feature in the Bill regarding banking, to which I will refer, when the measure comes up for second reading. I may say now that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the banking interests of this country are not opposed to the banking feature of co-operative societies. In European countries, where a similar law is in force it is regarded as an ancillary measure to the regular banking law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT—COMPENSATION FOR LANDS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: This Bill is one that passed this House last session with very little discussion, the House being unanimous in its favour, but which, for some reason, was never dealt with in the Senate. It was introduced in that body, but I find, on hunting up the Senate proceedings, that it was not carried through its other stages. I expected—and so, I think, did the country—to find this Bill on the statute-book. But it is not there, and it must be passed again to become law. The object of the Bill is to give the landholder the same right to accelerate proceedings in relation to arbitrations concerning land taken for railway purposes as the railway company has. As the law has stood since 1903, owing, apparently, to one of those slips that will occur in revising statutes, the landowner has no right to move for an order of the court to have arbitrators appointed and to bring the matter under adjudication, when he and the company cannot agree as to compensation for lands taken. As the law stands to-day, the company alone can invoke the court to accelerate proceedings. Of course, this bears particularly unfairly upon the landowner who has had his land taken. The effect of this Bill will be to allow the land-

owner to move for an order of the court to have arbitrators appointed, his witnesses called and his claim adjudicated upon without awaiting the good will of the company to accelerate the proceedings. The former Minister of Justice, the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, conceded that this was a Bill which should be passed. And it was passed unanimously by this House, but, as I have said, was not passed by the Senate. I trust that the Bill will pass in this House again, and that, this session, the Senate will deal with it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT—LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to further amend the Railway Act 1903. He said: This also is a Bill which was passed in this House last session, but was not passed in the Senate. The Bill as it is now introduced is identically the same as that of last year, except that I am giving the railway companies six months longer to comply with its provisions than the time provided under the Bill of last session. The reason is that nearly six months has elapsed since the Bill was passed in this House. The object of the Bill is the protection of life at street level railway crossings. The Bill has been discussed for three years in this House. Last session it passed unanimously after very considerable discussion, being considered and redrafted by a special committee. It became an amendment to the Act amending the Railway Act, 1903, which was passed last year at the instance of the government and in charge of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The Senate dealt with this part of the measure at the closing hours of last session and in a very short way—they refused to pass it. I shall not now go into the merits of the Bill, if necessary I shall deal with them at some length on the second reading. Suffice it to say at this stage that the Bill was unanimously passed in this House after careful consideration. The only change made in the Bill as compared with that of last session is that it is to come into force in January, 1908, instead of in July, 1907. I trust that the House will deal with the Bill and pass it again this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting certificates to Masters and Mates of ships. He said: This Bill was also dealt with by the House last session and adopted practically as I am now introducing it. But the Bill of last session had some provisions with regard to qualifications which are not in the present one. All that the present Bill provides is that masters and mates of ships shall be British subjects, and that provision is based mainly on the fact that the neighbouring republic insist on masters and mates on their ships being American citizens, and further I think the qualification of Canadian or British citizenship is a necessary one. The Bill was to this extent unanimously approved of by the House last session, but it went to a special committee after the second reading because of some additional amendments with regard to the qualifications of officers, which I do not now propose to insist on, they being of minor importance as compared with the great principle that masters and mates should be British citizens. If the House passes the Bill as it now stands, that is all I shall require this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RESIGNATION OF THE HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether any additional resignation has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman). I would also ask my right hon. friend, the leader of the government, whether or not the retention of the portfolio continues, as he stated to the House the other day.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister.) In so far as the resignation of Mr. Hyman's portfolio is concerned, I have had no further communication from him since I last addressed the House. He has gone south in very poor health, and I have reason to believe that I shall have an answer from him in a very few days.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no further resignation to report.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to one point regarding the coming budget speech. It would be quite unusual, very inconvenient, and somewhat unfair to the House to ask us to enter on a discussion on the finances of the country without our having before us the public accounts and trade returns. My hon. friend himself of course and his colleagues have access to those documents, but to the opposition they are a sealed book. I would not make so strong an objection if it were only a ques-

tion of the absence of the trade returns, but it does seem anomalous altogether to expect us to criticise the financial conditions of the year unless we have in our hands the public accounts themselves. It may be that these will be ready before my hon. friend makes his speech, but I thought it well to draw his attention to the matter.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). With regard to the trade returns, my hon. friend is evidently not aware that they are now in the hands of members. As regards the public accounts, they are almost ready. The last proofs have gone to to the printer, and I hope they will be on the table before the budget speech is delivered. However, we only deal with the totals in the budget debate and the details may be dealt with later. The substance of last year's operations has already been made known in the public press and has no doubt reached my hon. friend. If the accounts should not be ready, I shall see that a summary of last year's operations is furnished my hon. friend a day in advance. I may say now that I expect to present the budget on Thursday of this week.

THE ROYAL INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood last session that a printed copy of the evidence taken before the Royal Insurance Commission was to be sent to the clerk of the House and that a sufficient number of copies were also to be supplied for the use of members. The clerk informs me that he has the printed copies up to date, but has heard nothing about the 500 or 600 others which were to have been furnished for the House. The evidence is very voluminous, and I do not see why a number of copies should not be printed at the same time and distributed to members or brought down for distribution.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not aware of any promise to have hundreds of copies printed for the general information of the House. My own recollection is that a request was made to have a copy of the evidence laid on the table and that has been done. However, as I was not present in the early part of last session, something may have occurred that escaped my notice. I thought that the request of the House had been complied with when we had a copy of the evidence placed on the table from day to day, and as the proceedings have been followed by most of the people in the public press from day to day, the evidence in detail will probably only require to be turned up from time to time by way of reference. I am not aware of any request or any arrangement for printing the evidence for general distribution. There was no parliamentary order for printing of the evidence. The printing was attended to by the shorthand reporter under an arrangement made by the commission, and a few extra copies were ordered for the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a pretty distinct recollection of having suggested myself that there should be copies printed so that members of the Senate and this House might have them, but whether that suggestion was acceded to or not, I am not in a position to say. I am not at all inclined to admit that what was printed in the newspapers is quite sufficient. I should not like myself to have to depend on the newspaper reports. Neither do I think that parliament should be asked to depend on them.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that no request was made for a general distribution of the evidence. This was a very ponderous report, and if it had been furnished from day to day the probability is that the majority of members would not be able to peruse it and would have to rely on the general information in the press and turn up the official report when necessary. Whether the proceedings will be printed for general distribution is a question which we may decide later.

Mr. FOSTER. For the members of the House, not for general distribution.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss the various paragraphs of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I wish simply to make a reference to one of those paragraphs just to indicate the stand I will have to take during the session on the special question referred to; I mean the question of immigration. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, it should be a matter of congratulation for parliament as well as for the whole people of Canada to see our country develop. At the same time I think our congratulations should be not only upon the quantity of the immigrants who may come into this country but upon the quality of those immigrants. I hope when the subject is further brought before the attention of the House that we will have some declaration of policy from the government as to their intention of, I would not exactly say checking the immigration into Canada, but of controlling it, so that the elements that are brought into this country will help in the moral development and progress of the country rather than by a mere material increase. I wish also to point

out that I was rather surprised to find no reference in the speech from the Throne to the coming conference in London. As may be remembered by the members of the House who were here in 1897, the delegates of the government went there without having communicated to the House the correspondence that had been exchanged between the Canadian government and the imperial authorities, and it was only through an imperial document that we knew the terms upon which the Canadian government had accepted the invitation. I must say that for the conference of 1902 the course was different. The government on that occasion laid before parliament the correspondence that was exchanged between the British and Canadian authorities, and therefore the people of Canada could know what their delegates went there to do. I hope the same course will be followed in this instance.

Now, I may be pardoned if I have to refer for a few moments to a subject which is entirely out of the scope of the speech from the Throne as well as the address in reply thereto. The attention of the House has been brought to it by the reference made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to a speech delivered by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) during the recent by-election in the constituency of North Bruce. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) read a couple of paragraphs of that speech, and I may be pardoned if I read the whole item, in which I am somewhat interested. It appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of Thursday, October 25, and as almost a similar text has appeared in all the daily newspapers of Canada, whether ministerial or oppositionist, I suppose I may take it for granted that the text is correct. Here are the words which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is quoted as having uttered at Wiarton on the 24th of October :

> Only yesterday in the county of Quebec, he said, the fires of sectarian hatred have been lighted, on the ground that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too British for his political opponents there. If he is too British for them he should be British enough for the province of Ontario. Just because he is, upon principle and upon conviction, a man firm and true in his loyal allegiance to the British Crown and to British institutions, just because he is, upon conviction, building on this continent to the best of his ability a united and harmonious race, just because he is, by every act of his life, straining every nerve to bring into peaceful union the two races which have been too long opposed in this country—just for this reason he is undoing the work of those who would seek to keep the two races apart. And just as those in Quebec who wish his downfall are to-day having the victory they say they have won on the plains of Quebec, those in Ontario who are exulting in the victory over Sir Wilfrid Laurier are, if they but knew it, digging the very grave of British institutions in Canada, and seek to put us in the position in which we were fifty or sixty years ago, when one province was arrayed against the other and there seemed to be no hope of a solution of the difficulties of our struggling country.
>
> The minister stirred his audience to a pitch of enthusiasm as he referred to the Prime Minister's loyalty at the outbreak of the South African war, when the whole empire seemed tottering, and when one wondered whether the strength had gone out of the old lion. To whom but Sir Wilfrid was Canada indebted for the measure that made him the mark of the outcry in the province by false friends such as Mr. Bourassa, who pretended to be his allies? Because they did not get the favours they expected to get from a French Canadian minister there are in Quebec to-day the men who brought about the reverse of yesterday, now alluded to by the Conservative papers of Toronto and to be repeated over the land to Conservative citizens as 'a defeat for Laurier in his own Quebec.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to that in a somewhat pleasant manner for which I do not blame him, because the speech is one which might prompt some pleasant comment. He put a question on that speech to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Prime Minister in his reply said that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) had put to him several questions, some pleasant, some jocose, some serious, and that he intended to reply only to the serious questions. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) having set aside this particular one, I presume he has classed it among either the pleasant or the jocose questions. Well, from a certain point of view, certainly it is, but from another point of view, which I think I am free to take, it is not so pleasant as that, Mr. Speaker, and that point of view is this : Is it a proper thing that a minister of the Crown, a man occupying a high position not only in politics, but I may say more so elsewhere than in politics, at the Canadian bar, a high position in the eye of all nationalities in this country, should take upon himself to stamp one of his colleagues in this House, one of his fellow Liberal members, a man who, although younger than the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), has done longer service to the Liberal party than the hon. gentleman has done, is it a proper thing, I say, that a minister of the Crown, a gentleman of high standing such as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is, in order to seek some applause, to seek some advantage for his candidate in one of the Ontario constituencies, should build up an argument for which there was no foundation whatever, either in the by-election of the county of Quebec or in the whole history of politics in Quebec for the last six years ?

Now, Sir, I take it for granted that the attack of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was not directed towards the new member elect for Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille). The member elect for Quebec county

(Mr. Robitaille) presented himself as an independent Liberal, giving his support to the government in their general policy, appealing to the electors of his constituency to vote for him because he thought the county of Quebec as well as any other Canadian constituency, should be free to choose its own representative without having one imposed on it by any government or any political organization. The second principle on which the election was fought was the right of the representative of the people to vote for the people before he votes for his party or for any government or for any political organization. Those were the only two foundations on which the candidature of the member elect for Quebec was based; it was on that ground alone that I went there; and no reference whatever would have been made to any other question, that might have as its result the stirring of racial and religious prejudices, if it had not been for the attack, for the onslaught made on my friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) and myself by 'Le Soleil' of Quebec and 'Le Canada' of Montreal. If the attack made by the government organs in Quebec, as well as the attack made on myself by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) are an expression of opinion from the government and from the Liberal party it is just as well that we should know it right now. Whatever my faults may be, I think I may be credited with a desire for a clean slate and well defined positions.

What was the basis of the argument made by the Minister of Justice? Was it because of the attitude taken by several Liberal members of this House, as well as by some Conservative members, upon the South African war? The minister has made a reference to that event. Is it because of the attitude which we took in the province of Quebec upon that question that I deserve to be stamped as a disloyal subject of His Majesty, as a false friend of the Prime Minister? Let us see. What was our position on the South African war, if you please? So far as the merits of the South African war were concerned, my position—for which I am not ashamed, for which I take no back water at the demand of anybody, whether a minister of the Crown or not—is the position that was taken by nine-tenths of the Liberal party in England, and which position has been vindicated by the people of England in the last general election. Not a word of mine has been spoken, whether in this chamber or upon any platform in the province of Quebec, in condemnation of the policy pursued by Mr. Chamberlain and the Tory government of the day in the South African war, which was half as strong as the language used by Mr. Lloyd George, or Mr. John Burns, who are to-day advisers of His Majesty in England. People may differ on that subject. I grant to the Minister of Justice that he may be an admirer of Mr. Chamberlain and the Tory party of England, but I claim he has no right to call us disloyal and rebels because we preferred a policy which happened to be at that time unpopular in Canada. Because we chose to stand with the British Liberals upon that question, I deny to anybody the right to stamp us as disloyal and as rebels.

Now, Sir, so far as the general question of the participation of Canada in the imperial wars are concerned, why should we be charged with disloyalty for the stand taken upon that question by myself, and supported by the younger element in the province of Quebec from that time to the present day? Why should we be denounced as rebels because, forsooth, we upheld in a time of crisis what the Prime Minister had said in a time of peace, because we stated at the time of the South African war that the government had no right to force us to participate in a war foreign to Canada? Well, Sir, what was the language of Mr. Laurier, in Boston, in 1891? That Canada would never consent to imperial federation even on commercial lines alone, because the consequence would be the participation of Canada in British wars, and Canada would never consent to participate in a British war.

Was I disloyal because, when the time of crisis came, when the time came to apply the principle, I stuck to the principle which had been laid down by the Liberal party through its chief, and not only by the Liberal party but by the Conservative party as well? My attitude regarding the South African war was that observed by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1885, when he refused to the British authorities the right to enroll men in Canada for the British army in the Soudan. My attitude on that question was the same that Sir Charles Tupper took in 1893 when he said in Winnipeg that the idea of basing a closer union between Great Britain and her colonies upon the principle of unity in defence of the empire, was a false one, that Canada had done all she could do, all that she ought to be forced to do for imperial defence, when she fortified her own territory and developed her own resources by building railways in the Northwest and giving free communication to British troops between England and Asia. Wherein did my position regarding the South African war differ from the position taken in times of peace by Sir John A. Macdonald, by Sir Charles Tupper and by Sir Wilfrid Laurier? Now I ask why should a man be charged with disloyalty because, when the time of stress arrives and the time for applying principles comes, he chooses to stick to the principle rather than to give way to the current of popular opinion that may be passing at the time?

But, Sir, there is more than that. After

the South African war was brought to a close, the very principle I advocated in 1899 was laid down by the Canadian government delegates in London and carried against the argument of the British Minister of War. The position I took—and I defy any one in this House or elsewhere to prove the contrary—the position I took during the South African war on the question of imperial defence is the very position which the Prime Minister, the Minister of Militia, the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Finance, laid down themselves in London in 1902, and carried against the wish of the British government. The position they took was that the best way of organizing the defence of the empire was for every part of the empire to look after its own defence.

But there is an argument still more to the point. The position I took on the question of the participation of Canada in the South African war was the very position which the Prime Minister took on the 3rd of October, 1899, with this difference, that, for reasons which I am not going to discuss now, reasons which were no doubt valid in the mind of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues—they changed their position themselves ten days later. Perhaps it was their duty to do so. I am much more moderate and conciliatory than some of my friends imagine; I am ready to grant that it was perhaps the duty of the government to change their policy. But the least I can ask from the spirit of fair play of those gentlemen, and of members generally on both sides of the House, is that I should be allowed liberty to stick to the position which I took, and which had been taken by the Prime Minister of Canada ten days before, without being stamped as disloyal, as a traitor and a demagogue.

Now what was the next question which brought me into quasi opposition to the government? It was the question of the Northwest Autonomy Bills. Has the Minister of Justice, or any of my Liberal colleagues in this House, a right to say that I played then the part of a disloyal British subject, or of a false friend of the government? When the Prime Minister brought the Bill before the House had he a supporter more faithful and more loyal than I was, and more ready to defend his course than I was? Again, I am not going to bring up that question to argue its merits over again; I am not going to say that the Prime Minister was wrong in changing his ground; but I do ask whether there is a fair minded man in this House who will say that because I chose to stick to the original policy of the government, after they had made up their minds to change their policy, I should be stamped as a false friend of the Prime Minister? Because the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) resigned his office, and brought on a crisis, am I to be stamped as a disloyal Liberal? Who brought about that crisis, if you please? Was it a humble member of the Liberal party, standing with his party, and ready to stand with it all along, provided they stood by themselves? or was it a minister of the Crown who forced on the crisis, and another minister of the Crown who accentuated the crisis by threatening his resignation? I would like to know who were then the true friends of the government and who were the false friends. Now I am not going to make an accusation of betrayal of friendship against the member for Brandon, or against the Minister of Finance; I am not going to pry into the consciences of those gentlemen to ascertain what their reasons might have been. I respect their reasons, but I claim that I have a right to be respected in the same way. If the Minister of Finance and the member for Brandon are entitled to the respect and support of the Liberal party because they chose to force a crisis upon the government of Canada, because they thought proper to threaten the existence of the Liberal party in Canada, in order to force the Prime Minister to swallow his own words and change his policy, why should I be taunted as a false friend of the Prime Minister because I thought proper to stick by the policy which the government had first enunciated?

Is there one word in the whole discussion that took place in 1905 that tends to show that I wanted the government to do anything else than what they had promised to do, that I wanted to bring the government out of the stand which they had taken only in the month of February of the same year? Taken from the narrowest party standpoint, who, in the eye of the party man, is the more guilty? The one who forces his own party to change its publicly avowed policy, or the one who resists the change after it has been forced by—if I would use the words of the Minister of Justice—the false friends who took their leader by the throat in a moment of crisis in order to force that change of policy? But, Sir, the opposition which I carried on afterwards in the committee on the Northwest Autonomy Bill was justified by the action of the government themselves who, after a few months of protracted debate brought one of the members from the Northwest (Mr. Lamont) to propose an amendment carrying out a part of the very thing I had been advocating for two months. It was only after a long and protracted debate and after several interviews with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and others, that I convinced them that the text which had been suggested by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) of clause 16 would practically abolish the rights of the minority in all but a few of the districts of the Northwest. Then Mr. Lamont was brought forward to propose the amendment which was adopted by the government and which largely justified the course I had been pursuing.

What was the third occasion upon which

my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) and myself opposed the policy of the government? It was on the Sunday Bill of last year. I am not going to refer at any length to this because the action of the government in the Senate, and the action of the Minister of Justice in the House of Commons in accepting from the Senate almost every amendment which we had proposed in this House, is proof conclusive that our attitude on that question was not so very much averse to Liberal policy or principle as some hon. members would have us believe. Otherwise, the government would have to plead that they are ready to accept anything that may come from any quarter.

It may be, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that my attitude upon the immigration policy of the government is what has made me worthy of the attacks of the Minister of Justice. But, I can hardly find any ground there for the accusation of disloyalty. Perhaps I am so imbued with disloyalty that I have lost the true sense of the word. Is it because of my opposition to the policy by which the money of the Canadian people is used to bring into this country men who are not of British nationality or imbued with British ideas? Is it because I opposed a policy the result of which may be in twenty-five years that this country will have no nationality of its own? Is it because I opposed a policy the application of which, through the organization of Jewish and Dutch syndicates in Europe for the bringing into Canada of all sorts and conditions of Europeans must result in changing the character of the population of this country? I hardly think the Minister of Justice would call the North Atlantic Trading Company one of those British institutions which it is so dangerous to attack. Is the Saskatchewan Valley land Company one of those worthy and time honoured institutions which have been threatened? Is it because we have objected that the lands of the people of Canada should be sold at a cheap price to American speculators in order to eable them to sell them at a high price to American speculators in order to enable are spoken of as disloval subjects of His Majesty and false friends of the government? Is it because we have opposed the principle of giving the lands of Canada away wholesale to all classes of corporations? I have always thought that trying to stand up for the rights of the people against corporations was a Liberal principle. I still think so, and I do not think I deserve condemnation at the hands of any so-called Liberal statesman for having persisted in saying what they themselves have said for years. Was it my attack on the hon. member for Brandon? I have had some differences of opinion with the hon. member for Brandon; but I think the hon. member for Brandon himself would not try to seek refuge against any attack from anybody behind an appeal to British institutions. He is too intelligent and clever for that, and I do not think it is proper that one of his ex-colleagues, and perhaps one of his future colleagues, should try to conceal a worthy ground of difference by waiving the British flag and speaking of British institutions.

I was not a member of this House from 1891 to 1896, but I was a frequent listener to its debates from the Press Gallery, where I sometimes regret not being instead of being here and I well remember the witty and cutting speeches of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when the Conservative party of that date was always replying to the attacks of the opposition by waiving the British flag in order to get the people of Canada to forget the denunciations by the Liberal party of their administration. I remember one of those speeches especially in which the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, after having made a list of scandals denounced by the Liberal party in the administration of the Conservative party, said: Oh yes, but let us cover that all by an appeal to loyalty and the British flag. I have no advice to give to my Liberal friends in the province of Ontario; and if I did offer to give it perhaps they would not take it. Sometimes, however, good advice comes from bad quarters, and I take the liberty of giving them this piece of advice: It is a great mistake for our friends in Ontario to try to take the Conservative policy or the Conservative means of action in order to keep themselves in power. The Hon. G. W. Ross has tried the loyalty cry, he has tried the high protectionist cry, and he has tried the denunciation of every Liberal policy and principle in this country. What has been the result? If our Ontario friends think that by following that practice, if they think that by denouncing the policy and the principles that they have followed themselves for the last twenty-five years they are going to liberalize the province of Ontario they are making a great mistake. They are torifying the province of Ontario and the result will be what they have found it in the last few years. The result will be that if the province of Ontario really makes up its mind on being Jingo and Tory it will vote for the real Tories and the real Jingoes and not the sham ones, even though they would go farther than the old Tories and Jingoes in waiving the flag and denouncing principles they have supported for twenty-five years.

Perhaps the most amusing thing of the whole affair is that none of these questions came up in the Quebec county election; not one of them. I stated at the opening of my remarks the grounds upon which the young independent candidate ran there. The Prime Minister himself came there; and I think the right hon. gentleman will not disavow my summary of his appeal to

the electors. He said in substance : 'There are four Liberal candidates ; against three of them I have nothing to say, but I would rather have Mr. Amyot elected because Mr. Amyot is the choice of the convention and is offering himself as a straight Liberal.' That was the only ground on which the Prime Minister appealed in favour of Mr. Amyot. Would it not have been the time then for the Prime Minister of Canada to denounce that dangerous agitation against British institutions which has frightened so much the Minister of Justice ? But, Sir, after the Prime Minister had left the county, the campaign went on. Two of the candidates withdrew and on nomination day—it was the first day I was in the county—two remained in the field, namely, Mr. Amyot, the defeated ministerial candidate, and Mr. Robitaille, the independent Liberal. And what was the sole appeal for support which Mr. Amyot made to the electors ? It was : You should vote for me because I am the straight Liberal candidate, because Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the first French Canadian Prime Minister we have had, and he is the last French Canadian who will occupy that high position. And later on, the French Canadian ministerial press—making a great mistake, I think, from their own point of view—announced that it was a fight between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal government on the one hand, and a small handful of young rebels, behind Bourrassa, on the other. What was the argument of the ministerialists in Quebec ? It was : A vote for Robitaille is a vote for Bourassa, a man whose grandfather died a Protestant, and whose uncle has refused to pay his dues to the Catholic church. Would the Minister of Justice please tell me in what part of the British constitution that is written ? Now, Sir, it may be said that this was an argument used by common place canvassers. That is not so. It started in the office of a senator, the organizer of the Liberal party in the Quebec district, Senator Choquette, and it was carried all over the county by Senator Choquette's own associate, who had been the candidate of the Parent government in the local legislature : it was used by another ex-candidate, Mr. Dubord ; it was used by Mr. Amyot's own son and it was used by a member of the Quebec legislature. The whole argument in Quebec county was that a vote for Robitaille was a vote for the grandson of a bad son of the church. Is it on that ground that the Minister of Justice is going to appeal to the loyalty of the people of Ontario for the support of British institutions?

Now, Sir, as I said a moment ago, and I repeat it now, it is not my intention to wage war against the government ; but it is just as well that we should know where we stand. For many years past, the Prime Minister, doubtless in all sincerity, has stated that the object of his life is to create greater unity among the races which inhabit Canada. It has been insinuated in this House, it has been printed in big type in the ministerial press of Quebec, that the object of the small nationalist group was to undo the work of the Prime Minister. This is the argument that has been repeated by the Minister of Justice. I defy any member of the government or any member of the Liberal party to state that I have ever appealed to the people of the province of Quebec as French Canadians. The argument I have always used in Quebec is the argument I have always used in this House—and justice was done me by one of the ministerial papers, the Montreal 'Herald,' which stated that the cry against me was based upon a false legend started by the Tory party at a time when they thought it was convenient for them to stamp the Liberal party with disloyalty on the part of one of its members, and kept up by the Liberal papers because they thought it was expedient to show the great difference between the loyal members of the government and the disloyal members of the nationalist party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no nationalist party. There are young men in the province of Quebec, belonging to both parties, who of late years have propounded the development of all the national resources of Canada, propounded the development of the idea of autonomy. The basic principle of their organization is that Canada should have all the autonomy which a loyal British colony is entitled to, that every province of Canada should have all the autonomy that a member of the Canadian confederation should have, and therefore these men have opposed the participation of Canada in British wars ; they have opposed the policy of Mr. Chamberlain in trade matters. As far as our participation in British wars is concerned I ask again : Is it the policy of the Liberal party that Canada should participate as a matter of right in British wars ? If so what becomes of the declaration of the Prime Minister in 1891 and what becomes of the position taken by the Liberal Ministry in London in 1902 ? Again, are we to be accused of disloyalty because we oppose Mr. Chamberlain's commercial policy ? Well, no better expression of the Nationalist sentiment in the province of Quebec has ever been given as to that policy, than that contained in the speech of the Minister of Agriculture when he spoke before the Reform Club in Montreal a few days after the defeat of the Balfour government. Our policy in that respect is just what the Minister of Agriculture declared and nothing more and nothing less.

So far as the organization of an Imperial Council is concerned our policy on that matter is stated in the very pregnant sentences contained in the communication sent by the Canadian government to the British government when they were invited to participate in the conference of 1902.

It is therefore I say, Sir, that it is placing the discussion of the public affairs of this country upon very dangerous ground when a man like the Minister of Justice goes to the people of Ontario and tries to make them believe that in the province of Quebec there is such a thing as a nationalist party organized in antagonism to British institutions—because such a thing is absolutely untrue and unfounded. It is a dangerous thing for the Minister of Justice to go to the people of Ontario and tell them that there is a nationalist party in Quebec which is opposed to friendly association between all races and all nationalities in this country, because I say again, such a statement is untrue. We have our difference of opinion. I have stated in this House myself, much more strongly than ever I have stated it in my own province, that I thought and I still think that it is a mistake to try and create union in this Dominion by endeavouring to make the French people think as the English people do and by endeavouring to make the English people think as the French people do. The only basis upon which it is possible to make a united nation of Canada is to be straightforward in the presence of all the people of this country; and no public or party man should have one language for the people of Ontario and another for the people of Quebec. It does not tend to the union of races in this country that public men should go into Ontario and denounce as disloyal French Canadians who are just as loyal to British institutions as the Minister of Justice himself is; and then that other colleagues in the ministry should go into the province of Quebec and tell the people there that it is useless to expect justice from the English majority of this Dominion. In this very Quebec election, I took issue with the government candidate when he stated on nomination day that it was true the government did not give full justice to the minority in the Northwest but that it is useless to expect it because the English majority would not grant justice. I denied that. I took the same stand in Quebec county that I have always taken in my province. I took the ground that our people are being deceived as to the true sentiments of the English speaking majority towards them. I have said before and I will repeat it, and I will go on repeating it—even at the expense of playing a little on the nerves of the Minister of Justice and some of his friends—that if we appeal to the fair sense of the English speaking majority, the Protestant majority in this Dominion, we can bring them to a common point of understanding with us, and that by appealing to the best sense of the people of Quebec we can bring them to a common understanding with the Protestant majority in this Dominion to work together for the peace, the prosperity and the development of our country. But, I have also said, and I repeat it now, that concessions cannot be made only on one side, that there must be give and take on the part of both races—and the idea of going to one province and crying: 'Hands off Manitoba! no separate schools in Manitoba! the Liberal government is the first government that has sent troops to help the British army; the Liberal government has done what no Conservative government has ever done in the way of imperialism!' and then going to the province of Quebec and saying: 'You French Canadians should vote for us because Laurier is the only French Canadian Prime Minister we can ever have; and if Tupper had been in power he would have sent 10,000 instead of 2,000 men to South Africa; vote for the Liberals because Bourassa and Lavergne and their friends are helping Doctor Sproule and the 'orangistes' in the House of Commons to defeat Sir Wilfrid Laurier.' That kind of thing, Sir, is not conducive to the peace and harmony of the Dominion.

Some of my friends smile; well, all this may be jocose in a certain sense; but I think it becomes serious when it reaches the point of a minister of the Crown going into a constituency largely peopled with men of the Protestant faith and telling them that there is a group of thought in the province of Quebec led by some members of the Canadian parliament whose object is to attack and destroy British institutions; it is all the more serious when a man of the position of the Minister of Justice makes that statement to such an audience, because it is a statement which he must know is not true. And if he does not know, he need only take information at the hands of some of his colleagues. Sir, upon this question, I would ask no other witness than the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself. I know enough of his love of justice, of his sense of honour, to know that, though he may be dissatisfied with the course that, at times, I have taken, he would declare that I never appealed to my fellow citizens upon the ground of racial or religious difference, and especially that I never appealed to them against British institutions. Why, I remember the time, when I was hooted in the city of Montreal by some supporters of this government because I said, in the midst of the excitement over the South African difficulty, that England was a great country, that Mr. Chamberlain was not the whole of England, and that the time would come when broad-minded ideas would triumph in that country. And what was the argument used then? It was that the Boer war was a bad one, that Canada should not have participated in it, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was forced into it by the fanaticism of a united English speaking population. If, now, the government turn to the province of Ontario and appeal to the electors there by denouncing men whom they know to be as loyal and as straight as they

are, then, I say they are taking a much surer way to destroy the very object of the right hon. Prime Minister's policy than by allowing the Liberals their freedom of speech.

Nine or ten years ago, shortly after I entered parliament, I heard the Prime Minister reply to one of the speakers on the other side who attacked the government because some of its friends had spoken freely upon certain questions. I do not remember now what the issue was ; but the Prime Minister stated then that the Liberal party could not be organized as the old Tory party was, that it was founded upon the principle of liberty and could not exist unless some liberty of thought, some liberty of speech, some liberty of action was allowed to its members. I hope the Prime Minister has not renounced that principle ; for he knows that when I accepted the candidature for the first time, twelve years ago, the condition which I then put to the leader of the Liberal party, as well as to my own people, was that I should keep my freedom of action in this parliament, and that I would receive no support in money or otherwise from the Liberal party to get me elected. Upon that condition I was elected ; upon that condition I have been re-elected three times ; upon that condition I will stay in this House or I will stay out of it. It is one of the basic principles of the Liberal party that every member of that party may appeal to his fellow-citizens upon the principle of freedom of action. If the Liberal party feels itself still broad enough and strong enough to stand some liberty of thought and action within its ranks, then everything is right. But, if that is to be changed, if Liberals are to live under cast iron rules, and if we are to have imposed upon the government a policy which will be a denial of every principle that the Liberal party has preached, the old Tory policy of jingoism and the waving of the British flag every time a question arises which they do not wish to have discussed before the country—very well ; but let us know it now.

Sir, I have fulfilled the object I had in moving the adjournment of this debate, which was to state what had been our position in the Quebec county election and to let my friends here know what our position is at present in the province of Quebec. One does not need to consider the attitude of the government to understand clearly our position. We will not vary merely because the policy of the government varies. Liberals we have been, and Liberals we are. And because we are Liberals, because we are free British subjects, and because we think there exists in this country such a thing as liberty of opinion for all, we are going to stick to the Liberal policy ; and every time we find jingoism and Toryism proposed by the Liberal party, we will denounce it for the very reason that we are Liberals.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, since Thursday morning last, we have witnessed much that is of a striking character. The ceremonies attending the opening of parliament, were, in every sense of the word imposing ; the speech from the Throne contained announcements of a most substantial nature ; the mover and the seconder of the motion now in your hands delivered addresses which won praise from all sides. But, Sir, impressive as these things have been, what has occurred to me as most startling, and what, I am sure, has taken his breath away from more than one member of this House, was the lecture on political morality delivered on Friday last by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I am sure I am not exaggerating the situation when I say that few expected—in view of certain revelations which occurred during recess—that the hon. gentleman would even face parliament. But he has done so. And what has he to say ? Piously looking across the floor of this House, he says, in effect : 'Let us be good, let us do no evil—in blank.' I put it to the House, has such a scene ever before been witnessed in parliament? Is the hon. member for North Toronto trifling with this House and with this country ? Even the morning organ of the opposition of this city seemed to understand the mockery of the whole situation, for it printed that speech in the smallest possible type, and in an obscure corner. The Ottawa 'Citizen' thoroughly understands the situation. And the people of this country understand the attitude of the opposition in this House and will not put up with such dictums as those of the hon. member for North Toronto. But that is not all, Sir. The hon. member for North Toronto could not find language harsh enough and biting enough with which to deal with the case of Hon. Mr. Hyman. We know the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). We have been his political comrades. And, in his time of trial and trouble he grows bigger than ever before by the manly attitude he has taken in this case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but what are the facts ? Legally, the Minister of Public Works had every right to his seat. And, looking at the case from a point of view of morality, I am bound to say that, even if some votes may have been obtained by undue methods, the Minister of Public Works did not buy his majority. And, though the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) speaks of purchasable public opinion in Ontario, I, for one, coming from the province of Quebec, have too high an opinion of the people

of Ontario to believe that a constituency in that province can be bought, and especially that the city of London was purchased or was purchasable. Sir, Mr. Hyman won his seat; Mr. Hyman could have held his seat. And still he is not in his place to-day. Why? Because he is an honourable gentleman. Would the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I ask, do the same? If so, let him do it. There are many in this country who think it high time that he asks his constituents whether he still retains their confidence. The time has come when the truth must be told and hypocrisy exposed. We are warned that this is to be a fighting session. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are ready. Let the opposition come on with their cohorts, and they will find that some of their chiefs will have to be dropped before they can make much progress or entertain the remotest hope of victory.

We have had reference made during this debate to the strike at Buckingham in the constituency of my hon. friend for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), the constituency adjoining the one I have the honour to represent. I do not propose to say much on that subject, and for two reasons. First, because I do not believe in interfering in the domestic affairs of my neighbour. And secondly because the matter is now before the courts, and they will decide which side is in the right and which in the wrong. I may say however that I am thoroughly satisfied with the course pursued by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux). He was certainly not slow in offering his mediation; and had his offer been accepted, we would not be to-day deploring the sad events which have taken place and brought sorrow to more than one household. Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has done as much as it is possible for man to do on behalf of labour in this country. Only lately he gained a signal triumph in England by procuring an amendment to the laws of the mother country, whereby parties guilty of misrepresentation in inducing people to come to Canada to replace strikers will be severely punished. Representing, as I do, a constituency in which labour forms a very important element, not only do I congratulate the hon. minister on what he has accomplished, but I thank him for the genuine sympathy he has shown the cause of the toilers in this country and the efforts he has put forth in their behalf. Capital, Mr. Speaker, has never difficulty in finding friends and champions, but labour is in a totally different position. And while I heartily welcome the advent of capital to Canada, while I rejoice in seeing our manufactures extending as they are, our railways developing, and our canals being deepened, in my opinion, the most gratifying result that this progress can possibly give is in the improvement of the conditions of the wage earner. And anything we can do to improve that condition will have my hearty support.

So far, Mr. Speaker, we have had nothing serious following the predictions which our hon. friends opposite have been so constant in making. For ten years their spotters and pickets have been looking for something against the government. And after all these years of search and scrutiny, what have they found? In that period hundreds of millions of dollars have been received by the government and expended, and what is the extent of the wrong-doing which our friends opposite have been able to discover? All that they found consisted of the North Atlantic Trading contract and the building of that little wharf in the city of Hull about which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke the other day. Last session these hon. gentlemen took up a great deal of time in probing into the North Atlantic Trading contract. Did they prove anything? All that they did prove—and that they proved to the hilt—was that it had been sanctioned by Lord Strathcona.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes. I ask these hon. gentlemen if they do not know Lord Strathcona. He was one of their political associates in the old days in this House. Do they believe that Lord Strathcona would sanction an immoral contract. I think these hon. gentlemen would do well to drop that subject. And then we had this discovery by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of that little wharf in the city of Hull. That hon. gentleman, while approving the vote of large sums of money to relieve distress in foreign countries would refuse a grant for a public wharf in a city that was devastated by fire on more than two occasions previous to that wharf being built. And the hon. gentleman forgets that when it was built, there was no interprovincial bridge connecting Hull with Ottawa and the crossing had to be made by ferry. I would ask him to come over to Hull and meet our good Conservative friends there, and they will tell him that when that wharf was built it was a necessity and that there was no useless expenditure on it.

I do not propose to take up further the time of the House. We, on this side, do not pretend for a moment that a slight mistake may not have been made by the government here and there, but we support the government on its general record, and we point with pride to the fact that never before has the country made such progress as it has done in the last ten years under Liberal administration. We have increased our trade by millions annually. The credit of Canada stands higher in the money markets of the world than it ever did before. Never before have our exports and imports been so heavy, never before has our trade

been in such a sound and flourishing condition. Deficits have been replaced by surpluses ; confidence exists everywhere, energy has full sway, our success is universally admitted. The greatest public works are being vigorously pushed ; our great west is rapidly filling up ; our people are happy, contented and peaceful ; and truly we may say : Canada is a nation.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to interfere in the family quarrel we have had this afternoon. All I desire is to make a few observations on the speech from the Throne. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) made, in many respects, a very excellent speech in moving the address. His remarks were characterized by a spirit of fairness which led us to believe that we might expect from hon. gentlemen opposite something better than we have had from them in recent years. To the extent he gave us reason for that opinion, I congratulate him. In many respects his speech was one of the best we have had from that side in a long time.

That the country is prosperous is generally admitted if we look simply to its commercial progress. But while our imports and exports are very large, I think, if the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will look into the figures, he will see that our imports are too heavy compared with our exports. The figures given by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) show that in 1905 we exported $63,000,000 less than we imported. That is an immense balance of trade to have against this country. It is much too large to be economically sound, and I think that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) should, in his tariff revision, see that our imports are materially reduced and that a large proportion of these $63,000,000 of imports be manufactured at home. That we are abundantly able to do. We have the workmen, we have the factories and the natural resources, and ought to be able to manufacture at home all that Canada requires, and I submit it is a wise commercial proposition that we should have such a tariff that this $63,000,000 of excess of our imports should be made in Canada and our workmen in Canada should thereby receive greater employment and greater remuneration than they are doing.

The taxation in this country has also been alluded to; it is evidently much too heavy. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1896 they told us the revenue was excessive, that our expense was excessive and they promised a very large reduction if they got into power. This promise has not been verified. In 1895 the total taxation of Canada was about $42,000,000. In 1905 it was $78,000,000, thus showing that they have almost doubled the taxation and the expenditure within this brief time. Now, I submit that this is entirely uncalled for in a country such as Canada, and that although it is contended that our national debt has not increased, the taxation of the people has very much increased until to-day it is almost $2 where $1 sufficed before. The population of Canada to-day is paying about twice as much per head as they were when the Conservatives went out of power in 1896. The tariff, however, is to be changed shortly and we shall await its introduction before criticising what has been done.

The British preference has been mentioned. I hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will see to it that something wiser and better is devised than we have at present. For my part I stand now where I have always stood, I believe that we should have a mutual preference between Great Britain and her colonies, and I regret very much that the negotiations between Canada and Australia have so signally failed as they seem to have done. In fact they do not appear to have been attended to at all; no reply seems to have been made, if we can trust the statements that have appeared in the press, to a communication sent by the Australian government and if this is the case the government have made a mistake in relation to the sister colonies. I believe the colonies should receive courteous treatment and if Australia makes any advances they should be received with the open hand of fellowship; and we should form a commercial bond with the great sister colony of Australia. I regret very much that this has not been done.

We are told that the Post Office Act is to be amended. I do not know what this amending Act may contain, but so far as I am aware there is nothing in this country that requires a revision much more than the Post Office Act at the present time. I do not know whether the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has received a circular that has been sent out, but I trust he has, from the various postmasters of this country showing that they were receiving far too little remuneration, and that out of this vast expenditure this government has not been able to pay a living wage to the postmasters of this country. Some men are working for $25 to $50 per annum and in some cases finding a horse. And then, we find that the whole country service is on mere starvation wages. The whole post office service has been in this condition. And further I understand that in the Northwest the mail service is nothing to what it should be, that it is often very dilatory, that in some cases the mails are scarcely distributed at all and that a letter may be ten days or two weeks on a two or three days' journey. There is every reason why postal matters should receive the attention of this government.

But it is not until we come down to the matter of political corruption to which the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) re-

ferred that we find the subject that should really attract the attention of this House at the present time, and it is with this subject especially that I intend to deal for a few minutes. We have heard an eloquent oration from the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). The member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) says that we probed last session in vain and found nothing. I do not know what he calls nothing, but I think that the country has been made aware that we found a great deal, that very much has been found that was wrong and that even the first minister admitted that some departments had been running wild. If that is the case how is it that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Devlin) says that nothing has been found? The political corruption that has been unveiled in this country within a few months is without a parallel so far as I know in any English speaking country in the world. To say that nothing has been found is to deny all the revelations that have been made in the courts in recent months. Take the history of the autonomy legislation put through the House two or three years ago. These Bills were conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity They were put through this House by nefarious means and after that was done we referred them to the constituencies of London and North Oxford, and we said there we would make a fair test of the opinion of this country on those measures. We went there as honest men from this side of the House and we conducted on every hustings in those constituencies of North Oxford and London from one point to another, such a campaign as was never put up in any two constituencies in this country, and we fought it to a finish on the Autonomy Bills. We thought that the opinion of this country was against us; we were mistaken, the honest opinion of those constituencies was with the opposition on that occasion. The present investigations in Toronto have revealed how London was won. We have had no investigation of North Oxford but we have reason to believe that if it were investigated a similar condition on a smaller scale would be revealed. In the recent London election case it was found that more than enough votes were purchased to have changed the result there. Those measures, those Autonomy Bills that were said to have been endorsed by a purchased vote. That is the way that these Bills were carried and condoned in London and North Oxford, in the session of 1905. Is that nothing to find ? I ask the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin). Is that nothing for the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) to have exposed to his view? I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the revelations that have been made in those courts should bring the blush of shame to every man on either side of the House. Has our political morality sunk so low that we are compelled to buy the vote at $10 a head and a small rake-off to the man who holds the stakes ? A sufficient number of voters have been shown on their own confession to have received money in that election, to have elected Mr. Grey, who I believe has been wrongfully deprived of his seat now on two occasions. The Autonomy Bills were submitted to these constituencies, it was thought that these people had voluntarily endorsed the measures and we withdrew as far as this question is concerned, and have not since tested a constituency on that point. There is the great evil, the injustice has been done, the country was deceived into believing that an open expression of public opinion had been given on these two questions, and when we wake up and have the veil removed, we see that it is the purchased vote of the constituencies of London and North Oxford that endorsed the Autonomy Bill. What happened next? These Autonomy Bills were sent out to the two western provinces. Every one knows the history of those elections—another blush of shame. Never were two sons launched upon the world with the promise of more brilliant careers than were those two great provinces in the west, and never were two sons more thoroughly condemned and injured by those who launched them. Those two provinces were launched with all the prosperity that could come to them with their immense area, they were given a constitution as we supposed that would safeguard to them their political rights, and we find that one province has been deprived of its rights, has elected men who were never intended to sit and when protests are entered in the courts the fact is revealed according to the judges that there is no legal machinery there that can touch them and they escape scot free. Who drew those Bills ? Were they drawn with a view to robbing the people of their rights ? Were they drawn with a view to keeping out election trial machinery ? Where is the fault ? This House is entitled to know at a very early day why that serious omission was made in those Bills and why all those protests fell to the ground in Saskatchewan. Who is responsible for this? In the meantime we must say it is the government who sit on that side of the House, that they must shoulder the full responsibility for the failure of these acts. What has become of our political morals in this country ? Shall we sink so low that we cannot play the game fair? If so, it is time that our autonomy was taken or diminished rather than increased; it is time that some of our so-called liberties were taken from us until we know how to use them better. I contend that the whole history of that autonomy legislation from first to last furnishes the darkest page in Canada's political history; further, it has made a wound upon the body politic that time will not be able to heal. These are strong words, Mr. Speaker, but they are justified by everything that has taken place, and I contend that this

country is entitled to know at a very early date what is going to be done about it. Are these protests to be thrown out because the government has not provided any machinery in the province of Saskatchewan to deal with them? The only answer we receive from the hon. gentleman opposite is, 'You did the same.' Mr. Speaker, I have been a careful student of political history for many years, though I have not been so many years in this House. I have studied political history for twenty-five years, and I must say, as a member of the Conservative party, that I do not know when we did it, and I would like to know. Can these gentlemen tell us when we invented a ballot box that was a trick box? Can these gentlemen tell us when we robbed a whole province, as that province has been robbed? Will they look down this list of political rascalities that have been revealed and tell us when we did any thing like it? It is easy to say, You are another. Let them prove it. When did we do it? We have never done it, so far as I am aware. The purchase of a few votes now is one of the minor sins of political life. We have to rob by wholesale now, switch ballots by wholesale, steal the honest man's ballots, count them wrong, and so on down the list. And all they have to say is, You did the same. Let those gentlemen tell us when we did the same. When did we send out two deputies to hold a poll and they never went near the place? When did we stuff 150 ballots into a box when not a single vote was cast? When did we use the thin red line and disfranchise some 9,000 voters, as was done by the thin red lines we heard about the other day? When did we do these things? Can any one tell us? I for one would like to know when we did it? I say that these things ought to be deplored by every honest citizen, and by every honest member of this House on both sides of it. I congratulate the government upon their promise of electoral reform, I hope they will give it to us. Don't let them rest satisfied with the argument we hear so often. You did the same, and we are following your own game, we are fighting the devil with his own fire—as we heard the other day. When fought we with this kind of fire? Can you tell us? I do not believe any hon gentleman on that side of the House can find in the history of the Conservative party a parallel for these nefarious crimes. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes this government immediately to set itself to work and right the wrongs that have been revealed. I do not want to cast any aspersions on the member for London, or any other hon. gentleman concerned. We all know the difficult position he was in. But I contend that the revelations that have been made in the courts of Ontario, in the courts of Nova Scotia, and in many other parts of this Dominion are such as to bring the blush of shame to every honest citizen of Canada, and they ought to be straightened out just as quickly as possible.

Mr. HERBERT S. CLEMENTS (West Kent.) I desire to draw the attention of the House briefly to two or three important matters which are of immediate interest to the whole country, and particularly to the section which I have the honour to represent. The hon. the Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that possibly by Thursday he will bring down the budget. We on this side of the House at least have therefore to bide our time in order to see what changes he is going to make in the tariff. It is needless for me to say that I have always taken the position that all the industries of this country, whether they are conducted by corporations or otherwise, should be considered from a protective standpoint. I suppose it will be no news to this House to tell them that within the last year there has been a very extensive oil field discovered in the riding of West Kent, which I have the honour to represent. I think myself that it is yet in its infancy, and that there will be a much greater production of oil there than has yet taken place. I may say that during the last month alone 46,000 barrels of crude oil were shipped from the locality known as the Tilbury fields. Now, I intend to propose, in due time, an amendment to the present Act regarding bounties given to the producers of crude oil in this country. A great deal of foreign capital has come into this country and has been invested in that particular oil field, as I think it has in other oil fields in Canada. A number of Americans have already come in there, I am told, to invest their money, who have been driven from the oil fields of Ohio and Indiana by great corporations on the other side of the line, who have practically put them out of business in the oil industry. They have come over here to see if they cannot better themselves in the same industry, but I shall have something more to say on that question later on. I am sure that the government and every member of this House will recognize the importance of these interests. I trust the government will provide ample protection to the oil interests of this country and prevent them from passing under the control of powerful corporations.

In the section of the country I speak of, many farmers are interested in oil and are practically oil producers themselves, and what I want to bring to the attention of the government is this, that when the capitalist comes over and leases a farmer's land for the purpose of developing oil in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, in the district I speak of, the farmer gets one-eighth of the royalty, or one-seventh of whatever it may be. I understand that the farmer is supposed not only to get one-eight of the oil produced on his farm, but

he is also entitled to at least a bounty of 53 cents per barrel, which the government of this country pays to the producer; that is to say, not only is he entitled to one-seventh or one-eighth of the oil, but he is entitled to the bounty upon his eighth barrel. Now, I believe that a great many of the large operating concerns in my district are paying this to the farmer without any hesitation. But I want to draw attention to the fact that there are some corporations there who, I understand, refuse to pay this bounty to the farmers, and for that reason I desire to suggest an amendment to the Act which will read as follows:

The Act cap. 28 of the statutes of 1904, intituled an Act to provide for the payments of Bounties on Crude Petroleum from Canadian wells shall be amended by adding the following to section 2 thereof:

The word 'producer' shall mean and include the owner of the freehold in the land in which such wells are situate. In case such wells are operated by or for the benefit of lessee or any assignee of a lessee of such lands, the lessor shall in such case be entitled to be paid such and the same proportion of the bounty as he is entitled to in the oil produced on his land.

That section 4 of the said Act be amended by adding thereto the following: Having regard to section 2 as hereby amended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the amendment of the Act will protect the agriculturist or farmer, who is interested in the oil question there and who, I contend, is just as much entitled to the bounty on his oil as the actual producer of the oil in that district. I have always contended that and I trust the government will see that the vast body of the electors of this country, namely, the agriculturists, will be looked after the same as other industries and corporations are. I contend and I have always contended, as I think the Minister well knows as I have stated my reasons in this House before, that the farmers have not had the same treatment in late years as the corporations have, and all I ask is that in the tariff revision provision shall be made that the Canadian farmer shall at least have the Canadian market to himself and that he shall be placed on the same footing as his foreign competitors. That is the stand I have always taken in regard to the agriculturists. When the tariff comes down it will be discussed pro and con and when these different subjects come up I shall have something to say further in regard to them. I only trust that the government will accept the suggestion I have offered regarding bounties on crude oil thereby protecting the farmer so that he will be placed in the position that I believed he should be in.

As the right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his seat I want to invite his attention and not only his attention but that of every hon. member of this House, I care not whether he is Liberal, Conservative or Independent, to a matter of very great importance to the portion of the country which I represent. I brought to the attention of the government last year a matter which I think is a most vital one and one which must have some consideration from the government in the very near future. I refer to the deputation which the Prime Minister received very courteously, I think a year ago, regarding the overflow of the River Thames for the purpose of hearing their suggestions in regard to some solution of the difficulty which at present exists.

I brought the matter up in the House last year and what I asked at that time was that the Minister of Public Works should furnish to the district one of the most eminent engineers he has in his department, that he might go into that section and that he might gain from the residents there a knowledge of the perilous position in which they are placed. The River Thames which extends from Lake St. Clair up to the town of St. Mary's, drains a district averaging from 35 to 40 miles in width, the river itself being possibly not more than one hundred yards in width. Years ago before the large drains through each and every township in that district extending for a distance of possibly 125 miles and the tile drains were constructed, the river, through the natural seepage, was able to drain the land and take care of the water without serious damage of flooding. If we take the country forty miles in width and from 125 to 150 miles in length drained by that river I do not think we will find any section of Canada that will equal the section through which the river runs. This land averages in value from $75 to $100 per acre and there is one farmer, on the average, to 100 acres of that district. I mentioned these facts in order to bring this question more clearly to the attention of the House and to give an idea of the vast amount of capital which is at stake and the large area of country which is subject to the overflow and destruction which must take place in the spring time or in midsummer. Mr. Stephens, who sat in this House for the same riding that I have the honour to represent, brought this matter to the attention of the government calling their attention particularly to the jamming of the ice in the river. I think that possibly ice jams were the cause of some of the serious damage which took place two or three years ago. I want to say that $300,000 or $400,000 would not repair the damage that the farmers alone suffered from the flooding of their lands two years ago. Last year a similar catastrophe was only avoided by the fact that we were favoured with the very best weather in the spring time. The snow and ice were melted by the bright sunshine with the result that the ice went out gently and flooding of the lands adjacent to the river was obviated. The river rose to over 28 feet in height and came within two or three inches of flooding the country in the

same way as it did two years ago. It was contended by the Minister of Public Works last year when I brought this question to his attention that while he lived in the city of London himself and realized the serious situation that London had been placed in for a number of years back, and that while he would be glad to see that an engineer was assigned to that district to see if some solution could not be found he thought that possibly it might be a provincial matter or a matter pertaining to the drainage laws of the province of Ontario. The bulk of the eminent authorities from whom I have been able to get information and opinions claim that it is a Dominion matter. The river Thames is navigable for some miles above Chatham and under these circumstances it must come under the control of the Dominion government. I know that in relation to several matters pertaining to the construction of bridges, &c., in the town of Chatham we have always had to consult and secure the consent of the Dominion authorities. It would not be a precedent for this government to take some action or at least to co-operate with the Ontario government to try and see if some solution cannot be come to whereby we can get some assured relief in the future. It is not a precedent because this government and the Ontario government have contributed in the past to the improvement of the Nation river, a somewhat similar case, I presume, only I want to impress upon this House that it is not as serious a case as ours because the capital invested from the town of St. Mary's to the mouth of the river would run into millions of dollars. It is not a case of financing.

In the city of Chatham and its vicinity, these floods have not only caused the destruction of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property, but loss of life as well. I remember that two years ago the water was so high that not a furnace could be lighted in the city of Chatham, and a cold spell coming on people were compelled to live in houses the inside temperature of which was cooler than the temperature outside, and on account of that several aged people contracted colds from which they died. I appeal to the government to at once take action and send to the district the most eminent engineer they can find so that he may devise some solution. I would offer this suggestion; there is a fall from Lake Erie to the River Thames of from four to six feet, and I believe that if a large sluice were dug over that distance of some eleven or thirteen miles possibly the floods might be averted. I do not ask that this sluice should be continued to the waters edge of the River Thames, for I believe it would be effective if it were started say eight feet above the natural water level somewhere between Chatham and London, and thus carry the water to Lake Erie instead of permitting it to continue some seventy or eighty miles further to its present outlet causing all this danger in its course. I think also that the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be asked to unite with the federal government and the Ontario government in this work. The reason I mention the railway companies is that I know that during the flood of two years ago damage to the extent of about $70,000 was done to the Grand Trunk tracks and for several days they were compelled to run their passenger and freight service over the Michigan Central. I have had an opportunity of talking this matter over with the Hon. Dr. Rheaume, Minister of Public Works in the provincial government, who I know is alive to the situation and who will gladly do his part, but he feels as I feel that in the first place it is a Dominion concern. Some six weeks ago I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Hyman, who I regret is not in his seat to-day, in reference to this matter, endeavouring to arrange that he and Dr. Rheaume should meet a deputation from the district to consult as to what could be done. In the absence of the Minister of Public Works I appeal to the Prime Minister this afternoon to place a competent engineer in that district at once so that we may have a scientific opinion as to the remedy for these disastrous floods. I fear that if this remedy is not at once provided, within a very few years the people of that district may be subjected to a terrible calamity. I refer more particularly to the township of Dover in which I was born and which is largely settled by worthy French Canadians who went into that district as pioneers when it was a forest and who developed and improved their farms to a high state of cultivation. Fully one-half of that township has been ruined by these floods. I mentioned to the Prime Minister the fact that there are some worthy sons of his own race in that district, in order that he may perhaps be induced to take a special interest in the matter. With a final appeal to him to endeavour to provide a remedy for the great difficulties under which the people of that section labour, I shall pass on to another subject. I see the Minister of Customs is in his seat and I would remind him that the tobacco growing industry is one of the most important in the counties of Essex and Kent; indeed it may be considered as an important industry in all that county from Essex to Niagara. I bring this to the mind of the Minister of Customs so that in the coming tariff revision he may take steps to protect the Canadian tobacco growing industry. I believe that with proper protection at least 11,000,000 pounds of the 15,000,000 of foreign leaf which were imported into Canada last year could be raised in this country. I trust the Minister of Customs will bring down a tariff which will protect Canadian tobacco growers against their foreign neighbours. We will have no fault to find if the Cana-

dian tobacco growers are placed in the same position in this respect as are the American tobacco growers.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, for a moment, I want, if I can, to get the Prime Minister to cast his memory a little further back than he was apparently capable of doing on Friday last when he mourned over Mr. Hyman's resignation and expressed his sympathy for the poor honest Grits who have had such a hard time of it in London. The right hon. gentleman then said:—

> I do not know, but Mr. Gibbons told us that the friends of Mr. Hyman having fought two elections and won fairly and having been deprived of the seat by unfair and fraudulent methods came to the conclusion that they would fight the enemy with the devil's fire. Well, no great mistake could be made if the Grits should undertake to fight the enemy with the devil's fire. I do not know how it is, but it appears that the Tories can always use the devil's fire. They seem to have been made for it. It seems to be congenial to them ; they can do it almost with impunity, but when a poor misguided Grit undertakes to deal with the devil's fire, he burns his fingers every time.

Does the Prime Minister's recollection go back as far as 1874 ? In that year, there was an election in this same constituency in which, in 1905, the Grits had to fight with the devil's fire. A certain Col. Walker became the Liberal candidate in that election of 1874. He was a very wealthy man. Hon. Mr. Carling had represented that constituency for some time. I believe he was elected and re-elected no fewer than fourteen times and never had a protest—a fairly good record for the place where the devil's fire is supposed to have originated. Col. Walker was elected. It was believed that at his election the city was fairly flooded with money. The election was protested. A score of witnesses were examined, and it was proven that for every vote polled for Col. Walker an average of $7 was paid. How much more money was paid has not been divulged, this average of $7 per head was made up only from the sworn testimony before the court. It was shown that the chairman of ward 1 had $775—there has been a little advance since those days, I fancy, and we may well believe that the chairman of that ward in the last election received more. One man, in this Walker election, admitted spending $5,000 of which $2,000 was spent on the day of the election. One contributor to the liberal fund, admitted having $6,000 pass through his hands. Col. Walker, was unseated and disqualified. And in giving judgment of the case, Mr. Justice Gwynne gave utterance to these words :

> I can as readily believe it possible for the respondent to have been immersed in the lake and to be taken out dry as that the acts of bribery which the evidence discloses to have been committed on his behalf, almost under his eyes, in his daily path, with means of corruption proceeding from his own headquarters and from the hands of his confidential agents there, could have been committed otherwise than with his knowledge and consent.

That was thirty-two years ago. And, now these poor, innocent, long-suffering Grits who never touched the devil's fire without getting burned seemed to be still patiently practising. And what happened to the poor unfortunate who was burned by the devil's fire in this election of 1874 ? By the court he was disqualified. But, as soon as it was possible, and before it was decent, he was appointed by his political friends, then in power in Ontario, to the chief office in the county of Middlesex—the Registrarship I believe it was. So, evidently, as long ago as 1874, the machine was at work. This Grit played with the devil's fire, so that the smell of it was all over the place, and that his detection was inevitable. And, when he was detected, he received at the hands of his friends the punishment which, apparently, every man on the side of the Liberal government receives at the hands of his grateful party after he has been discovered. Sir, the only way in which corruption can be put down is for the government who have it in their power to put it down. Had not the present government in Ontario been elected, we should have heard nothing about this present London affair. It is such an enormous strain upon private resources to undertake an election prosecution that few are willing to face it. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows, as well as any one else, that it is not proper that the cost of finding out and punishing corruption should be thrown upon private individuals. The only people who can stop corruption are those who are in power in the province or in the Dominion. So far as concerns any attempt having been made by this government to put an end to corruption, invariably, when a corrupt Act has been committed by a man of prominence in their party and the perpetrator has been found out, instead of punishing him, they have rewarded him. Now, many elections have been held in London so far as the Conservative party is concerned, I think I am right in saying that Sir John Carling, who represented the constituency so long, had something like fourteen elections, without a single charge of corrupt practice being made against him. There were, I believe, some legal proceedings in relation to one election, but, as it was of a technical character, if it is to be discussed at all, it can best be discussed by the lawyers in this House. With regard to what has come out concerning the latest London election whether the courts pronounce judgment or not, the people of Canada, and especially the people of Ontario, have already in their own minds repeated the judgment of Mr. Justice Gwynne to which I have already referred, that they can as readily believe it possible

for the respondent to have been immersed in the lake and to be taken out dry as that the acts of bribery which the evidence discloses to have been committed on his behalf, almost under his eyes, in his daily path, with means of corruption proceeding from his own headquarters and from the hands of his confidential agents there, could have been committed otherwise than with his knowledge and consent.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). In these first three days of the third session of the tenth parliament of Canada, hon. members have certainly been treated to some incidents not devoid of exciting and dramatic character. When, at the call of His Excellency the Governor General, we repaired to the Senate chamber to listen to the speech from the Throne, we were told in that speech that it was necessary to reform the law for the prevention of electoral corruption. Then we came back to this chamber and were afforded the spectacle of a minister of the Crown being introduced here as a new member by reason of his being re-elected, that election having been made necessary by the fact that he had been unseated for bribery and corruption of a most extensive character. The ceremony of the introduction of members having been gone through, you, Mr. Speaker, announced from your place the resignation of another minister of the Crown. And we all knew well, as the country knew well, the reason that prompted that hon. gentleman, at long last, to tender his resignation and in that respect to discharge the duty to the people that he ought to have discharged long before. These were the characteristic incidents of one day. To-day we are treated to another incident of a notable character. That incident is enough to remind us of what the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) has told us that judging from the incidents thus far, we are to have a fighting session. But where is the fight to take place ? Judging by the debate of this afternoon, the bitterest fight will be among hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. What is the meaning, and the significant meaning, of the speech of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) ? That speech was directed, Mr. Speaker, against an hon. gentleman sitting to your right. It was directed against the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Aylesworth), who sat silent and who still remains silent after the scathing remarks that were made against him on account of some of his utterances. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, earlier in the day brought the Minister of Justice under the lash for these same utterances, but that minister chooses to remain silent. In the first three days of this session we have been treated to incidents involving three ministers of the Crown, and in each case we have the most profound silence on their part in so far as any explanation is concerned.

Mr. OSLER.

Well, it is gratifying to know that the subject of electoral corruption is one which is going to be dealt with by the government this session. For long years the people have been looking for some drastic measure whereby this electoral corruption which is eating like a canker into the heart of the Canadian people, can be checked. Our people are loyal to the core, our people are honest and fair, and on every side we have denunciations of the corruption revealed in the recent Ontario elections and in connection with the Dominion elections during the past few years. What has been the result of the investigations taken in the Toronto police court during the last month ? That investigation has made it clear that there have been in practice various means of carrying elections for the present government. The most common is the ordinary means of bribery and corruption, the ordinary purchase of votes at $10 or $5 a piece, and the promising of office. Then there are the other methods by which the voter may be corruptly induced to vote for the government candidate. There is the actual manipulation of the ballot, the stealing of the man's vote after it has been given, the stopping of it in the channel between his hands and the returning officer's count or even after that. Then there is the actual stealing of the ballots—that beautiful mechanism which was exhibited here during last session known as the switching of ballots. And last but not least, there are the fradulent methods of manipulating the voters' list. The first is that known as the thin red line—that is by striking off every voters' list—as was done in Manitoba—the names of thousands of duly qualified Conservative electors, or electors whose leanings were thought to be Conservative or who were marked dangerous. The second is a method peculiar to my own constituency and which gave me a great deal of trouble. That is the making up of voters' lists contrary to law—making them up by persons not authorized by law and without the proclamation required by law. In this way over 500 names were added to lists in a single night. 500 voters appeared in a single night like mushrooms, without notice, and were added to the lists in very remote polling divisions. This is one of the conditions which parliament will have to deal with when undertaking to check electoral corruption. If His Excellency had inserted in his speech a clause stating that in additon to the unparalleled prosperty we are all glad to note there also existed a condition of unparalleled political corruption in this land, he would have given a very salutary intimation to the people. Let me say a word regarding the manner in which voters' lists have been manipulated in outside territories. I think I am the ouly representative in this House from an unorganized territory who exposed the manipulation of those

lists and is politically alive to tell the tale. I was the only one who had the audacity to lift my voice in protest and have the matter sifted and investigated in the courts and who obtained a decision of the high court of justice upon it. Let me state briefly the scheme which was practised upon a poor unorganized district in New Ontario by this very provident and careful government. There is a section in the Franchise Act which provides that where voters' lists are made up at certain periods when they are not likely to be ready for a pending election, they may be made up upon the direction of the Secretary of State, but in their making up the laws of the province should be conformed to as nearly as possible. I do not want to weary the House by quoting the statute. The statute is clear and has been referred to in previous elections—for instance in the Nipissing election. That clause was invoked and its meaning stretched for the purpose of creating in nine polling subdivisions—only created the summer prior to the November election—new voters' lists. These voters' lists were made out for places where there never had been voters before ; where there was no settlement, no roads, no regular fixed inhabitants—almost absolutely in the wilderness and far removed from civilization. The instructions given to the enumerator by the Secretary of State show that the preliminary to the making of those voters' lists was a proclamation according to the Ontario law, which requires a proclamation for the making up of voters' lists in unorganized districts to be published in all school houses and public places during thirty days before the election. The Secretary of State appears to have desired that that should be carried out, but cut the number of days down to six days from the time the proclamation was posted at a lumber camp or on a pine tree at which the enumerator proposed to stand when he counted up the list of men who were in that particular lumber camp.

But, Sir, the enumerator went to work and appointed his sub-enumerators and he scattered his men through the woods and through the marshes and along the streams in canoes and by other means of travel and he picked up 543 voters and he put them on the lists and had them sworn to without a single proclamation having been issued, without any one knowing anything about it. Then according to the Franchise Act the voters' lists were to be made up in accordance with the laws of Ontario so far as they could be, applying the section to the province of Ontario. We know that in Ontario the lists are made up by the sheriffs, but there was no sheriff's responsibility attached to the making of these lists. The gentleman who made them up was a sheriff's officer. I believe, a man who was clothed with authority, not by order in council, because I demanded that of him, but by a telegram signed by Mr. Scott, not as Secretary of State, but just with his ordinary signature and without any other form. There again the law of the province was absolutely disregarded. Then, Sir, having made up these voters' lists and having had them sworn to, they became voters' lists in law, they were legal voters' lists to all intents and purposes and what remedy had any one who felt aggrieved? They were made up without notice, no one knew anything about them, until they were created, sworn to and printed, what were the enfranchised electors or any one to do if they felt aggrieved? We were told we could appeal. These lists were made up in the fall of the year when travel was difficult and these places were inaccessible. There were nine of these lists and they were made up at lumber camps, some at a distance of 30, some 20 and some 15 miles from a line of railway, without any means of communication to them, and to show how closely the government instructed its officers to carry out the laws of Ontario, in connection with these voters' lists, we were told that we could appeal and that notice of the time and place at which a court of appeal would be held would be posted up at these different polling places just six days before the poll was held. Under ordinary circumstances if we had a messenger on the spot at each polling division to see when the lists were posted it would take two days to get to town, two days to get back, and therefore we would have just two days to prepare all the material to appeal 543 names. The matter was relegated to the courts and an application for prohibition was made, with the result that the application was refused by the Hon. Mr. Justice Meredith, who, however, in the course of a judgment delivered by the court upon the matter, which I have not under my hand at the moment but which I shall take an opportunity of laying before the House, found that his authority to question an order in council was wanting, but he laid down this principle and I can refer to it generally because the judgment, which is on record, will speak for itself, that where an order in council had been passed, at variance with the law providing for the making up of the lists, the provisions of the law and not the provisions of the order in council must be obeyed, that it was obligatory on the Crown to obey them and the Hon. Justice left it to parliament to provide the remedy in future.

I have briefly gone over the facts in a case which might be very long drawn out, but I draw them to the attention of the right hon. gentleman, as I have done on previous occasions, in view of a paragraph which appeared in His Excellency's speech on the question of electoral corruption, in order that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in view of the announcement that he has made, as I think in all

seriousness, from his place in this House, that he desires to do all in his power to check electoral corruption, may check that form of electoral corruption and have introduced such measures as may be necessary to prevent a recurrence of one of the greatest outrages that has ever been committed in these northern districts. When those lists appeared there were 543 names on them. I am talking now about the lists in West Algoma. I had the temerity to appeal every name on the list. One provision of the Franchise Act which was passed by this government is that the judge of the district court in the district shall be the appellate judge and the instructions, which are marked as an exhibit to the application sent by the Secretary of State to the enumerator, gave the names of the two district judges who should be judges of appeal to investigate the lists. But, Sir, the judge was deprived of his office, he was put on one side, and his jurisdiction was ousted for the purpose of having the appeals come before William A. Quibell, a stipendiary magistrate appointed under the Ross government, having his headquarters at Sault Ste. Marie. Those lists were followed carefully, name by name, and the disclosures there were very bad. To my own personal knowledge there were on these lists names of men who had not been in the province of Ontario for forty-eight hours, and they were placed on the lists as being duly qualified voters under the Dominion Act and entitled to vote at Dominion elections. Many men were aliens.

Mr. TISDALE. How long should they have been in the country ?

Mr. BOYCE. They should have been here for nine months. Many of the men were aliens, and one man in particular I know said he had told the enumerator that he had no right to vote and the enumerator said it did not matter a—— He put his name on the list just the same. As I said we had the temerity to appeal every name on the lists with the result that, even crippled as we were in providing for the appeals, crippled as we were by the ousting of the jurisdiction of the judge who had been accustomed for 16 years to doing such work and against whose honour and integrity no word can be said, we were able to strike out from the lists a little over 200 names. I have been informed, Sir, that had the lists held, had they not received such a fearful shaking up, our friends on the Michigan side of the river, some of the contractors, the vote contractors who furnished the votes on the 'Minnie M.,' were prepared, for a per capita allowance, to furnish the necessary voters to supply the bush poll with voters to replace the men who had jumped before the election. It must be necessary to know before whom the lists were sworn because the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may wish to investigate the matter further in view of the duty laid on the government by one of the judges of the High Court of Justice, and I may tell him that one of these lists is made up by and all the others, with one or two exceptions, are sworn before a gentleman named W. L. Nicholls, and very shortly afterwards, by a strange coincidence he was appointed Indian agent by this government. He is a gentleman to whose name there is a little history attached, because in the famous election petition in 1904 in Sault Ste. Marie, it transpired that W. L. Nicholls was the returning officer holding the poll at Michipicoten harbour where the 'Minnie M' landed her voters. In the course of the evidence which was given at the trial, Mr. Nicholls was put in the box, and said that he did not know why he was appointed deputy returning officer at Michipicoten harbour because he did not know any of the voters there, and he went on to say that he presumed he was appointed on account of his ignorance. Well, Sir, that gentleman, after serving the Ontario government in that respect, and after serving this government in connection with these voters' lists, received his reward and was appointed Indian agent under this government at Sault Ste. Marie, where he now occupies that position.

Then we come to the London election. In that connection I remember what the right hon. the Prime Minister said in quoting Mr. Gibbons' statement regarding corruption in London, as if it were a usual thing. Now it is true, as my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) has said, that the record in London has been clean in past years; and is it only within the last ten years, as the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) says, that London has become cleansed of political corruption ? I think the hon. member for Toronto was correct when he said that there was no protest against the election of Sir John Carling for twenty years, and that only in one instance was a protest entered in a provincial election, namely, in the case of the present Sir Wm. Meredith, and that was dismissed there being no corruption proven. Those are the two instances in which London was absolutely free from corruption, yet the right hon. the Prime Minister attempts a defence by quoting Mr. Gibbons, who says that London was rather a corrupt constituency, and that money had been expended freely during previous elections. I think it will be found that what I have stated with regard to these two elections is an historical fact.

Then we come to the city of London and the time when the Hon. Mr. Hyman was first elected. We know what were the means used previously by pic-nics, and furnishing delicate repasts to tempt the appetites of the London electorate, and induce them to vote in favour of the government candidate. When that hon. gentleman

stood for re-election in 1904 as a member of the Liberal party, he came back with a narrow majority of 23, enough to make a prominent member of the Liberal party in this House quake with fear. Then came the time when the right hon. gentleman who leads this government gave, as he said, an opportunity for the electors in London and North Oxford of expressing their approval or disapproval of his autonomy Bill for the Northwest Territories, and we were afterwards told that London had approved of the action of the right hon. gentleman's government, and he pointed to London as a signal instance of the approbation felt for his policy by a large majority of the people of London in electing the Hon. Mr. Hyman as Minister of Public Works. Now, Sir, at the risk of wearying the House, I desire to read from the evidence adduced in the Toronto police court before Colonel Denison, police magistrate, the names of persons who were bribed and the amounts each one received. The names I read are those of persons who were bribed in the election held on June 13, 1905, when the Hon. Mr. Hyman was re-elected.

Edgar Clark, $10; George McCoy, $7.50; Geo. H. Bonser, $10; Charles Forward, $9; John Archer, $10; Wm. Bier, $10; Henry Donaghue, $9.50; John W. Mackay, $10; Charles Leagh, $9; Hamilton Ramsay, $10; John Redmond, $9.50; Charles Stevens, $9.50; John Weener, $5; Enoch Fowler, $10; Charles House, $10; Thomas Vanstone, $9.50; Joseph Tait, $9.50; John A. Normand, $10; John H. Andrews, $10; Wm. McCauslau, $9.50; Jas. Quinley, $9.50; Chas. Evans, $10; Frank Prior, $9; Jas. Rustin, $9.50; A. E. Pitch, $9; Hugh Clarke, $10; Chas. M. Tilden, $9; Arch. McMurphy, $5; Jas. Dewar, $9.50; Wm. Ruse, $10; Jas. Smith, $10; Wm. Goodland, $9.50; Edgar Jeffrey (reception to Mr. Hyman), $100; Daniel Holm, $9.50; Robt. Normand, $10; Geo. E. Hodgins, $10; Geo. Harvey, $10; Alf. J. Clarke, jr., $9; Alf. Clarke, sr., $9.50; Alf. Bowman, $10; Murdock McKay, $10; John M. Graham, $5; J. T. Storey, $9; Wilson Roche, $9.50; Henry E. Ware, $9; John Crockett, $9.50; Samuel Baunback, $10; Geo. Taylor, $10; Henry Gregory, $10; Pat. Meehan, $10; Thos. Taylor, $9.50; Joseph Ridey, $9.50; John Smeiser, $5.50; Adams Jones, $9; W. A. Hea, $10; Wm. Hea, $10; Wm. O'Brien, $9.50; John Dwyer, $5; Wm. Cochrane, $9.50; Albert Burgess, $9.50; Joseph Fortner, $8; Fred. Ellis, $9.50; John Trawley, $9.50; John Orr, $10; Jas. Hea, $10; Walter Osborne, $5; Jas. Dewar, $10; Andrew Robson (spent on voters),, $9.50; Chas. E. Downing, $9.50; Harry Johnston, $10; Chas. Paul, $10; Wm. Heaman, $20; L. H. James, $10; J. D. McAlpine, $15; John Crochet, $9.50; Wm Cooper, $9.50; Geo. B. Cooper, $15; Wm. Spence, $15; Wm. Serviss, $25; Jas. Orme, $10; livery men (driving for Hyman) about $800; Thos. E. Crooks, $5; Jas. Pincomb, $5; Thos. Adams, $5; Robt. Hassoch, $10; Chas. Pepper (received from J. C. Duffield for working for Liberals), $400; John Stevely (to be distributed among voters named in envelopes), $150; J. E. Campbell, $5; Ed. Stonehouse, $2.50; F. Hutchinson, $5.

So far as had come out in the court at that time, $2,366.50 had been spent. All these men were proved to have been paid these sums of money to vote for the Hon. Mr. Hyman as Minister of Public Works. Well, that hon. gentleman came back to this House amidst great demonstrations of enthusiasm from the Liberal benches, and crape was put upon the door of the leader of the Conservative party and upon the door of the Conservative whip.,

Well Sir, we know now who is wearing the crape but I will point out to the House that these revelations have been considerably added to by recent evidence because I am taking the evidence adduced up to the 8th of November only in order to read that roll of honour in the London by-election for the Hon. Charles S. Hyman. And, Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman was face to face with a list that shows that over eighty persons, let alone the $400 item, the $150 item and the $800 item, had received moneys ranging from $2.50 up to $25 for voting for him he remained quiescent and made no effort to resign his seat in this House. It was only after we had heard the speech from the Throne in which electoral corruption was deplored that you, Sir, announced that you had received an irregular letter of resignation from the hon. member for London which you were, owing to its irregularity, unable to present formally to this House. So much for the London election. We wait with considerable interest to see if the legislation promised in the speech from the Throne will make the punishment fit the crime. We are now in a position to enumerate some of the different varieties of methods by which the voters have been disfranchised, methods by which hon. gentlemen opposite at the present time hold their seats, but if the right hon. leader of the government is sincere in that statement—and I do not want to question his sincerity to any extent whatever—then he will see to it, I know, that such legislation would be brought down as will make this as great a crime as it ought to be with the idea of saying to the Canadian people that this method of stealing the franchise is regarded as a more heinous offence than the stealing of bread and butter or your neighbour's jewels.

I am pleased to note that some changes are to be made in the tariff. I am sure that many hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House realize that they will be very necessary. I have a few remarks to make in that connection and they are in favour of the farmers of my constituency. The home market of the farmer must be protected and especially must the home market of the farmer be protected as against the invasion of our foreign neighbours in places where our shores nearly join. In two of the principal staple products the farmers of West Algoma have suffered very severe competition as is shown by the records of this House. I refer to hay and potatoes. The duty on hay coming into Canada is $2 a

ton. The duty on hay going to the United States is $4 per ton. The duty on potatoes coming into Canada is 15 cents a bushel while the duty on potatoes going into the United States is 25 cents a bushel. I have merely to quote the figures to show the effect of this competition upon the farmers of West Algoma. In 1905, during the first session of this parliament, I asked certain questions of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in regard to the quantity of hay that was entered through the Customs house at Sault Ste. Marie in the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1904. The result shows that commencing in 1900 only 14 tons of hay were imported. The quantity imported increased until in 1904, 674 tons of hay were brought in and I was told by the hon. gentleman that in 1905 1,042 tons of hay had been imported from the United States thereby invading the market of the farmers of West Algoma to that extent. The item of potatoes is also a very important one, because, according to the figures so kindly furnished by the hon. Minister of Customs, 25,801 bushels of potatoes went through the Canadian Customs office at the boundary there during last year. That shows that such protection should be afforded to the farmers up there as will enable them to have the advantage of their home market to which they are entitled. To-day they are at a disadvantage. There is a strong barrier against them. The American markets are not open to them and their own market —the market at Sault Ste Marie—is invaded by importations on a large scale to their detriment.

The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) asks what the opposition have discovered during the ten years that this government have been in power. In view of the spectacle we had just been treated to before the hon. gentleman rose to his feet I was somewhat disappointed at his raising that question, because, if in ten years we had not discovered something, in the hour preceding his speech we did discover something. But, how an hon. member who has sat in this House during two years of the present parliament can rise in his place, and, having upon him all the responsibility of the representation of a constituency in Canada, say that no scandals during the last ten years have been discovered which affect the prestige of the government, that the purity of the government's record was almost spotless or was absolutely guaranteed, almost beggars description and almost compels a man to believe that this hon. gentleman who represents the county of Wright is with the government twice when the government is wrong and once when the government is right. The hon. gentleman is perfectly satisfied, like the parasite, to close his ears, to be a fungus on this government and to stick to them, or being blind and deaf and dumb he fails to see or hear or to speak of anything in respect to the sins which have been laid at the door of this administration. There has been, during the one session which was closed in July last, enough scandal to last any decent community for half a century. There has been enough politcal crime disclosed and the responsibility for it fixed to disgust the people with the methods employed by this government and to cause them to absolutely lose confidence in the government. But, Sir, although we have had ministers quietly dropping out, some at the instance of the courts and some by the persuasion of their friends, some for the benefit of the health not of themselves, but of their Liberal friends and the government, we see that at this stage of the game, on the opening of another session, with a declaration coming from the Crown in the speech from the throne that there is need for a reform of the laws and for making further provision to check political corruption, an hon. gentleman can stand up and complacently say that in ten years this government have not been convicted of any political immorality and that its hand are clean. There must be responsibility for all that has been disclosed and that responsibility must lie where it should properly belong and that is upon the government of the day. Can any one tell this House that Hon. Mr. Hyman was so absolutely inexperienced in election methods, that, having a by-election to face, going back to his constituents as a minister of the Crown, having a majority of 23, having to face issues upon which he had every reason to believe his constituents were aroused, having engaged in a fight the issue of which was rather questionable and which he admitted to be rather questionable, did not get in touch with his organization, did not inquire and did not know what was going on, that he could remain in London for three weeks going through all the different committee rooms, remaining in touch with the men who were maintaining these committee rooms and not know that this money being distributed, not see a cent of it and not know that improper methods were being pursued ?

If that were the case, then the hon. gentleman is a very much simpler specimen of humanity than most honourable members of this House take him to be. The whole force of this government was thrown into the constituencies of London and Oxford in order to secure for this government the prestige of a victory in London and Oxford just at that time. Taunts were thrown across the floor of this House in regard to these constituencies, there were exchanges of acrid remarks as to what might take place when the government trusted itself in London, and consequently the eyes of the government were wide open to the exigencies of the political situation. And, if the

methods that have been disclosed are disgraceful; if the victory which was said to be achieved was achieved at a price per voter of from $5 to $25, then I say the government cannot shirk the responsibility and the Minister of Public Works cannot say in this House to-day that his hands are clean, that he knew nothing whatever about it, that he is absolutely innocent of any knowledge or any connivance. If he were an honourable gentleman, then when the first breath of suspicion came as to the method employed in the election he would at once have resigned his seat and his portfolio, put himself again in the hands of the people, and he would be here to-day to state exactly what his position was.

I am delighted to see in the speech from the Throne a reference to the unparalleled prosperity of this country. It is an item that has appeared in almost every speech from the Throne during the last few years and it is one with which we are all heartily in accord.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was remarking that the House would hail with gratification the mention made in His Excellency's speech of the prosperity which Canada to-day enjoys. As Canadians, we are glad indeed to witness the growth of the prosperity which has come over Canada as well as the rest of the mercantile world during the last ten or twelve years. We have ample means by which to maintain the prosperity with which we are blest to-day. We have a country full of resources. We have wheat fields of boundless possibilities. We have mineral lands which are just beginning to show the vastness of their riches. Our fisheries are almost inexhaustible and our forests are without peer, possibly, in any other country in the world. The eyes of the civilized world are turned in our direction and here the settler finds a country to which he can bend his steps with confidence that he will share the prosperity we enjoy. But, when we are face to face with the political conditions in Canada to-day, we cannot but pause and think whether material prosperity is everything—whether the development of our resources is all that we should look for, and whether this alone will secure for us the place we ought to have among nations. Surely our own people and the people of the civilized world would look for something greater in a growing country like Canada than material prosperity. Surely there must be some morality demonstrated in the use of these splendid resources. Surely these bounties should be developed and held by a people. Zealous in good works, regardful of public morality and demonstrating their love for it in parliament and out of parliament, during elections and outside of elections. But, when we regard the matter in this way, we are compelled to see that this Canada, with its immense resources, its boundless possibilities, its teeming riches and growing immigration suffers under political corruption which is debauching the country and eating out its heart. I would again refer to the state of things set forth in the evidence thus far adduced in the London election and proceed along the line of my suggestion, and my contention that the responsibility must be fixed where it belongs —upon the Minister of Public Works who was the candidate, and upon this government which desired the prestige of a successful election at that time when it was most needed.

As members of this House, as men who have been, some of us once, and some of us more than once, through the throes of an election, we know the machinery of an election and can judge how far the candidate is, or should be, in touch with those who are assisting him in the work of organization by means of which it is hoped to secure his election. We can all apply the knowledge that we have thus gained to the case of the London election in which Mr. Hyman was returned. Mr. Hyman had committees and sub-committees. He was himself in the city of London. I remember that he left this House some weeks before election day and that his department was attended to by one of this colleagues. He left here to be present in the city of London and to endeavour to secure, by every means in his power, the election so much desired by himself and his friends. It is shown by the evidence that committees were appointed in that election, that committee rooms were opened, and that certain people were frequenters of these committee rooms. Was the Minister of Public Works so blind that he could not see in the committee rooms this man O'Gorman or Mulloy, or Lewis, or Sifton, or Reid, working hard in his interest and working with those who were recognized by him and authorized by him to promote his election? It is verging very close upon demanding belief in the impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite to ask us to believe that Mr. Hyman could go about that campaign, could go through the streets of London, could go into the houses and into his own committee rooms in the different wards, and not meet these men, or, if he met them, not know the work in which they were engaged and the means they employed in carrying it on. It is a safe proposition to lay down that if the hon. gentleman did not know he should have known. And it is perfectly just to impute to him the knowledge that these men were engaged in this work. Or, if we assume that he did

not inquire about these matters or did not know about them, then, on the principle expressed in the old maxim that 'there are none so blind as those who will not see,' it is fair and just for us to hold him responsible for wilfully refusing to know that which he should have known. The hon. gentleman is not here to make explanations with regard to these matters, if there are explanations that he could make. We regret to know that physical infirmity has had its share in preventing his presence here. But we have before us facts which are incontrovertible, facts which cannot be gainsaid and which are evidently sufficient, for the hon. Minister of Public Works himself to cause him, as I have said before, at long last to perform an imperative duty and tender his resignation as a member of this House. This man O'Gorman to whom I have referred is not a stranger in political life. He is a worker for the Liberal party, or 'organizer,' as these men are called by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, whose record is not unknown. For it is part of the political history of this country that he figured conspicuously in the Pritchett revelations of 1889. We know also that it was he who manipulated the vote in Brockville. We know also that he has figured in several elections since. It is perfectly safe to say that, if O'Gorman, whose record in connection with current elections was so well known, was present in London, it was the duty of Hon. Mr. Hyman to be aware of that fact, and in the interest of a clean campaign, drive him out of the constituency.

If I remember rightly, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), speaking at Wiarton, complained bitterly that this matter had not been relegated to the electoral courts. If it had been, and had come to trial the law of agency would have been applied, and those of us who are lawyers know that that law is pretty broadly applied so as to saddle the responsibility for corruption upon the candidate whose election is questioned. Could it be said that these men, O'Gorman, Molloy, Lewis, Sifton and Reid and many others, who were frequenters of the committee room, who were travelling around with the envelopes and slipping them into peoples waistcoats and overcoat pockets—could it be said that these active workers could have been excused from agency if they had been charged with it in an election petition. But unfortunately for the Minister of Public Works, there was no election petition lodged in London and there was no comfortable procedure to enable him to crawl out of the difficulty by simply resigning his seat. Had there been such a petition, then the chances are that, after reviewing the evidence and finding that the whole constituency had been debauched and that thousands of dollars had been spent in the purchase of votes for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), his resignation would have been tendered to the court and no evidence would have been received except such evidence as would be pertinent to a personal charge. The country, in that case, would have been deprived of the knowledge it now has of the manner in which elections of members supporting the government were carried. But the people are fortunate in having in Ontario a government which is not afraid to do its duty, a government which does not hesitate to sift political corruption and expose the shady means by which the government keep in office. Another question, and a very natural one presents itself to the ordinary mind. That is the question which was echoed and re-echoed throughout Ontario many years ago, before well merited retribution overtook the Ross government. That question is: Where did the money come from? I have shown from the evidence given in the police court up to a certain date—and it is not all the evidence by any means—that there was something like $2,500 employed in the bribery of voters in the London election. Where did it come from? Will any hon. gentleman contend that O'Gorman or Molloy or Lewis or Sifton or Reid, who were so busy distributing amounts from $20 down to $2.50, were spending their own money? Are we so simple as that? Will any one argue that these men were spending there own money in order to secure possibly some favours from this government? If that be not the excuse offered, then nothing remains but the conclusion that the money came out of some organized fund and as a result of some concerted attempt to debauch that constituency. And if that money was spent, surely the first duty of the candidate was to ascertain where it came from. But, judging by what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) said at Wiarton not very long ago, the Minister of Public Works was completely innocent and as ignorant of what was going on as a new born babe. Well, I think he has been through too many elections and has had too much experience for any one to admit that he could possibly have been ignorant of what was going on ; and this very contention of innocence saddles on him the responsibility and the duty of inquiring into what was taking place. Candidates were unseated and disqualified for similar proceedings right in the city of London in the election of 1874, referred to by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) when Colonel Walker, who was the Liberal candidate against Sir John Carling, was unseated and disqualified. What was the evidence in that case? It was much the same as it is here. It showed that the whole constituency had been debauched from end to end, that the majority consisted entirely of voters who had been paid for their votes, and the proceedings were

characterized by Mr. Justice Gwynne in the most scathing terms. Mr. Justice Gwynne said :—

> I could as readily believe that a man might be thrown into the lake and be taken out dry as that any politician could see such men in his committee rooms and not smell corruption in the atmosphere.

Apply that decision to the present condition of things. We had these men running loose in the committee rooms, forming a part of the machine which was working hard to secure the prestige of the government by carrying that election. Could the hon. minister go through these committee rooms daily, as he no doubt did and could easily have done—for the constituency has a very limited area—and not 'smell corruption' in the very atmosphere? But assuming that these men were spending money of their own in order to carry political favours, let us see how reasonable such an assumption might be. Here were these men spending their own money to the extent of thousands of dollars in debauching a constituency—for what purpose? To curry political favour with this government. Admitting that, where does it lead us? If a man were to spend his own money in debauching the electors in favour of a candidate, would he be likely to conceal from that candidate what he was doing for him? Would he not say to him: 'Look at the money I am spending in order to secure your election,' and he is generally the kind of gentleman I would think who would tell it well in advance and give an exaggerated idea of the amount that he was spending.

Now, Sir, that is the condition of things at the present time in London, and I am taking up a great deal of the time of this House in commenting on it. Matters of this kind, political corruption in this country has got to such an extreme point that it has got to be met and it has got to be suppressed or it will run riot through the country and the history of Canada will be blackened for ever by it. My hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) in his specious remark as to the purity of the record of this government took occasion to comment rather severely, I thought in a rather uncalled for manner, upon some fancied or imaginary stain upon the character of the hon. gentleman who represents North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and represents it with signal ability, with too much ability, probably, to be appreciated by hon. gentlemen on the other side. Now, here is the spectacle of an hon. gentleman not three years in this House who rises in his place and vilifies another hon. member, a man of considerable experience, a man sworn of His Majesty's Privy Counci in Canada, without saying one single word in the shape of a specific charge against that hon. gentleman. There is the spectacle that the hon. gentleman presents to this House and I ask in all fairness whether members of this House ought to be subjected to that sort of thing at the hands of government members. Not one iota of a charge was made by that hon. gentleman against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) but he referred in vague and indefinite terms to some imaginary dark cloud hanging over the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to which I venture to say the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not losing much sleep. What did he mean? We have seen in the newspapers some reference to some evidence adduced in the insurance investigation in which the name of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) figures, and comment has been made upon that evidence and if that is what the hon. gentleman refers to, and he was not specific about it, then I should like to know what are the specific charges made against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I am not here to defend the cause of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I think that this House can judge as to his ability to defend himself upon all occasions and he has announced his intention of defending himself and making what explanation he has to offer upon the floor of this House ; but surely Mr. Speaker, it would have been more manly and more strictly in accord with parliamentary procedure that an hon. member at least should reserve any charges of that character until after the report which has been promised in the speech from the Throne is brought down and there is something upon which the hon. gentleman can base his remarks.

As I said this afternoon this country is hoping for a higher standard of political morality and it is to be hoped that the meaning of the statement in His Excellency's speech is that such measures will be introduced by the government as will meet the condition of things that have been developing in this country for years past, and which have been becoming more acute of late years, that such strict legislation will be introduced as will meet the different forms of electoral corruption, not simply the mere buying of votes, because that is specified already, but the different forms of trickery which have been brought to the light of day and a great deal that has not been brought to the light of day, by which constituencies can be stolen from men who are lawfully entitled by the will of the people, the real vote of the people, to represent those constituencies in this House.

I desire to correct an error which I made this afternoon with regard to the preparation and revision of the voters' lists to which I refer. I am glad to say that I erred on the side of Conservatism. The nine lists of voters as prepared and sworn to in West Algoma, under the order in council of this government, dated August 26, 1904, lists which sprang up like mushrooms in a single night, and which if not appealed would have become legal lists contained

543 names, and when revised there were only 211 names left on the lists, so that the number struck off on revision in the short time at the disposal of those attacking the lists was 332 names of persons who were illegally upon those lists which had been prepared and sworn to, and which to all intents and purposes were the lists to be used at the general election then pending.

One word more in explanation of the situation. Section 9 of the Franchise Act applies to cases where the lists are prepared not at regular intervals but at times fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or other provincial or local authority. Now Sir, it is clear from the correspondence brought down, and I am only going to touch it shortly, that at the time that this order in council provided for the making up of these marvellous lists in this extraordinary manner was promulgated or rather before it was promulgated, correspondence was exchanged between the Hon. R. W. Scott, as Secretary of State and the sheriff. I shall read from the return brought down to the House on the 20th February, 1905, a telegram dated August 22, 1904, to W. H. Carney, sheriff, Sault Ste. Marie, as follows :—

What progress, if any, has been made in the preparation of voters' lists under the Ontario statute of last session in the unorganized sections of your district ? Explain fully by wire what steps have been taken up to present time.

Then there is a telegram on the same day from W. H. Carney to the Secretary of State :

Voters' lists for all statutory polls will be ready for printing first September. Notices are being posted up for making up voters' lists for eleven new polls recently established by order in council, and lists for these eleven new polls will not all be ready for printing under provincial Act until first October. Press of business in my office for three months will prevent me from being able to accept appointment under section nine of Dominion Franchise Act.

W. H. CARNEY,
Sheriff.

Now that indicated that the sheriff notified the Secretary of State of this government that the machinery of the provincial law was actively in force, and that the voters' lists were being compiled as rapidly as possible under the provincial machinery in all these places mentioned by the order in council against which I complain. On the 25th day of August, the Secretary of State wired to Mr. Jacob Stevenson, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. :—

You had been appointed to prepare the lists for unorganized parts of West Algoma with power to appoint a sufficient number of enumerators to enable the work of enumerating voters to be completed not later than the 10th September.

The sheriff had wired to that gentleman on the 22nd of August that the voters' lists he had in preparation would be ready under the provincial law, and with all due formalities observed, on the 1st of September. On the 26th of August, the Secretary of State wired Mr. Jacob Stevenson, Sault Ste. Marie :

So soon as a list for the unorganized township or polling place is completed, have it printed and notice posted that appeals will be heard six days from date of posting.

So it was clear from the papers that at the time this order in council was passed on the 25th of August, 1904, the government was actually aware, by telegram from the sheriff of Algoma, that the provincial lists were in course of preparation, and that the regular provincial machinery for making up the legal lists was being used, and that fresh lists would be ready by the 1st of September. It is also clear that notwithstanding that statement, the whole course of the provincial machinery was stopped with regard to these voters' lists, and the opportunity for any one interested to have notice of the time and place at which these lists would be made up was taken away, and the lists were made up without notice to any body. Now, Sir, all these questions were relegated in the prohibition motion to the High Court of Justice, and application was made to prohibit all those who were interested in making up those lists. And just here, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I have no complaint whatever with regard to the appointment of the chief enumerator, Mr. Jacob Stevenson, who nominally had charge of the making up of these lists. It is fair to Mr. Stevenson, as I am attacking the whole machinery of this order in council, to say that so far as he was concerned I believe him to be a man of integrity and honesty, and that he would not stoop to any irregularity in making up those lists. But Mr. Stevenson had nothing whatever to do with the making up of the lists. He appointed nine enumerators who scattered themselves out into the bush, and made up their lists and swore to them as being duly qualified voters' lists, and these men are responsible for the making up of the lists. The chief enumerator's position was simply that of an official who had nothing to do but receive the lists. Another extraordinary feature of the order in council was that the direction given in carrying on the machinery was that the enumerators were to be appointed upon the nomination of the candidate, and that the lists were to be completed and filed in the office of the clerk of the peace. Now the peculiarity of the working out of that provision as regards West Algoma was this, that the candidate himself was the clerk of the peace. So that the candidate had to appoint the enumerators as the clerk of the peace, and then the clerk of the peace was the official of the Ontario government who had to receive

them and file them in his office. A very comfortable state of things indeed. These lists were thus made up, and I hold in my hand the lists, which any hon. gentleman may see if he desires, as they appeared when they were revised by the persons appointed to revise them. Here are thick red lines, not the thin red lines that are in favour in Manitoba. Take the first list I hold in my hand, and there are ninety names on it, with the affidavit duly sworn to before this gentleman, Mr. Nicholls, that he has set down in the voters' lists for the electoral district of West Algoma according to the best of his information and judgment the name of every person entitled to be entered thereon, and there were not intentionally omitted from the said list the name of any person whom he knew or had good reason to believe were entitled to be entered thereon. Now on the first list I looked at, namely, the list for the polling place of McFadden, Malloy's Camp, in the township of Jarvis, there are ninety names on the list duly sworn to and out of that number only seventeen names survived. On the next list sworn to in the same way under the same functionary, for a place called Breckenridge's Camp, in the township of Anderson, there were thirty-four names on the list and there were seven survivors. On the next list at Mashkode there were ninety names, with only twenty-six survivors. In the township of Gilmore, Camp No. 1, there were thirty-seven names on the list and eighteen survivors. In Camp No. 2, of the township of Curtis, there were sixty-three names on the list and only twenty-six survivors. In the polling place for Waboose Station, ninety names were on the list and thirty-eight survived. At Haydon Station, township of Aweres twenty-three names were on the list and fifteen survived; at Wylde, twenty-five were on the list and nineteen survived; at Searchmont, ninety were on the list and forty-five survived. There were a total of 530 names on the lists, of which 211, less than one-half, survived. Now, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the vigilance of some people up there those lists would have been the lists to go to the returning officers upon which to hold the election. Every attempt was made to send the lists to the returning officer in that way. They were cut down to the extent of over one hundred per cent, there were apparently 211 legal names on the list and 332 illegal names. Had it not been for very prompt action, those lists, which had actually been sworn to, would have been placed in the hands of the deputy returning officers at those distant and inaccessible places where the votes of the electorate of Canada were to be taken. The facts were laid before Judge Meredith on a motion for prohibition to prohibit those officers from making up the lists. At the risk of wearying the House I desire to place upon 'Hansard' the judgment of that very learned judge, which I had not under my hand when speaking this afternoon:

In the matter of the West Algoma voters' lists.

October 1, 1904.

There are involved in this appeal——

The word 'appeal' is wrong because it is not an appeal; it is a motion for prohibition——

—two questions of considerable importance.

1. Whether the order in council in question is, or the proceedings of the respondent acting under it are, ultra vires, and if so

2. Whether this court has power to prohibit such proceedings.

The more correct way of dealing with these questions is to consider the latter first, because, if this court has no jurisdiction it is better to express no opinion upon the merits of the application; if there has been bad faith or any sinister or improper conduct, such as has been charged, in matters quite within the power of those whose conduct has been called in question, they are answerable, not to the court but to parliament, and parliament to the people; and any alleged wrong-doing may perhaps also be the subject of investigation and of some measure of relief if established in the federal election courts.

Then is there jurisdiction in this court?

If the circumstances which warrant the Governor in Council in acting under section 9 of the Franchise Act, 1898, never existed, I would have little doubt of such jurisdiction. One of the foremost duties of this court is the prevention of the exercise of wrongful judicial power. It can hardly be doubted that if any one, without colour or right, should usurp the judicial functions pertaining to the preparation of voters' lists, the power and duty to prohibit must rest somewhere, and I know of no other court than this in which such power and duty rests, in respect of such a usurpation within this province.

But it is said that in the North Perth case there was a decision of a divisional court to the contrary. With that statement I am unable to agree. The two cases are widely different. When that case was decided there existed officers and courts appointed and constituted under federal legislation for the very purpose of dealing with the whole subject of voters' lists for parliamentary elections; the whole of that legislation has been repealed; no such officers or courts now exist. The holding in the North Perth case was that this court could not interfere with such federal courts in respect of such voters' lists. In this case the main question is does any federal court exist? Have the respondents any authority whatever in law for the exercise of any judicial functions in respect of such lists? If not there must be power somewhere to prohibit, and that power can be found in this court only

Whether the respondents have, or have not, any such power depends upon the proper interpretation of section 9 of the Franchise Act, 1898. That Act entirely repealed the Electoral Franchise Act under which the federal courts were constituted. It changed completely the whole law in regard to the preparation of the voters' lists, adopting the provincial lists instead of having parliamentary lists prepared as provided for in the repealed enactment. But, to provide against the possibility of there being no sufficiently recent provincial lists in some of the electoral districts, the ninth sec-

tion of the Act was passed; it is as amended, in these words:

'9. Where under the laws of a province the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division or any of them are prepared not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or some other provincial or local authority or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division or the parts thereof for use in which they were prepared, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed.'

For the district in question there are in existence no lists prepared at any regular intervals, but there are lists in course of preparation under a provincial enactment which requires their preparation at regular intervals.

The purpose of the section is to insure reasonably recent lists for parliamentary elections; it can, therefore, hardly mean that when a provincial enactment requires the lists to be prepared at regular intervals those lists only shall be used no matter how long it may be necessary to wait until they are prepared; it means rather that where such lists exist—are prepared in fact—they shall be used, but where they do not exist the mode of preparing them provided in the section may be adopted. It was therefore, in the facts of this case, within the power of the Governor in Council to appoint all necessary officers for the preparation of the lists, thus making them officers of a federal court just as the revising barristers were under the federal enactment; but they are expressly required by the enactment to observe and follow as far as possible the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial lists.

But it is said that the order in council appointing the respondents presumes to give directions to them in conflict with the later statutory requirement. The answer to that is if it be so, the order, to that extent, has not effect, the statute, not the order in council, is to be obeyed.

Then it is urged that, assuming the appointment of the respondents to be valid, they are not proceeding in some respects in accordance with the statute, but are acting to some extent in contravention of it. The answer of that—if it be so—is the answer which was given to the applicant in the North Perth case. The subject is one affecting matters peculiarly within the exclusive powers of parliament; they are answerable to parliament, not to this court, in such an application as that.

A point of some importance—not argued—is whether parliament has, in section 9, delegated to the Governor in Council the constitution of a federal court, and if so whether there was power to do so. The answer is there is no such delegation, that the enactment itself constitutes the court and prescribes its procedure, and that to the Governor in Council is committed nothing substantially but the appointment of the officers, the putting in motion of the provincial machinery operated by federal officers.

The application therefore fails and must be dismissed.

Then the learned judge dismisses the application on the ground of want of jurisdiction. So much for that chapter in the political history just preceding the elections of 1904. As I said before that is only one chapter in the story of the manner in which the lists were made up to capture the constituencies in North Ontario remote from centres of civilization. It was a sinister method sprung upon the people without any notice, without placing any person in a position to become prepared but for the purpose of creating thousands of votes in places where they could be manipulated and worked and voted at the instance of some political 'thug' who would vote them as machines and who would vote them in accordance with the dictates of whoever was 'bossing the job' at the times. Thousands of names were placed upon the list in New Ontario under the same orders in council and if we pay any attention to the judgment of the learned judge we shall see that while he was unable to grant the prohibition on the ground of want of jurisdiction, holding that the whole matter must be relegated to parliament and not to the court, thousands of these names were the names of illegal voters but they were put there in many of the constituencies where the same vigilance was not excercised as was done in West Algoma and were used to defeat the opposition candidate to the advantage of three or four gentlemen now occupying seats on the government benches. In the position which Canada finds itself to-day, in a state of very great prosperity, and with a growing trade, it is meet that we should look to the political morality of this country. Let us hope that the legislation which is promised in the speech from the Throne will provide for the suppression of those political crimes which are growing in number annually. Let us hope that we are reaching forward to a higher standard of political morality. Let us hope that as a young country we are going to set a better example than we have in the past to the other countries which form a part and portion of this great British Empire to which we are proud to belong. There can be no more stable foundation upon which to upbuild our country than that the corner stone should be well and truly laid on the basis of political morality and purity in the election of members to the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that

you, Sir, as well as the members of this House, and for that matter the people of all Canada are to be congratulated that at last another great discovery has been made; the discovery that the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) succeeded in carrying the constituency of West Algoma at the last election. It is very evident from the observations which the hon. gentleman has addressed to us that his political friends and associates are not sufficiently appreciative of the high qualities he possesses. For two hours this afternoon he has taken up the time of the House in demonstrating to his friends that during the past few years they have been doing an injustice, that they have not been conscious of his worth, that in fact they have not been sufficiently looking up to him. I am quite sure that after his speech to-day, they, as well as all who heard him, must arrive at the conclusion that the member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) is a rare man, a very rare man, for he has told us, not only has he been able to overcome the opposition directed against him from within his own constituency last election, but he has been able so to defy and so to defeat the machinations of the government at Toronto and at Ottawa, that to-day he is the happy possessor of a seat in this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He is a great star.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In the words of my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) a great star has arisen on the political firmament. But, to address myself to the immediate subject in hand. Those of us who sit on this side of the House take considerable pride in the fact that the bill of fare which has been presented by the government in the speech from the Throne has not been called into question by gentlemen on the other side who have spoken in this debate, nor has it received any serious criticism from them. The leader of the opposition did not have much fault to find with it. True to his custom he did cavil at the expenditure during the years the Liberal party has been in power, and he in common with his party is of the opinion that our expenditures are a little too large. It is not necessary for me to dwell on that, because the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) demonstrated to the entire satisfaction of the House—as it has been demonstrated over and over again to the entire satisfaction of the country—that the expenditures made by the present government are not in the least alarming. Over and over again the people of Canada by their ballots have shown that in their opinion—and their opinion is worth something, and their opinion is respected by the men on this side of the House—the people of Canada over and over again by their votes have demonstrated that the increased expenditure by the present government since 1896 was in the interests of Canada, and in that view I trust that these expenditures will grow still larger.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) does not seem to agree with me in that. He no doubt would like to go back to the old days when the expenditures were low and the deficits large; he would like to go back to those old days which gave him light and glory, but I can assure him, if he does not know it already, that the people of Canada have made up their minds that there shall be no return to these days of stagnation in our history for which my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) so vainly sighs. What concerns the people of Canada to-day is whether the expenditure of the government is in the interest of the country or not, and I think the Liberal party has proved to the satisfaction of the people that the expenditures during the past ten years have been made in the interest of Canada as a whole. The best evidence of that is that to-day we can point our people to the condition of the country itself, its growth in wealth from ocean to ocean, its increased trade, its enlarged production in every branch of industry and its vastly greater population. Out of the large sums expended by this government in the aggregate, the leader of the opposition was able to point to one item of which he did not approve; it was an item of $250,000, not a very large item it is true. Well, Sir, if that is all the fault he has to find I think our friends generally throughout the country can view the situation with a good deal of comfort and a good deal of confidence. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was also a little disturbed as to the increased expenditures since 1896 and he was able to go the leader of the opposition one better and to put his finger on two items out of the whole expenditure for the past ten years to which he took exception. He quarrelled with the construction of an elevator in the city of St. John; he said it was a useless expenditure. He took exception to the construction of a wharf in the city of Hull, but the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) who represents the constituency in which Hull is situated, gave the hon. member for North Toronto an answer, which if it is too much to hope, will satisfy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will I am quite sure be accepted as a satisfactory explanation by the people of the country. As I have said, the hon. member (Mr. Foster) did not approve of the building of an elevator in the harbour of St. John. I am curious to know what view some of his own friends will take of that matter. It would be interesting to know whether his friends who sit about him agree with him that

to build an elevator to accommodate the traffic of the port of St. John was a useless expenditure. Up to the present at all events none of them have expressed an opinion, and I suppose we must sorrowfully come to the conclusion that his colleagues from St. John share his view that the construction of the St. John elevator is a useless expenditure. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the judgment of the immediate future will be—if the judgment of the immediate past has not been—that the building of the elevator in the city of St. John by the present government will not be written down in history as a mistaken policy. I make the prediction here to-night that inside of a few years, not even the member for North Toronto, let alone his colleagues from St. John, will dare to say before the people or the parliament of Canada that that elevator erected for the accommodation of the commerce of the Dominion is a work which should not have been undertaken by this government.

Well, so much for the speeches of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). But we have had another, greater than all these. We had a speech this afternoon from the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). Well, it is always pleasant to listen to the observations of a great man. Over and over again during the last six or seven years, this House has been electrified by the observations of the hon. member for West Toronto. He always contributes something bright, something rare to the debate in which he takes part. And I am sure that it will be recorded in history that his contribution to the debate this afternoon was, perhaps, beyond any he has ever made to a debate in this House. There is one thing that has always been noticable in the case of the hon. member for West Toronto. He always gives one the impression that in his perambulations he has a decided preference for the graveyard. From these perambulations among the tombs he came in this afternoon and read us certain chapters from the history of Canada thirty years ago. He told us some startling things with regard to the conduct of elections in that distant period. But it is not necessary for us who are in political life to-day to become body-snatchers, or to walk about the graveyards in order to find evidence of political corruption. We can take the records of recent history, and to one of these I propose to call the attention of the hon. member. Of course, it is too much to expect that my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) should know anything about this episode to which I propose to refer. And for two reasons. One is that it is a matter of comparatively recent date and my hon. friend cannot be expected to know about such things. The other is that the document read refers particularly to some rather malodorous performances of the political party with which he is connected. In the hon. gentleman's own province of Ontario, there have been, in times not very remote—much less remote than thirty years ago—some startling revelations in connection with the conduct of elections. Some people might think it extraordinary that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) had heard nothing about it. I am sure that if he were to ask any of those who sit near him in this House, they would be able to assure him that these things actually did take place in his own province and at a time in the recent past. It would have been well had the hon. gentleman asked some of those about him, some of the men who were associated with him in the work of the elections of 1896, that he might learn something of the history of the party to which he belongs and of which he is such an active member. I have in my hand a copy of the circular that was sent out by the Conservative organizer for the province of Ontario in 1896. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) was a candidate in that election or not. But, if he was a candidate, it is a fair presumption that the organizations supporting him had copies of this circular to which I shall refer. It is a fair presumption that he himself, as candidate—if he was a candidate—had copies of this circular in his possession and that he distributed them to his faithful followers. For the edification of the House, and especially for the edification of hon. gentlemen opposite who have become so virtuous in recent years, I am going to read this circular. It may appear cruel, but we know that sometimes it is necessary to be cruel in order to be kind. It seems really kinder on our part to wake up these gentlemen to a realization of the history of their own party in these matters. Says this Conservative organizer, in this charming document:

> We have the printing of the ballots, therefore, a sufficient number should be printed extra to enable the deputy returning officer to have them marked for our candidate and ready to use after the count to replace those read out wrongly to the scrutineers.

What a frank and interesting explanation.

> Or the deputy returning officer can have them marked and folded in his pocket to slip into the box in place of an opposition ballot, if opportunity offers.

And it has been shown by the evidence imported that the opportunity did offer on more than one occasion.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. BARKER. What book is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am reading from a circular sent out by the Conservative organizer——

Mr. BARKER. That circular is a fraud on the face of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) takes exception to the book from which I am reading.

Mr. BARKER. I asked the hon. gentleman what book it was he was reading from.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) does not mind, I will take my own way to answer him; and I am sure I shall answer him to the satisfaction of the House and the country, though, perhaps, not to his own.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) said that he would answer my question. My question is: What book is the hon. gentleman reading from.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It does not make very much difference what book I am reading from. I am reading the circular issued by the Conservative organizer of the province of Ontario.

Mr. BARKER. On the face of it, that circular is untrue.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I understand very well that it does not seem desirable to hon. gentlemen that this should be brought up here, but it is necessary. It is necessary, not for the sake of the Liberal party or for the sake of hon. gentlemen on this side but for the sake of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is necessary for their spiritual nourishment, as an hon. gentleman beside me suggests.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jonhston is reading from a bogus book.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is disturbed about the book. Well, Mr. Speaker, had he ever seen before a book such as this I hold in my hand? This is 'Hansard.' If he desires it I will send him a copy of 'Hansard' in which he can read the circular which I am placing before you and before the members of this House. But that is not all the circular. I had not nearly completed this interesting document when I was interrupted by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is his anxiety to know exactly what I was reading.

To get control of both scrutineers, have one of our men—not a prominent one but a supposed kicker—to apply to the opposition as scrutineer inside. They are generally short of workers——

The Liberals in those days were supposed to be generally short of workers.

—and a few plausible men will turn the election in a close constituency.

There is the doctrine taught to the people in those good old days to which my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) desires we should return. Here is another gem:

Efforts should be made to make these methods work in wards that give heaviest opposition vote.

I want my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to take special note of this. I am sure he has never seen it before:

Having control of both scrutineers, a large vote can be polled—dead and absent electors &c., can have their ballots marked.

Just fancy the active workers of the Conservative party in 1896, throughout the great province of Ontario, marking ballots for the dead and absent. What an interesting operation that must have been. I wonder if my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was engaged in it.

Dead and absent voters can have their ballots marked. There is no redress if both scrutineers were present. A friendly constable should be present to keep the poll clear of loungers and inquisitive people.

What right had anybody, in these good old days previous to 1896, to go into a polling booth in the province of Ontario and ask questions? That was no place for inquisitive people. Here is another ingenious piece of advice:

The deputy returning officer should be a reliable, sharp and plausible man, so that if we do not get control of the opposition scrutineer, he can, when the counting time arrives, ask both scrutineers to take a piece of paper and record the votes for their candidates as he reads the ballots which have been emptied on the table. He will then have a chance to read out wrongly.

Thus the first duty of this plausible man was to read out wrongly the ballots as they came out of the boxes, and that was to be one of his expert qualifications.

He will then have a chance to read out wrongly, so that a majority can be secured for our candidate. The ballots should be put back into the boxes as quickly as they are read.

Certainly put them back before any honest man has a chance of coming around and ascertaining for whom the ballots are really marked.

The extra ones will do to fix things correctly when he goes home.

Thus, when this plausible returning officer, selected by the party of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) before 1896, read out the ballots wrongly, he had also taken care to provide himself with a sufficient number of ballots marked for his candidate, which would do to fix things up when he went home. Here is another exquisite bit of inormation:

Spoiled ballots can be made sure by a little doctoring. Opposition ballots can be spoiled by the lead out of a pencil fastened under the little finger with beeswax, drawn across opposite our candidate's name in opening the ballot.

If you cannot get control of opposition scrutineer, have your deputy returning officer announce that he is against you, so as to lead him astray if possible.

Yes, the whole object was to lead him astray. That, I am quite sure, is a little piece of the political history of the Conservative party which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) should look up. I am quite sure that if he had known that his own party had issued this circular before 1896, he would have devoted his whole time to it this afternoon instead of resuscitating thirty years's old history. But that is not all. I propose to submit to the consideration of my hon. friends opposite the testimony of one who is a most active man among them, who is a living force to-day, who is a member of this House on that side to-day, who has been a member of the Conservative party many long years, and who no doubt knows what he is talking about. I am quite sure that no one on that side will venture to say that when that hon. gentleman made the statement I am about to read he did not know what he was talking about. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. McLean) is a live political force in this country to-day, as hon. gentlemen opposite have had the opportunity of knowing quite recently. He gave us some history, not so very long ago, regarding the methods employed by the Conservative party as late as 1902 for the purpose of carrying elections in the city of Toronto. The newspaper conducted by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), the Toronto 'World,' one of the brightest papers in the city of Toronto, gave prominence to the following statement, published immediately after an election in the good city of Toronto. That statement is headed 'The Surest Way':

Are you a worker in that subdivision? Yes, I handle it. How much will it cost? $200. Will you guarantee to keep the vote even for that? Yes, I will. All right, here is the money. But do you see this other hundred dollar bill? Yes. And you know this gentleman here? Yes, I know him and can trust him. Well, I am going to give the hundred dollars to him. If you will make the majority in your division ten better, he will hand you the bill when the count is made and the majority is shown. I understand and will do it.

In the city of Toronto, under the immediate gaze of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), this happened as late as 1902; but in his anxiety to recall what took place thirty years ago, he overlooked it entirely. That was the sole reason for him not reciting this interesting piece of history to the House this afternoon. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), or the paper conducted by him, went a little further in 1902 on the same occasion. Under the heading of 'Professional Corruptionists,' it said:

The public are being aroused at last to the existence in Toronto of an organized system of professional corruptionists. They have a nest in the centre of the city. They handle the money of corporations; their mission has been to corrupt representatives of the people and to corrupt electors; most of all to invade the one thing that ought to be sacred in our politics—the ballot box.

I wonder if it can be the constituency represented by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). That is the evidence of a prominent member of the Conservative party, occupying one of the most prominent positions on the other side, and familiar with the history of the Conservative party during many years. That is the testimony I have to submit to the House. We do not have to go around body-snatching and bring up the evidence of professional and self-confessed perjurers in support of the statements we make, but we bring men who are living, active forces in the community to-day and present their testimony for the consideration of this House. But there is more than that. In South Ontario there was an election not so very long ago, of which no doubt my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has some recollection.

In March, 1898, the government of Ontario appealed to the people and on that occasion one of their candidates in the riding of South Ontario was defeated by a very narrow majority. The matter of that election subsequently came into the courts, and we have as a part of the history of this country the evidence of one William Smith, and the evidence of that gentleman William Smith is very interesting in the light of the professions of our friends during the last few months. He sat in this House as Conservative member for the riding of South Ontario and it is interesting at this date as I observed to read his testimony on that occasion. For the information of those who are not familiar with this history, for the information more particularly of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who has not heard of this before, I desire to put it on 'Hansard.' Mr. Smith came into court in connection with this election in South Ontario. He was cross-examined by counsel and the cross-examination was as follows:—

Q. Did you use any money during that election?—A. I did.
Q. For what purpose?—A. I suppose for buying votes.
Q. How much money did you use?—A. I cannot tell you.
Q. About how much?—A. I cannot tell.
Q. Over $100?—A. I never bought a man personally.
Q. Over $100?—A. Yes.
Q. Over $200?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $300?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $400?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $500?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $600?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $700?—A. It might be.

Q. Over $800?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $900?—A. It might be.

Mr. BERGERON. Make it $1,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Oh, yes, but for the information of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) I like to draw this out.

Mr. BERGERON. What book is the hon. gentleman reading from ? I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman should inform the House from what document he is reading.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have a document here.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend has done the same thing before. He said he was reading from 'Hansard' but he has not told us from what volume or from what page. I ask you Mr. Speaker, whether an hon. gentleman quoting from a book is not obliged to inform the House from what book he is reading ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the rule is so general. I think in the case of ministers reading extracts from public documents they are obliged to lay the documents on the table of the House, but the practice now is and it is laid down specifically that

It is now in order for a member to make extracts from books, newspapers or other printed publications as part of his speech, provided in doing so he does not infringe on any point of order.

I think in view of this that a member is at liberty to read extracts and it is optional with himself whether he shall table the document or not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It affords me great pleasure to come to the rescue of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and inform him where he can get the extracts. He can get them in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. What year ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Year 1900.

Mr. BERGERON. What volume ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Three, date May 17, 1900, and the page, 5627.

The cross-examination by counsel continues.

Q. Over $900?—A. It might be.
Q. Over $900 you used for buying votes at that election?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. Then you are willing to say that you used money for buying votes at that election?—A. Yes.

Who would have thought in view of the protestations of the hon. member for North Toronto that this man who was giving this testimony was sitting behind the member for North Toronto the very year he was giving this testimony as one of his faithful followers. It seems most extraordinary that the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on that occasion did not tender his seat back to the people and refuse to handle the money of the people of this country. It is not so written nor has it been spoken up to date. The cross-examination continued.

Q. Did I understand you to say that you did not pay out any money yourself?—A. No, not to the individual voters.
Q. How did you work it?

This is interesting.

Q. How did you work it? Did you select the persons to pay it out?—Yes, sir.
Q. Can you give the persons?—A. No, sir.
Q. Do you decline to name the persons?—A. I do.
Q. Do you know the persons but decline to name them?—A. I do.
Q. How many persons were there that you gave money to?—A. I do not propose even to tell that.

The counsel then appeals to His Lordship and Judge Osler remarks :

I think he may be asked that question.

And counsel proceeds :

Q. How many persons were there to whom you gave money?—A. Half a dozen.
Q. How much to each?—A. I cannot tell that from memory.
Q. Have you a memorandum?—A. No.

Then Judge Ferguson who was sitting on the case went on to say :

Can you tell us how much more than $900 you paid?—A. No, I can't.
Q. Can you say not as much as $1,200?—A. It could not be more than $1,200.
Q. Will you say it was not more than $1,200? —A. No, I cannot.

After some further questions, Judge Ferguson asked :

Have you any means of saying where Baker got the money that he actually did spend? Does he own a bank?—A. No, sir.

In the course of the argument of Mr. Patterson, counsel for the accused, he claimed that Mr. Smith, this Conservative ex-M. P. had given his evidence in a candid manner and Judge Osler made this observation:

I shouldn't call Mr. Smith's manner candid.

Mr. Patterson, counsel for Mr. Smith, said:

He showed no disposition to fence with the counsel.

Judge Osler remarked:

I should call it brazen, that is the word.

In giving judgment, Judge Ferguson remarked:

I look upon the evidence of Smith as being a brazen, distinct, strong denial, a denial that I do not believe and I prefer to take the evidence of Baker as against the evidence of these other two. I think Mr. Smith's evidence cannot be too strongly condemned as it bears

on the question, it is discredited by his admission that he was guilty of this gigantic corruption.

Judge Ferguson said further:

I have some regrets that this large offender, Mr. Smith, is not before us. I have nothing to say to him but that his evidence is the most glaring piece of corruption I have ever heard.

Now, this is the testimony not of 30 years ago, but the testimony of recent years, and the testimony given by a man who sat behind hon. gentlemen and among hon. gentlemen as a member of the Conservative party of this country, and when they come before the people of this country and say that the Liberal party has been the mother of corruption in this country they should bear in mind that they have a history in this country and they should open their eyes and discover the beam in their own eyes because everybody in this country from end to end long ago has seen and discovered that beam. Why, in every household in the country nothing is better known than the fact that for years previous to 1896 the history of the Conservative party, not alone in the province of Ontario but in many other provinces in this country, has been one of the most flagrant corruption and the records are full of instances to prove the statement I am making.

I am reminded that so satisfied were our friends opposite with the record of this man whose testimony I have been giving to the House, so satisfied were they as to the extraordinary manner in which he would serve them, so satisfied were they as to his fitness for being a member of the Conservative party in this House that at the very earliest opportunity they again sought his services and placed him in nomination in the riding of South Ontario, in the province of Ontario. Yes, and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who a few evenings ago, lectured this House upon its duty in this matter, lectured the Liberal party more particularly upon its duty in this matter, did not hesitate on that occasion to go to the riding of South Ontario in support of this man who has been named by a judge of the Supreme Court of the province of Ontario as one of the most glaring corruptionists that have come before the people of this country. Are these the men from whom the people of Canada are going to take lessons in political morality or electoral purity? So long as that history remains, so long will the people of this country refuse to take lessons in morality and electoral purity from these men who have set themselves up as teachers.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he was reading from the 'Hansard' of 1900, Vol. 3, and he gave the page. I cannot find his extract.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I may have given the wrong volume. It is volume 2, page 5627.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

Well I find here in recent history, not the ancient history quoted by the member for West Toronto, a circumstance to which I wish to allude. As late as 1900 there was a general election in this country, and I wish to refer to what occurred in the county of Welland the hon. gentleman representing which county I do not see present. There was a Conservative association in the county of Welland, and the secretary of that organization wrote a letter to Mr. H. A. Rose, of Toronto, in which he said:

Dear Hugh,—Your note received. I have settled with both your claimants and everything in that line is O.K. In a few days the finances will be straightened out and I will have Col. Raymond forward you your expenses. We expect to have another contest on here in a few months and then we will require your assistance again, and if I have anything to do with it the town end will be managed differently. I have pointed out to the local big guns that you are the only man of the bunch——

It would be interesting to get hold of that bunch.

I have pointed out to the local big guns that you are the only man of the bunch who secured your men and did it with less money.

Yes, he secured his men, and he did it with less money than the rest, therefore his services were so satisfactory that he was notified in advance that at the next general election he would be sent for by the Conservatives in the county of Welland. I have no doubt they have kept their hands on him ever since, and that he is available at a moment's notice. Here is something else that I do'nt know about, if my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) was here he would be able to explain the significance of these things.

Eddie was telling Sears last night a little story which leads me to believe Ireland might have been playing the double cross. The Major claimed he told him everything. I think I will feel Eddie and see if he will give up any of his guts to me. You do the same with Ireland. I am now preparing lists of every Conservative in town who voted for us. You might be able to pick up some new tricks in Toronto.

Ah, there it is again. I wonder if it was in the constituency represented by the hon. member for West Toronto that this man was expected to pick up these new tricks.

We want to be prepared for the next.

Yes, and we are desirous that you who have proven yourself so skilful and so satisfactory to the Conservative Association should be ready to help us. Now so much for history that is not ancient, but is comparatively new. But we have some more history still more recent, showing the methods by which our Conservative friends conduct elections. The leader of the opposition, while addressing the House a day or two ago, made some observations with regard to the recent contest in Queen's and

Shelburne, Nova Scotia, from which the Minister of Finance was triumphantly returned on the 31st of October last. The leader of the opposition said: I desire to say that anything I have said about the Minister of Finance I am prepared to stand by. Well, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was unfortunate in that he only took this position after the election was over, we did not have an opportunity of knowing what we had to say with regard to the Minister of Finance before the election. But on his behalf we have the opinion of a gentleman who was well known in this House, because he sat here for ten years as a prominent member of the Conservative party. He sat in this House until 1896, and I am quite sure that neither the leader of the opposition nor any man supporting him will dispute the statement of Dr. Weldon in this connection. Dr. Weldon was a candidate in 1896 and in 1900. He was not a candidate in 1904, but he was closely identified with the Conservative party, and it is a fair presumption that he knew well the history of the Conservative party in that province. In the recent contest in Queen's and Shelburne he was giving to the electors some sidelights on the history of the Conservative party. He told the electors of that county over and over again that he was asked in 1904 to become the candidate of the Conservative party in one of the constituencies in Nova Scotia. He said he was waited upon by the leaders of the Conservative party in the city and county of Halifax who were running my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as their candidate, and asked him, Dr. Weldon, to become their candidate. We do not know where he was to become their candidate, we only know that he was asked by the leaders of the Conservative party in the city of Halifax who were running the leader of the opposition as their candidate, to stand for one of the counties and he says that the proposition he made to them was this: If I become your candidate will you consent to run a pure and clean election in the constituency? They instantly told him that they would not and the moment they told him that they would not, he refused to become their candidate. That is the history of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia. It is not thirty year old history; it is only two year old history. We have had it from a gentleman, as I have already observed, who knows what he is talking about, who knows the history of the Conservative party, who worked with the Conservative party for many long years, who was very closely identified with the Conservative party, who, to-day, is associated with and looked upon as one of the most prominent members of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, who was the candidate chosen by that political party and also by the hon. the leader of the opposition to oppose my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the recent contest, and surely when we have such testimony coming from him it is worth more—worth far more than the testimony of any self-confessed perjurer whose evidence has been submitted to this House. Now, there is something more. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, speaking a few days ago, said that anything he had said in regard to the Minister of Finance and the election in Queen's and Shelburne he was prepared to stand by. As I have said we were denied an opportunity of knowing what my hon. friend had to say, but we were not denied the opportunity of knowing what the newspapers supporting that hon. gentleman on that occasion had to say and those of us who have taken the trouble and those of us who have followed the campaign set up by the papers supporting the candidate of the hon. leader of the opposition know well that probably in the history of this country a more scandalous campaign never was conducted on behalf of any political party. Let those who dispute the statement I am making refer to the columns of the Halifax 'Herald,' the chief organ of the hon. leader of the opposition and of his party in the province of Nova Scotia. It is a fair presumption that the Halifax 'Herald' and the other Conservative newspapers in Nova Scotia represent the views of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and if they do represent the views of the hon. leader of the opposition—then I would say to him that he should hesitate a long time before linking himself to the statements made on behalf of the Conservative party in these newspapers to which I allude. Let me refer to one instance. From the town of Liverpool, in the county of Queen's and Shelburne, was sent out what I do not hesitate to say was a slander of the vilest character a few days previous to the election. In order to prejudice the fishermen in Queen's and Shelburne against Mr. Fielding and the Liberal party on the eve of the election, from the town of Liverpool, and it is well understood that it was sent out by the organizer of the party, a statement was sent out which is known to-day by everybody, which is known to-day by even Dr. Weldon to be most damaging in its character, to be utterly at variance with the facts, and yet this statement was sent out in the hope of being of service to the political party represented by the hon. the leader of the opposition. That story was to the effect that certain gentlemen engaged in the lobster business in Nova Scotia had gone down to the counties of Queen's and Shelburne and supported by certain other gentlemen who were and are in public life, were endeavouring to create a great big combine in fish in Nova Scotia, which would squeeze to the very last degree the fishermen of the counties of Queen's and

Shelburne. It was hoped that this would alarm the fishermen and prejudice them against the Liberal party and that on the eve of the election. Now, I propose to read to this House and for the information of the people of this country the denial of a man who was charged with being guilty of misconduct. I have reference to the denial made by Mr. H. E. Baker, of Sydney, who was charged by the Conservative organizer, or the organizer of the hon. leader of the opposition, by whose every action, he said, the other day he was prepared to stand. Mr. Baker says :

As to my going to Queen's-Shelburne, to distribute money for campaign purposes, as insinuated by the 'Herald,' I have only to say that I was never offered in my life any money by either political party for any such purpose nor for any purpose whatsoever, except once when a prominent leader of the Conservative party offered me a large sum, which I declined to accept.

If the 'Herald' and the Conservative party in their zealous efforts for pure and clean elections desire to know more about this matter I will be glad to give it to them publicly or privately under affidavit.

Well, so much for the election in Queen's and Shelburne. The country generally is aware of the fact that the election in Queen's and Shelburne resulted in the handsome endorsement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. For months the people in this country and the people of Nova Scotia particularly were told that it was a great crime to have any member of the House of Commons unseated. Indeed they sought everywhere throughout the country to create the impression that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was the first member to be unseated in this country for a violation of the election law, but these people forgot the fact that prominent members on the other side of the House have over and over again been unseated. They should look to the judgment of the court, because in the judgment of the court they will find that the judges who tried the election petition against my hon. friend the Minister of Finance were careful to say that nothing in the whole trial in any way whatsoever reflected upon the conduct of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The judges were careful to say that he knew absolutely nothing about the efforts made in his behalf which resulted in his unseating.

I bring these matters to the notice of the House and to the notice of the country in order to show to some extent at least that the history of the Conservative party in this country on the particular question of purity in politics is not one which entitles them to rise in their places and set themselves up as a party who are going to teach the people correct methods of conducting elections. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was bold the other day as well, and in this connection let me refer to an observation made by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) a few moments ago. He wanted to know what my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) was aiming at when he intimated that there were some charges against the hon. member for North Toronto. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Wright intimated that there were any charges against the hon. member for North Toronto or not, but it was clearly in the mind of my hon. friend from West Algoma that there were some charges hovering in the air against the hon. member for North Toronto, because the hon. member for West Algoma told this for the first time that the hon. member for North Toronto was preparing to defend himself. The hon. member for West Algoma, in one breath, said that there were no charges against the hon. member for North Toronto, and in the very next breath he said that the hon. member for North Toronto was preparing to defend himself against the charges if there were any made against him. I would commend to the careful perusal of the hon. member for North Toronto certain articles which have been appearing in recent months in certain of the Conservative papers in Canada. I would commend to his especial consideration certain articles written for the Toronto 'News,' a newspaper which I am sure no man on this side of the House or either side of the House will charge with being unduly lenient to the present government. As to whether or not there are charges, I commend him to a perusal of the Halifax 'Herald,' the organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, and which delights to copy from the Toronto 'News' or any other paper anything that reflects upon my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I commend him to the Halifax 'Herald' of the 22nd of November, 1906, which sets out in large headlines :

Keen criticism of Hon. G. E. Foster's position in Conservative party—Independent and caustic review of the effect on the country of the side issues brought to light by the insurance investigation—The duties and fighting effectiveness of an opposition.

I commend to his special consideration the sentence which I am about to read:

Mr. Borden would greatly strengthen himself with the people by relegating Mr. Foster to a seat on the back benches of the party.

That is not the testimony of a Liberal newspaper, that is the testimony which is found in the Halifax 'Herald' the leading organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia of date November 22, 1906. So that when he wonders what my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) had in his mind, let him go to the columns of these newspapers ; these papers which are more familiar with the history of the member for North Toronto and more familiar with the history of the Conservative party than we are. There he will find whether or not

there is any foundation for the rumors that have been rife throughout this country during recent months. One word more: the hon. gentleman had something to say about switching ballots and about tampering with ballots. I join with the leader of the government who said in this House the other day: That while the man who purchased votes was to be detested the man who tampered with the ballot boxes was much more to be condemned. And when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was taking this high moral stand in the House, he should have remembered that as late as 1891 there was an election in the county of King's, New Brunswick, and he should have remembered that on the night of that election a certain gentleman returned to the city of St. John defeated by the ballots of the honest voters of the constituency but the following morning that same gentleman was declared elected as the member for King's, New Brunswick. The hon. member for North Toronto should remember the incident before he undertakes to lecture this House or to lecture this country on purity in elections. I would commend this incident to the careful, indeed to the prayerful consideration of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and particularly of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I have never before said a word in a debate on the address and I would not speak now had it not been for the little reading that the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) gave us from a pamphlet. I asked him what he was reading from ; he immediately offered to tell me, he has taken very good care not to do so. I have never seen it printed in a book or the manuscript of it. But I recollect hearing some four or five years ago that a man from the State of Ohio who professed to be an expert at getting up campaign literature—Mabee I think he was called,—came over to the province of Ontario and offered to sell to the Conservative party a manuscript for publication which he said was excellent campaign literature against the Liberals. It was of such an absurd and outrageous character that no man of common sense would have believed in the thing or in any part of it. No Conservative in this country, whatever he might have thought of the Liberals or of any Liberal, would for one moment have accepted the statements in that man's paper. Nobody but a fool would have been taken in. The Conservatives absolutely rejected the thing, they would have nothing to do with it. I was informed that this ingenious Mr. Mabee transposed the language of the precious document, and wherever the word 'Liberal' appeared in this work of his he put the word 'Conservative,' and vice versa, and he found some fool or rogue in the Liberal party with so little sense and so much money that he was willing to buy the pamphlet. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnson) knows that this is not new. When he got up to speak he knew that the whole thing had been exposed years ago. No honest man would believe in that pamphlet. I ask if there is an hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House who heard what the member for Cape Breton read would believe for a moment that any man in his senses —a Conservative official or organizer or whatever you may call him—would be such a consummate ass as to write a paper of that kind and issue it as a Conservative circular. Be it said to the credit of the Conservatives, there was not such an ass to be found in our party. The moment it was shown the Conservatives saw what it was and let Mabee go and he sold to some one else that thing which the member for Cape Breton has read to-night. Now Mr. Speaker, I am not going to occupy this House for many minutes. I am sure there is not a Conservative in this Dominion possessed of so little sense that he would read that circular and believe that it emanated from any political party. I did not think there was such an ass in either party as to believe such a thing. I can hardly believe it now. I don't believe the member for Cape Breton thinks it. But he has not hesitated to read it and he has read it seriously here as adding to the dignity of the debate in response to the address. Can anything more contemptible be thought of in such a connection ? Will the hon. gentleman say as an honest honourable man that he believes that thing was written by any Conservative ? I hope he is not capable of such a belief. I don't believe there is any gentleman on the other side of the House who believes it for one moment. If a man on this side of the House got up and said he believed that of a Liberal, I would say he ought to be sent to the lunatic asylum.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I have no desire whatever to prolong the discussion and I do not intend to raise any contentious question. I simply rise from a sense of responsibility to say a word in regard to the threatened fuel famine in Saskatchewan. Before the Order of the Day on Friday last I called the attention of the government to a very alarming report which was attributed to the Hon. Walter Scott by the Ottawa 'Free Press' in regard to this matter, and I expressed the hope that the government would be able to assure the House that immediate and strenuous action would be taken. The Prime Minister replied as follows:

The government is alive to the situation which exists in the Northwest and it only re-

grets that it has not more power to deal with it. The Department of Labour, which is the only department which can deal with the matter, has sent Mr. Mackenzie King to try if possible to bring about a settlement of the strike.

In view of the previously expressed opinion by Mr. Scott, that it was very doubtful whether such a matter came within the power of the provincial authorities to deal with, I can only state that the right hon. gentleman's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier's) reply is not very reassuring, and express my conviction that he cannot be realy alive to the critcal nature of the situation. The latest newspapers from the Northwest are full of very alarming reports, which I fear, in many cases, are only too well founded. A good deal, of course, will depend upon the weather of the next few weeks. The necessity for more drastic measures than were referred to by the Prime Minister is immediate and imperative. Even if Mr. Mackenzie King is successful in his effort to end the strike at Lethbridge, which has been going on, I think, for nearly nine months, and appears to be a very difficult matter to settle. I doubt very much if the immediate difficulty will be done away with. And I venture to think that people who may be facing the prospect of possibly freezing to death will expect some more definite action than has been promised by the Prime Minister. It must be remembered that a large population has gone into the Northwest during the past year, including many people who have had no experience of the rigours of a Canadian winter, and many, possibly, with no conception of what our winter may be like. The dwellings of many of them, also, will scarcely be in shape to enable them to stand the cold that may come at any moment, unless they have a good supply of fuel. The distances are very great, and recent snowstorms will make transportation very difficult at this time. Under the legislation passed last year, parliament refused to hand over the ownership and control of the public domain to the new provinces. To my mind, these new provinces had a right to this public domain. But whether I am right or wrong in that opinion—and the matter is one which I do not wish to raise at this time—the fact is that the Dominion government control, and, I believe, is now making a revenue out of the royalties on the coal supply of that country. This control carries responsibilities with it. There are also responsibilities fastened upon the government by the large number of settlers whom they have brought into that country, many of whom, as I have said, have no experience of what they may have to face. I feel that every precaution ought to be taken so that suffering may not take place amongst these people, both from the humane point of view and from the point of view of the harm it may do to this country if such a thing happened. This is a matter in which the government cannot afford to take any chances. The climate of that country is too severe for that. I do not wish to appear as an alarmist in regard to this matter; but any one who has had experience of the conditions of life in the Northwest must realize that the present situation is full of danger. No question as to the relative responsibility of the provincial authorities on the one hand and the Dominion authorities on the other, should stand in the way of effective action at this time. If suffering should unfortunately take place, the people will not be satisfied with a mere formal expression of regret on the part of the government that they did not possess power to deal with the question beyond the power which is vested in the Department of Labour. The people will want to know that there is some authority which realizes its responsibility in this matter and is prepared to discharge that responsibility and see to it that the people of that country have an opportunity to obtain a sufficient supply of fuel to see them through any rigorous weather which may occur, and that at no too runious a price.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I can assure the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) that he is not more fully impressed with the importance of this question than are the members of the government. I can assure him also that there is nobody in the Northwest, either he as a representative or any member of the community there who is more earnestly in sympathy with the demands of the situation and the needs of the people. It seems, however, to be an occasion where the difficulty is to overcome the lack of coal. So far as we could see, the only method to bring about a supply immediately was to secure the working of the Lethbridge mines. These mines have been the source of supply of fuel for that part of the country; not the only source by any means, because, fortunately, there are coal measures in the northern part of Alberta as well as at Lethbridge, and in the southern part, and the working of these is not affected by this strike.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And are they being worked ?

Mr. FISHER. They are, and are putting out coal, but not on anything like the scale of the Lethbridge mines. Moreover, they are further away from most of the consumers, and so the freight charges on this coal will be a little higher. So far as I can make out, it is not a question of the price of coal, but simply the fact that people have been—I will not say taken by surprise—but have not foreseen the crisis. And dealers in coal have not seen the necessity of preparing to supply their trade from other

sources, probably hoping and expecting that the strike at Lethbridge would cease, and that they would obtain their supply as heretofore.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long has the strike continued ?

Mr. FISHER. For some months, I believe. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) said that it had continued for nine months.

Mr. LAKE. Since the beginning of March.

Mr. FISHER. But I believe that during the summer time the strike was not looked upon as a serious thing. And it was only in the fall that the immediate need for a supply became evident and the people became alarmed.

I am glad to say that our latest information is that the Lethbridge mines are producing to-day at the rate of 500 tons a day, and that coal is being sent forward from day to day. The usual output, however, at this time of the year is three or four times this quantity. The supply of 500 tons a day is undoubtedly inadequate to meet the demands of the country.

Mr. OSLER. My information is that they are producing only 200 tons a day.

Mr. FISHER. Our information on Saturday was 500 tons, and I can only give the facts as they are given to us. The obvious, and, it seems to us, the most likely method of overcoming the difficulty was to overcome the strike, in Lethbridge. To that end Mr. McKenzie King, the deputy minister of labour, was sent out. He has been dealing with the matter, and we have hopes that his efforts will be successful, that in a few days the strike will end and the labourers return to their work and the supply of coal be rushed forward. If these hopes are realized, I do not know that there is anything more that the government can do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the strike a question of wages only, or are there other conditions in dispute.

Mr. FISHER. I believe there are other conditions as well. The workmen and the owners are being brought into communication by Mr. King, with the hope of a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. I confess that my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has not presented to the House any other solution of the question which seems more feasible. I had hoped, when he rose, that he was going to propose some action on our part which would appeal to our reason and common sense. I do not see anything more that we can do. We can hardly, as a government, undertake the business of distributing coal throughout the Northwest. We could not do that so expeditiously or as well as we can accomplish the same end by terminating the Lethbridge strike. We are waiting anxiously further news from Mr. McKenzie King and are hoping that it will be most satisfactory.

I did not intend to take part in this debate but there was a word from the lips of the hon. member from East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) to which I would like to refer. He drew the attention of the House to the necessity of certain classes of our agricultural products in which cold storage would play an important part. I shall not go into that question in detail, but wish to compliment my hon. friend for having drawn our attention to it. It is undoubtedly a very important one, and the views he put forward are quite in accord with my own, although I would not like perhaps to endorse entirely all the figures and statements he made. This matter has been occupying my attention as Minister of Agriculture, a great deal lately. Various propositions have been made by which the objects pointed out by my hon. friend might be realized. Among these has been a proposition to provide cold storage warehouses throughout the country by means of a government guarantee of the bonds. We do not see our way to give such a guarantee in behalf of a private corporation which, from its very nature, might take a monopolistic form and thus interfere very seriously with the objects desired. However, I am glad to be able to say to my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) and the other members interested in this question that I think we have been able to elaborate a proposition by which we shall encourage the establishment and equipment of cold storage warehouses in the various centres where the demands of the trade and production seem to justify them. And I have asked my colleagues to put into the estimates, shortly to be laid on the table, an item for this purpose. I simply say these few words to endorse what my hon. friend from East Huron has said and to assure him that we are fully impressed with the desirability of our attaining the objects he has in view.

Mr. LAKE. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that he would like some suggestions from myself.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Might I make the suggestion which I think this House would be willing to accept. I understand there is a large supply of coal at Fernie, and I would suggest that the government should take possession of that coal and distribute it throughout the country, no matter at what cost. There are thousands of lives hanging in the balance, and no cost should stand in the way of preventing loss of life.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I intended at the opening of the House to-day to make an announcement regarding the Lethbridge coal strike, but after consideration I thought it better to

wait until to-morrow. I believe that to-morrow I shall be in possession of such information as will satisfy my hon. friends and the House that the strike is ended. This afternoon I received from my deputy minister (Mr. King), a telegram in which he said that he had sat up until two o'clock this morning with the miners and the employers and that they had practically concluded an arrangement. I expected that he would have been able to wire me this afternoon that the strike was ended and that work would be resumed to-morrow.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois.) I was disappointed in not finding in the speech from the Throne some announcement of the policy of the government as regards the amending of the Labour Act. I read the other day with pleasure some remarks made by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) in Nicolet. Speaking about the strike in Buckingham, he expressed the opinion that the Act was defective and should be amended, and I understood that it would be amended this session. The defect of the Act is that it provides no means of enforcing any order from the Labour Department. It is all very well to send Mr. King, who is a very intelligent man, to give advice, but he is not invested with any power to settle any difficulty. Strikes are becoming very frequent in Canada. This strike in the Northwest is, from the information given by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), very alarming. It is one which has lasted since the month of March. We have had a strike in Fernie and Michel and some other coal centres and we had quite lately a strike in Buckingham, in which deplorable loss of life took place. We have also news to-night that in the strike now on in Hamilton people are threatening to shoot one another. It is said that 500 pistols have been purchased with which the men are arming themselves to oppose the troops. This is a most alarming and extraordinary condition of affairs and calls for immediate action to prevent such trouble. I have no advice to offer, but the government should devise some means of ending this deplorable condition of affairs. Although we cannot prevent workingmen from striking for increased wages or better conditions, we might possibly devise some means of preventing the men from not working. Some plan may be devised by the Department of Labour or the government by which an arbitration tribunal would be invested with certain power to meet the employers and employees and discuss matters with them with the view of bringing about a settlement which would prevent the men from losing any day's work. We all know that a strike causes great loss of labour and wages to the working men. In many cases they are out of work for weeks and months, and their families have in the meantime to suffer. It is all very well to talk about the organization of labour, but the labouring men are always the losers in the long run. I call the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) to this matter because I know he is very earnest and sincere in his desire that something should be done to avoid a recurrence of the conflicts we have been witnessing and which are now threatened in the city of Hamilton.

As I am on my feet, I wish to say a word in reply to the famous speech of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). We have heard that hon. gentleman talk for an hour about something that was entirely refuted six years ago. I am not surprised at all that my hon. friend was loath to put on the table of the House the papers he was reading from. It is not surprising. It has been declared here in 1900, on the 17th May, that it was a forgery. The whole thing was a lie from the commencement to the end.

Mr. MACDONALD. At what page of 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. Page 5642 and the page before and the page after. My hon. friend can amuse himself for some time in reading that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is sworn to by Freeborn.

Mr. BERGERON. Freeborn ?

Mr. CAMBPELL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is Freeborn ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The man you sent up.

Mr. BERGERON. He is still-born. Now every man in this House, I have no doubt, appreciates the manner in which elections have been carried on for some years past. It is no use using that 'tu quoque' argument ; whether it be true or not that some Conservatives have been guilty of acts of that sort is not at all a question which should be brought up to prevent the parliament of Canada from passing the most stringent laws so as to prevent in future what we are deploring in the past. But, Sir, let us be frank about this. The ballot was instituted in 1874. Immediately, less than two years after that, in 1876, in the county of Laval, it was known that ballot boxes had been stuffed by the Liberal party. Everybody knows the Ste. Anne affair in Jacques Cartier in 1878 when the ballot box was taken down into a cellar, the votes for Mr. Girouard, the Conservative candidate, were taken out of the box and replaced by votes for Mr. Laflamme, who was then Minister of Justice. It was well known, it went before the courts, the perpetrators were found guilty and punished and Laflamme, let me say to his honour—we were speaking a few days ago about the nice position taken by

Mr. Hyman, I commend him for it, but let me say to the credit of a man who is gone now, but who has relations still living, that Mr. Laflamme showed a keen sense of honour. The moment he heard what had been done in Ste. Anne's, the moment he was convinced it was true, he not only immediately resigned his seat, to which he had been proclaimed elected, but he had his opponent elected immediately without another election, and Mr. Girouard had not to go before the people but came here and took his seat on the 13th of February, 1879. Then it has kept on all the time. We can follow it since 1878 and unfortunately for hon. gentlemen opposite most of the time it has been their own candidates who have burned their hands in that fire of which my right hon. friend spoke the other day. But I want to accuse my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because I think it is one of those cases where we have to strike high. You cannot accuse the poor man who sells his vote. Bribery and corruption, although deplorable, can hardly be stopped in a constitutional community. Unfortunately some electors do not appreciate what it is to have a vote and traffic with it, but when it comes to stealing elections, when it comes to stealing the ballots, when it comes to stuffing boxes, when it comes to putting double bottoms in ballot boxes or when it comes to striking off by a red line as in Manitoba the names of free electors in the lists, disfranchising over 9,000 men in Manitoba, when it comes to that, I say that every man in Canada who has any love for his country should stand up whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative and say that everything possible must be done to prevent that in the future. What I want to blame my right hon. friend for is this. In 1899, I believe, when there was a question of what had been done in West Huron and Brockville, and when an investigation was granted by my right hon. friend before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and when my right hon. friend did not think that matters were as they were, he granted an investigation. He went further than that and said that everything of the kind that had been indicated would have to be stopped immediately. I admired him in that circumstance. We went before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I had the honour of being a member of that committee, and there it was proven as clear as day that ballots had been switched by a deputy returning officer himself ; he had been taught by Pritchett.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And we had the ballots there.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, we had the ballots there and at least 45 of those had been taken from Mr. McLean, the Conservative candidate, and given to Mr. Holmes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not a word against the returning officer.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, the returning officer, Mr. McNish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Cummings.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Cummings. I was present when he was examined and I was astonished to think he could switch ballots because he did not look like it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not in West Huron.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, you are mistaken.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and the session of 1899 closed before the investigation was over, in fact that investigation had been commenced at the end of the session, we had not the information soon enough. At the commencement of the next session the very same motion was made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asking that the same case might be brought before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and asking more than that, that we should be allowed to examine into the election in the constituency of Brockville, where we had every reason to believe the very same thing had taken place. That time, the Minister of Marine, Sir Louis Davies, was put up by the government to answer, and he refused to permit the investigation urging that that was no time to do so, that we should have contested the election, that it was childish and we should not do it. It was nearly six o'clock when he spoke, and a good many Liberal members, and I am proud to say this, I am glad that there were some men on your right, Mr. Speaker, who said: That is no answer, it has gone too far; and at eight o'clock the right hon. gentleman probably having heard it, gave a better reason and said: We will not send the case to the Privileges and Elections Committee, but we will do better than that, we will institute a royal commission composed of judges to examine these cases, not only in Huron and Brockville, but we will trace the matter further to find whether elections have been properly carried on in this Dominion. We have never heard of this commission since. Am I right in saying that the Prime Minister by not appointing that commission led every ballot crook and ballot thief in the country to believe that he was protected by the government ? And then what went on in West Elgin and St. James division of Montreal ? My right hon. friend knows what happened in St. James division. I heard some one speaking about buying the scrutineers. What my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) was reading was perfectly correct if he had put Liberal instead of Conservative. That is what they did in St. James, they

bought the scrutineers and it was easy afterwards ; they had the ballot boxes for themselves all day. In one poll there were 86 votes on the list. We all know that 50 per cent of the men in that division voted. In that poll, poll 33, I think, out of 86 names on the list 90 men voted, and my opponent had 86 of a majority. They stretched the string too much there and it broke and that is how we found it out. We brought the men before the court, I had Mr. Brunet, my opponent, not only unseated but disqualified and the other men I had brought before the criminal court. And again what happened to men who had been sent to gaol, one by the Chief Justice, another man by another judge of the High Court of Quebec ? They were taken out of gaol by order of the Minister of Justice. Now the people of this country are intelligent and the thieves are intelligent and the worse they are, probably the keener they are in certain ways. They thought they were immune, that the more they would do in that line the better they would stand with the government of Canada. That has been going on ever since. Those revelations in London are really a disgrace to Canada. Talk about this country being prosperous. Of course it is, and we are all proud of it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is something more important than prosperity that we should desire, and which is necessary to make us great, there are ideas of honour and honesty to be cultivated. We talk about inviting people to immigrate to Canada, a country which enjoys probably greater liberty than any other country in the world; but what will people abroad think of Canada when they read of the revelations of the London election ? When the Governor General the other day promised us a new election law, there was gladness all over the country. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) has been telling us what happened in the past, reading a circular which has been pronounced a forgery.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What about Dr. Weldon ?

Mr. BERGERON. Where is his testimony ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have given it.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is it? Now, I say that we should all join hands to put down this great evil. Why, Sir, I am surprised that there is a single man sitting on your left, in view of the desperate lengths to which the Liberal party will go. They have tried every device. In every election we have said to one another : What are they going to do this time ? We have to look to our right and we have to look to our left to see what new method they have invented to steal an election. Now is it not enough to make the people of Canada reflect when they heard the right hon. gentleman only the other day boasting about Mr. Preston ? Is Mr. Preston the honest man that my right hon. friend said he was the other day ? I do not like to speak of a gentleman who is not here. But certain things have been printed. Is it true that Mr. Preston was the man who invented all these different tricks to steal elections in the province of Ontario ? Is not he the man who telegraphed to some one to hug the machine for him ? And yet this man is rewarded for having done all that : Why, Sir, this government have given him a position as immigration agent in England to reward him for his work in corrupting elections. Does my right hon. friend believe that the people of this country are a lot of fools ? I think he still has some respect for some of them, although he has contempt for the majority of the electors. Mr. Preston came here last year and we examined him before the committee, and he refused to answer certain questions. He, an employee of the government, paid by the people's money, refused to answer questions put to him with regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company. We asked him, Where is that North Atlantic Trading Company? Where is this company which has passed a contract with a minister of the Crown, and to which the people of Canada have paid over $350,000? And he answers, 'I will not tell you, it is a secret.' And the majority of the committee stood by him, and afterwards the majority of the House stood by him. He declared he would not answer, and he dared the committee to make any attempt to compel him to answer. He must have had some reason for it.

Then there is another thief. There is a man who has been convicted of stealing and put in jail. He is immediately taken up by this government and his salary is increased. Now do you believe that the people of this country think that dishonesty is a good thing ? What is the best way of obtaining the confidence of this government ? Stealing. What is the best way of obtaining a position under this government? Getting people to perjure themselves. What about Jackson ? There was a lawyer in the province of Ontario who, it was proven gave money to a man to perjure himself. He should have lost his gown, but instead he is taken up by this government and given a position with a high salary in Europe, far from the arm of the Canadian law. Now what must the people think of public life in Canada when they read of these things? The other day when the member for North Toronto was talking about corruption. He said, 'Why should not the poor man sell his vote for $2 or $5?' It is well known to-day in Quebec—I do not know so much about the other provinces—that in order to obtain a position of judge it is necessary to have passed through the House of Commons, to have been a amem-

ber of Parliament. We had a little inkling of that to-day. Any one who can read between the lines must have understood the allusion made to-day by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). It may be unpleasant for his colleagues, the right hon. gentleman understood him better than anybody else. Most of the members from Quebec expect something from the government, either a judgeship or some other office. Why, there is to-day a difficulty in the government about the appointment of a judge for St. Hyacinthe, the question is whether they should appoint a member of parliament or some one else. I believe the understanding is that the position shall not be given to an outsider unless it is first refused by a Liberal member of parliament. Well, the electors understand these things. A man says, so and so goes to Ottawa, he gets a salary of $2,500 a year, he gets perquisites, passes on the railways, and why should not I sell my vote for $5 or $10 ? The example is given in the higher station and it is followed in the lower station. If you wish to purify political life in this country begin at the top and not at the bottom. The position taken by the Minister of Public Works is a commendable one, it is a good example. We cannot employ our time better in parliament than in an endeavour to purify the political atmosphere. Why, I do not think we should do any work in this House until after the government have brought down their promised legislation on this subject. I say that public opinion in the country has become nervous on this subject. My hon. friend opposite, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) laughs. He need not laugh, he may not get that position in the Cabinet. I know he deserves it, and he has been working hard for it, but he need not laugh now. I say that both sides of the House should co-operate in this work. I am ready to help the government to make an electoral law which will be effective, I am ready to help them to do anything which will tend to purify the political atmosphere. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I have detained you and the House, and I did not intend to do so. But, we are not losing any time to-night. We probably would have gone home as we have nothing else to do. I think there is no harm in talking as much as we can on this subject because the more members will talk about it the more the people will hear about it and the better it will be for the House of Commons and the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 27, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ENTRANCE TO PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to the fact that not only have we no Minister of Public Works to-day but no acting minister in his place. For many years it has been the practice of the Public Works Department to have all the steps leading to our public buildings covered with rough boards during this season. Last year the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) saw fit—I presume for the purpose of giving three or four contractors a job—to change the usual system, and he procured a lot of pine lumber, had it planed, and then had some blacksmith to prepare a lot of irons for the steps and attach them to these planed pine boards. Not finding that device slippery enough, he had the boards painted so as to make them still more slippery. And this year, now that the frost and snow are on, it is practically all a man's life is worth to undertake to walk up the steps leading to any of our public buildings. One man nearly lost his life this morning going into one of the buildings. He fell on these slippery steps and hurt himself very seriously. I hope the right hon. gentleman will have an acting minister or some one in the department to see that the steps are made safe for members of parliament and the public.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am happy to inform my hon. friend that there is an acting Minister of Public Works to-day in the person of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher).

Mr. TAYLOR. He never looks after anything, not even cold storage.

INQUIRY FOR REPORT.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Might I ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) when we may expect the report from his department ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I expect it will be laid on the table some time this week.

THE LETHBRIDGE COAL STRIKE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I told the House last night that I thought I would be able to make an announcement to-day regarding the Lethbridge coal strike. This morning I received a message from Mr. King, stating that the negotiations for a settlement were progressing favourably, and I am hoping every minute to receive the news that the strike is at an end.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (Centre York). The motion which has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is one that always excites a good deal of interest in this House and in the discussion on which very wide latitude is allowed. Not only questions indicated in the subject-matter of the speech, but also matters that may have been omitted, may be discussed. Any member of this House who has a grievance, or who imagines that anything has not been properly done, has a right to give his expression to his views on a motion of this kind. I am sure that the speech delivered by His Excellency affords very fruitful subject for debate. The recent visit of His Excellency to the west, the unparalleled progress of that important portion of our Dominion, the great flow into it of immigrants from lands beyond the seas, and especially the high character, as a rule, of our new population, are all subjects of interest and naturally call for some comment. The abundant prosperity, shown by the customs returns, and which will be given in detail in the financial statement about to be laid before the House, affords food for very gratifying reflection and consideration. The speech also alludes to the treaty recently made between Canada and Japan. It likewise foreshadows very important legislation, such as the amendments to the Customs Act and the election law, and one would naturally expect that such matters would receive a good deal of our attention. But to my surprise, I find that all these subjects have been passed over by hon. gentlemen opposite almost without a word, with the single exception of the promised amendments to the election law. And in this latter connection, the extremely wild statements which have been made by them are, to my mind, unworthy of the dignity of any hon. member of this House and not calculated to raise this parliament in the esteem of the people. The whole theme of these hon. gentlemen seems to be the gross corruption which they claim has prevailed, notably in the London election.

My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), in discussing this question last night, used what I consider very strong and very extreme language. The hon. gentleman prefaced his remarks by stating that he had been reading the political history of this country for the last twenty-five years, and he declared that he had never heard of such a thing as switching ballots, stuffing ballot boxes and bribing electors on behalf of the Conservative party. I wonder where this innocent abroad has been all this time. I wonder what he has been reading? Let me quote his exact words:

> The political corruption that has been unveiled in this country within a few months is without a parallel, so far as I know, in any English-speaking country in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite applaud that. I wonder if the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) had reference to certain investigations that took place in Toronto in reference to the municipal elections that took place there a short time ago. I wonder if he had in mind the investigations that took place recently before the Royal Commission in reference to certain trust funds. When he uses such extreme language as he does, I cannot but think that the hon. gentleman, though he may have carefully read the political history of Canada for the last twenty-five years, closed his ears and shut his eyes to what has been going on within public knowledge in his own time. In 1891 the whole country rang with charges of corruption that then prevailed. Did my hon. friend never hear of the case of South Ontario, mentioned by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) last night? In that case the Tory member for the county was accused, and admitted under oath, that he had spent at least $1,200 in bribing the electors of South Ontario. And yet his friends, forgetting that, nominated Mr. Wm. Smith, as Tory candidate for that county in the next election. Did the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) never hear of the election of 1891 in London? Did he never hear of the election of 1896 in London? These things were notorious, and the whole country rang with charges of corruption at that time. And not only were these things heard of in our Dominion, but such a powerful journal as the London 'Graphic' felt called upon to say in reference to the Dominion elections of 1891:

> The government rested on a stupendous and all-prevailing system of bribery and corruption, and even Tammany Hall smells sweet and clean in comparison with the huge stink-pot of the Canadian government.

Has the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt), this careful student of the political history of Canada of the last twenty-five years, never heard of this political corruption which the London 'Graphic' describes in such strong terms? And the London 'Telegraph' the leading organ of the Tory party in England was forced to say:

> Only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem public life in Canada from the taint of corruption the like of which we have not seen in our own country for hundreds of years.

And the London 'Echo' says:

> No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors and where ministers are open to offers.

And the St. James 'Gazette,' another organ of the Tory party in England, had this to say:

> The existence of an organized system of corruption among public officials in Canada has been conclusively proved, and, like everything else on the American continent, the bribery has been colossal.

And yet my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt), carefully reading the history of Canada, in his innocence and childlike simplicity, rises in this House and states that the investigation which took place within the last few months was never paralleled in this country and is not paralleled in any other country under the British flag. The hon. member also said, referring to the London election:

> A sufficient number of voters have been shown, on their own confession, to have received money in that election to have elected Mr. Gray, who, I believe, has been wrongfully deprived of his seat now on two occasions.

I would ask the hon. gentleman to read the speech of the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) last night. That speech shows that this investigation was started and carried on by the Attorney General of the province of Ontario. The whole treasury of Ontario was at their back—with its surplus of $2,000,000 which the Liberal party had piled up. They had, in Mr. DuVernet, one of the ablest counsel in Ontario, or in the Dominion of Canada. And he had at his back the police magistrate of Toronto. Nobody can say that the counsel was hampered or hindered in his investigation by the police magistrate. Every objection taken by the opposing counsel was overruled. The prosecution were allowed to go to the ends of the earth to subpœna witnesses. They had not to go into their pockets to find the money—the province of Ontario paid the bill. And, with all this, the hon. member for West Algoma shows us that, in this city of London, only $2,300 was shown to have been expended corruptly. And not one single scintilla of evidence was brought forward to show that Hon. Mr. Hyman, who was returned in that election, had any connection with or knowledge of this corruption. Do you suppose, Sir, that, with the means at their command, and with the strong desire they had to find evidence against Mr. Hyman, the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite would have failed to find it if it existed or would have failed to bring it forward if they had found it? Why, they were sitting up nights to hunt up evidence against Mr. Hyman. They exhausted every means that could be suggested to that end. And yet, the hon. member for West Algoma tells us they were only able to show some $2,300 spent corruptly. The hon. member for Brantford tells us that enough votes were shown to have been corruptly influenced to have turned the election. Why, more than half the men who admitted that they had received money declared that they were Liberals and intended to vote for Mr. Hyman in any case; and a number of others stated that they were Conservatives, while they took the money, they voted for Mr. Grey, the Conservative candidate.

I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is right, but I want to show the extravagant, wild statements made by some hon. gentlemen in this House. We can excuse the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce); he is a young man, he has not been reading the political history of this Dominion for the last 25 years, I think. He has not been conversant with the events that have been going on for the last 25 years and for any wild statements that he makes there is some excuse, but when you find men like the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), like the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), men who have been in the political arena for years and years, who have been studying the political history of this Dominion for 25 or 30 years, when you find men of that stamp and that character making such wild, unwarranted, untruthful statements as they made, I say, Sir, it is nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not a thing that is very edifying.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the word 'untruthful' is a word that should not be used and should be withdrawn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I meant to say inaccurate. I say that when we find gentlemen who have been old campaigners by their own admission for 25 years, who have been studying the political history of this Dominion making such wild inaccurate statements as they did, it has not a tendency to elevate the House of Commons in the eyes of the people of this Dominion.

Now, Sir, after all that has been shown by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Boyce), and goodness knows they have had every opportunity, and if there had been any corruption there to any extent they certainly would have been able to show it, they were anxious as I say to bring a charge against the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), they were doing everything they possibly could, and the very fact that they were not able after weeks of investigation with all the means at their disposal to bring home one single charge against the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) is to my mind conclusive evidence that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) was innocent in this matter and did not know what was going on. Sir, let us look back over the history of London elections; it is a subject that we might well investigate and before the matter is finally disposed of I hope that some further investigation will be made as to the conduct of elections in the city of London. It is notorious that

when the Conservative party guided the destinies of this Dominion every possible means to thwart the views of the people was employed. They had everything their own way. All the ballots were printed at the Tory printing offices. In 1901, all the ballots for the London election were printed in the Tory printing office in London. The revising officer was in charge and I say that if ever there was a man in this country who was unfairly treated, it was the Hon. Mr. Hyman in 1891. In that election the revising barrister, Mr. Fraser, made up the list. It was not made up by a judge of the land as it is now, it was made up by the revising barrister, Mr. Fraser. The Liberals appealed against 500 names that were proposed to be put on that list. They consulted Mr. Fraser as to the notice that they were to give for appeal and Mr. Fraser agreed with them that the notice was right. He afterwards took exception to it and said the notice was illegal but allowed them to amend it. They did amend it, and then the Conservatives appealed to the judge, Judge Elliott, who pronounced that in his opinion he had no jurisdiction but he gave it as his private opinion that the appeals were irregular. Acting on that the revising barrister immediately allowed the 500 names that they had put on the list and to which the Liberals objected. An appeal was taken to the higher court and Judge Burton, Judge Osler and Judge Falconbridge unanimously decided and issued a mandamus, compelling the revising barrister to hear the appeals. The revising barrister did then, acting on the instructions of the court, hear the appeals and will you believe it that when that trial came on, out of the 500 names no less than 230 were admitted by the revising barrister who was compelled to hear the appeals as being wholly illegal and unwarranted. One would suppose, Sir, that that party of purity of which my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is such an exponent, would settle the matter and that those 230 names would be struck off. But no, they were allowed to remain on the list pending an appeal by the Conservatives to the Court of Appeal in Toronto. This court, composed of Justices Haggarty, Burton, McLennan and Osler, held that they were good, and appeal was then taken to the Supreme Court at Ottawa by the Tories, and before the appeal was decided the election was brought on and those 500 names, 230 of which the revising barrister himself declared had no right to be on the list, were allowed to go on and 130 of those men voted at that election, 128 voting for the Conservative candidate, Mr. Carling, and only three, I suppose out of sympathy, voting for Mr. Hyman. Then, Sir, what was done? An election petition was entered The case came up and the question of the legality of these names was fought out in the court. If it could be established that those 230 names that the revising barrister himself said had no right on the voters' list were to be struck off, Mr. Hyman would have been returned as the member for London, but an appeal was taken to Judge Elliott and Judge Elliott, strange to say, although he had in the November election before declared that he had no jurisdiction at once turned around and reversed his decision and held that the notices were irregular, going against the seven judges, the highest judges of the land, who had declared that the notices were regular and that those 500 names should not be entered on the list. And yet, Sir, Judge Elliott reversed the decision of the whole seven judges and decided that the notice was irregular, the votes were counted with the result that Mr. Hyman in 1891 was deprived of his seat, and the Tory candidate, Sir John Carling sat here from 1891 to 1896 and he never offered to resign, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) has done to-day. There never was a more scandalous exposure than that election of 1891 and it is exceedingly strange and I marvel greatly that such a wise, such a learned man, a man who has been studying the political history of this country for 25 years has never heard of a case of that kind at all. I hope we will give him something more. The election of 1892 when Mr. Hyman was deprived of his seat was held to be valid and Sir John Carling sat until 1896. Another election was held in 1896 and upon this occasion the machinery was in the hands of our Conservative friends. They appointed their deputy returning officers, they were not obliged as they are now to notify their opponents and publish the names of the deputy returning officers. No person knew, who these returning officers were to be until they turned up at the polls next morning and a more corrupt, a more scandalous election never took place in the history of this Dominion than that election in 1896. What happened then? The election took place in 1896 and as I stated the Liberals knew nothing as to who was to be the returning officer. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) read to the House the instructions that were sent out by the Conservative organizer to the people of this Dominion. I feel almost tempted, although they were read before, to repeat them. First, he said:

> We have the printing of the ballots——

That was a very important thing at that time. They could print all they liked. The 'Free Press' office in the city of London turned them out by the hundred; they could print 5,000 or 10,000, or all they liked.

> We have the printing of the ballots, therefore a sufficient number should be printed extra to enable the deputy returning officer to have them marked for our candidate and ready to use after the count to replace those read out wrongly to the scrutineers. Or the deputy returning officer can have them marked and

folded in his pocket to slip into the box in place of an opposition ballot if the opportunity happens. This, of course, will occur quite frequently if we have the control of both scrutineers.

To get control of both scrutineers have one of our men, not a prominent one, but a supposed kicker, for instance, apply to the opposition to be put on as scrutineer inside. They are generally short of workers and a few plausible men will turn the election in a close constituency. Or the man can write to their headquarters for scrutineer papers if he lives in the country.

Efforts should be made to make these methods work in wards that give the heaviest opposition vote.

Having control of both scrutineers, a large vote can be polled—dead and absent voters, &c., can have their ballots marked ; there is no redress if both scrutineers were present.

A friendly constable should be present to keep the poll clear of loungers and inquisitive people.

The deputy returning officer should be a reliable, sharp and plausible man, so that if we do not get control of the opposition scrutineer, he can, when the counting time arrives, ask both scrutineers to take a piece of paper and record the vote of their candidate as he reads the ballots, which have been emptied on the table. He will then have a chance to read out wrongly, so that a majority can be secured for our candidate. The ballots should be put back into the box as quickly as they are read. The extra ones will do to fix things correctly when he goes home.

Spoiled ballots can be made sure by a little doctoring. Opposition ballots can be spoiled by the lead out of a pencil fastened under the little finger with beeswax, drawn across opposite our candidate's name in opening the ballot.

If you cannot get control of opposition scrutineers, have your deputy returning officer announce that he is against you, so as to lead him astray if possible.

Could it be possible that in this country such an instruction as that could be sent out by the Conservative organizer?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was sent out. You cannot get away from the fact. It is on record in the investigation which took place into the scandalous manipulation of the ballots in Manitoba. That evidence was brought out, the documents were laid on the table and the evidence is in existence yet. This man Freeborn who was sent by Mr. Birmingham to Winnipeg went up there for the express purpose of teaching the deputy returning officers how to switch and substitute ballots. He called upon Mr. Nathaniel Boyd, the Conservative member for Macdonald, I think. Mr. Boyd was a strong Conservative. He was anxious to win, no doubt, but he was so amazed that he could not credit the statement that Mr. Birmingham had sent up a man for that purpose. It was such a heinous crime to him that strong partisan as he was he could not believe that this man was not an imposter so he telegraphed to Birmingham asking about Freeborn. What is the reply? Birmingham wires back:

He was a good man in North Bruce.

He was manipulating the ballots, I have no doubt, in North Bruce where the Conservative member was only elected by thirty majority, and I venture to say that if the correct result of the voting had been announced the Liberal candidate would have been elected by a large majority. What happened in London? These same instructions were followed to the letter. Other means were adopted. They got these deputy returning officers whom nobody knew, one of whom had a long police record. Every one of these men received these instructions and the result of the elections shows that they carried out their instructions to the letter. In that election there were no less than 296 spoiled ballots. Most of these spoiled ballots occurred in fifteen polling places. In several polling places there were none or only one or two spoiled ballots. In eleven there were only sixteen spoiled ballots altogether, while in fifteen polling places in the city of London there were no less than 280 spoiled ballots. Do you believe it is possible that the electors in London would spoil their ballots in these fifteen places in that way ? No, Sir, they were spoiled by following the instructions of Robert Birmingham and the Conservative party as set forth in this circular and by putting a piece of lead pencil under their fingers——

An hon. MEMBER. With beeswax.

Mr. CAMPBELL. With beeswax to so disfigure the ballots that the returning officer would have a good excuse to throw them out. It is on record that in one polling place alone the deputy returning officer threw out forty ballots all marked for Hyman because he could not identify his own initials on the back of them. There never was a more monstrous election anywhere in this country than that election in London. Two hundred and ninety-six spoiled ballots! Take the election that followed in 1900 when the machinery was in the hands of this government, when we appointed the returning officer and the deputy returning officers, when the ballots were printed, as they should be printed here in Ottawa and sent there and not printed by the Liberal or Tory paper, and what was the result? In London, in 1900, there were only forty-seven spoiled ballots in the whole city as against 296 spoiled ballots in 1896. In fifteen polling places where we knew that the Liberals were in a large majority they got in their fine work. With the beeswax and lead pencil under the thumb or finger they got in their work and in fifteen polling places there were no less than 280 spoiled ballots. Now, Sir, I say that this election

shows clearly the methods adopted by our hon. friends. It was shown in that election that men were brought from Detroit, from Toronto, and other places, that they received their fares and were paid $10 apiece for their votes.

One chairman of the Conservative organization paid out $20 a man, and the secretary of the Conservative organization admitted under oath that he spent $1,174 more than he put in his accounts. Money flowed like water and when the election petition came on twenty of these faithful Tories in the city of London got suddenly sick, fled to the United States and could not be subpœnaed. There was a regular stampede of Tories from London to the city of Detroit for the benefit of their health. So I say that no man in public life in Canada has received such unfair treatment as the Hon. Mr. Hyman—cheated out of his election in 1892, cheated again in 1896, and only in 1900 when he got a fair election was he returned to this House. The last by-election in London was a very important election. Mr. Hyman had been appointed Minister of Public Works ; he was anxious of course as every man is to be elected ; he looked around him and he saw every Tory heeler from Dan to Beersheba flocking into London ; my hon. friend from East Grey (Dr. Sproule) and every Tory heeler and speaker in the Dominion went to London. Do you suppose that if their accounts were investigated so thoroughly as were the accounts in the recent trial in Toronto, that judging by their record in the past these Tories did not use a little substantial means in that election. I hope an investigation will be held into their conduct, and if so I venture to say it will be found that during that election in London there was more money spent by the Tory party than by the Liberals. The sum of $2,300 is not a very heavy sum to dispense in a constituency the size of London. And besides that when we find that half of these men swore they were Liberals and intended to vote for Mr. Hyman any way it only shows the fruitlessness and absurdity of spending money in that way. You might as well throw it in the river ; that has been my opinion right along.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) smiles, but he is the man who spent $4,000 in his constituency.

An hon. MEMBER. Nine thousand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Nine thousand dollars, was it ? I wanted to be moderate in my estimate. And yet this hon. gentleman smiles at the city of London. How did he spend his $9,000 ? What did he spend it for ? I venture to say that if you look at his returns in his sworn statement you will find that his expenses were not $5,000, and yet he spent $9,000. But I want to give some facts for the edification of my hon. friend from Brantford. I wonder if he ever heard of the election in North Ontario in 1896, between Mr. Duncan Graham, Liberal, and Mr. John Macgillivray, Conservative. In that election it was shown that no less than 21 Liberal ballots were taken out of the ballot box and replaced by 21 Conservative ballots for Mr. Macgillivray. So scandalous was this and so apparent was it that it all came out. They went about it in such a clumsy way it was easily detected. The ballots were not folded and creased and it was quite evident that they never could have gone into the box in the usual way. Judge Burnham who tried the case expressed the opinion that they were fraudulent and bogus ballots put into the box after polling day. It is a wonder my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) never heard of that election. I wonder if he ever heard of the election in Kent in 1896. I was the candidate in that election and we had an affidavit read in this House in 1900 concerning it, and I myself saw several bogus ballots marked for my opponent and the returning officer, Mr. Warren Lambert, a manufacturer in the town of Chatham deliberately had a large number of extra ballots printed in the office of the Chatham 'Planet' and he distributed them to the deputy returning officers throughout the country with instructions that they were to substitute wherever they could one of these bogus ballots for a good ballot marked for myself. When they saw a man coming up to vote that they knew was a Liberal their instructions were to substitute a bogus ballot—not what you might call a bogus ballot but a ballot printed in the regular way and marked for the Tory candidate, Mr. William Ball. I believe there were hundreds of bogus Conservative votes substituted for genuine Liberal votes in that election. The seven ballots were produced in this House and I believe they are in existence to-day ; seven ballots marked for the Tory candidate. How did they get them and where did they come from ? They came from the returning officer with instructions to use them wherever opportunity offered. And so following out the instructions of the Conservative organizer they were to substitute and they did substitute Tory ballots for Liberal ballots wherever they could all over this Dominion. Did my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) ever hear of the Northumberland case and the South Grey case. In South Grey, Doctor Landerkin was returned by a majority of votes and on a recount it was found that a large number of ballots marked for him had been abstracted from the box and others substituted therefor. In that case the Tory managers did not complete their work properly ; there were three or four disputed ballots, they thought they had guarded every avenue, they thought they had secured the defeat of Doctor Landerkin by substituting enough bogus ballots to elect his opponent.

But when it came to the recount the judge decided that some of the ballots which had been rejected by the returning officer should be counted for Dr. Landerkin, and he was returned by a majority of one ; but it was a close call. When we hear men like the hon. member for Brantford asserting that he had never heard of bribery and corruption, switching ballots, or stuffing ballot boxes, it is almost incredible that a man of his intelligence and learning, who as he told us has studied the political history of this Dominion for twenty-five years, should have shut his eyes and closed his ears to these things, and have lived in a paradise of such blissful ignorance. Another noted case was that of the Parry Sound election, in which there were no less than forty ballots substituted. We have also the notorious case of the West Northumberland election in 1891, when the Liberal candidate, Mr. Hargraft, was really elected and declared elected, but a recount was asked for, and then it was shown that ballots had been substituted. There was also the South Ontario case, which was referred to by my hon. friend from Sydney (Mr. Johnston), one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of this country. The man who had been the Tory candidate deliberately got up in court and swore that he had spent $1,200 and more to buy the electors of South Ontario ; and the Tory party, notwithstanding all their professions of purity and honesty, selected Mr. William Smith as their candidate in the very next election. Then we have the case of North Middlesex, a similar case. Time will not permit me to go into the details of these cases. I only mention them for the edification of the hon. member for Brantford ; and there have been scores of cases of the same kind. We have the records of the two parties in regard to spoiled ballots. I have said that the Conservative party sent out directions as to how ballots were to be spoiled, and the record shows that those directions were carried out to the letter. That record shows that in Addington in 1896, when our Conservative friends controlled the elections and appointed the returning officers, there were 181 spoiled and rejected ballots, whereas in 1900 there were only 32. In Bothwell there were 167 in 1896 and only 37 in 1900. In Brant South there were 165 in 1896 and only 32 in 1900. In Kingston there were 215 in 1896 and only 33 in 1900. In London there were 296 in 1896 and only 47 in 1900 ; in Middlesex South there were 100 in 1896 and ony 23 in 1900 ; in Muskoka and Parry Sound there were 175 in 1896 and only 58 in 1900 ; in South Perth there were 129 in 1896 and only 14 in 1900 ; and so on—I need not go over the whole list, suffice it to say that in 30 counties in the province of Ontario there were in the election of 1896 no less than 3,785 rejected ballots, whereas in the election of 1900, under Liberal auspices, there were only 916. It only shows, what I have stated, that in that election of 1896 they carried out to the letter the instructions that had been given by the Conservative organizer in the circular he sent out. Not only that, but I find that our Conservative friends were so determined to carry the local election in 1902 that they imported as the Toronto 'Mail' said on July 15 of that year, 40 expert crooks to Toronto from New York and Buffalo, and assigned them to different constituencies. Two of them operated in North York, and we have the evidence, under oath, of the then Tory candidate, the present Tory member for North York, Mr. T. H. Lennox, as follows :

Q. Did you have a couple of gentlemen from Buffalo over there?—A. There were a couple of distinguished men from Buffalo, I think.

Q. How did they come to be there ?

Listen to this Mr. Speaker, after the fine address we heard from the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) last night. Listen to this evidence given by the present Tory member for North York, who knew whereof he spoke :

They were sent up there by Mr. E. B. Osler.

This is not my testimony ; it is the testimony of the present Tory member for North York, who swears that these crooks from Buffalo were sent up there to corrupt the electors by Mr. E. B. Osler, the present member for West Toronto in this House. There were a number of them in Bowmanville working in the interest of the Conservative party. They had a list of the voters who were thought likely to vote for the Liberal candidate, and the list happened to fall into the hands of the Liberals, and these men immediately absconded, and when the trials came on they were in Buffalo and could not be got.

I want to say a few words in reference to the remarks of my hon friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who I regret is not in the House. He took very severely to task my hon. friend from Sydney for reading what he said was the Mabee pamphlet, which he characterized in very strong, polite and gentlemanly language. He said nobody would suppose that there was any Conservative such a consummate fool or ass as to believe that the Tory party was responsible for that pamphlet. The hon. member for Sydney in his speech last night never referred directly or indirectly to the Mabee pamphlet; I do not know whether he knew anything about it. The hon. member for Hamilton said in reference to that :

Nobody but a fool would have been taken in. The Conservatives absolutely rejected the thing, they would have nothing to do with it. I was informed that this ingenious Mr. Mabee transposed the language of that precious document, and wherever the word 'Liberal' appeared in this magnificent work of his he put the word 'Conservative,' and he found some

fool or rogue in the Liberal party with so little sense and so much money that he was willing to buy the pamphlet.

Nobody in this House but a fool or an idiot would have supposed—except perhaps the hon. gentleman who was addressing the House—that the hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Johnston) had in his mind that Mabee pamphlet at all. He never referred to it directly or indirectly. I do not suppose he ever saw it or knew anything about it, so that the lecture which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) read my hon. friend from Sydney (Mr. Johnston) was wholly uncalled for and without any basis in fact. But I happen to have a copy of an affidavit made by this celebrated Mr. Mabee, and I want to read a few passages from it. Mr. Mabee came over here from the United States. He had lived in the county of Norfolk. He was a friend and supporter of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale).

Mr. TISDALE. As the hon. gentleman makes a positive statement, he will allow me to explain. I never knew this man Mabee at all until one of my elections, when I got a letter from him telling me that he was the son of very respectable people in my county, and that he had been employed largely by the Democratic party in the United States in manipulating elections. He proposed practically to put himself at my service. I knew his family very well—a very respectable family. I wrote back to him that I had no use for any one of his sort. He never was a supporter of mine, and never voted in Norfolk in any of my elections. In fact he could not vote, because he never had a residence there, but only came over temporarily. I read in the papers about this celebrated pamphlet, and I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to quote as a fact that this man was a supporter of mine and worked for me, because he was neither a friend nor a supporter, and I had nothing to do with him.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. I have no desire to say anything reflecting on him in any way, but I have here a statement sworn to by Mr. Mabee on the 15th November, 1901, before Donald McDonald, a commissioner in the city of Toronto. I shall not read the whole of this declaration, because it is too long, but I think it will interest the House to hear a portion of it :

I, Charles Ralph Mabee, of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, publisher, do solemnly declare that in the month of September, A.D. 1900, I sent to Colonel Tisdale, M.P. for South Norfolk, a copy of the book 'McKinley in the Witness Box,' and wrote him a letter asking him if he thought a similar book could be got out for the Conservative party in the Dominion campaign then going on. I wrote him as I knew him personally, as I had lived in his riding for years, and my family were among his strongest supporters. Colonel Tisdale wrote me in reply to the effect that the idea was a good one but it would have to be done at once to be of any use. He gave me the address of the Conservative headquarters in Toronto, and told me to write them at once and make a proposition. I did nothing more about it as I concluded that the time was too short to get out an effective book.

I came home to Canada early in January, A.D. 1901, and shortly afterwards I became acquainted with Mr. R. Southam, the manager of the Mail Job Printing Company. I showed him a copy of the book 'McKinley in the Witness Box,' and he sent it on to Mr. Whitney. On or about the 11th day of February, A.D. 1901, Mr. Southam handed me a letter which he had received from Mr. Whitney, dated February 9, A.D. 1901, in which Mr. Whitney stated that he had the American campaign book and thought the idea of a similar book in Ontario a good one. The said letter is now in my possession and was marked as an exhibit to a former declaration made by me. After this, and during the month of February, I devoted some time to gathering material for a book in the interests of the Conservative party and had some cartoons prepared which I sent to Mr. Whitney. On the 8th March, 1901, I received a letter from Mr. Whitney asking me to come and see him either at the parliament buildings or at the Grosvenor House with reference to the book. This letter is now in my possession and was marked as an exhibit to a former declaration made by me. Among other matters contained in said letter is a reference to the cartoons which I had sent to him. In answer to said letter I went and saw Mr. Whitney in his private room in the parliament buildings when he told me he was convinced that a publication similar to the American book, issued in the interests of the Conservative party, would be of material benefit to the party. At this time he had in his possession some of the cartoons which he and some of his followers have since denounced and was quite delighted with them. He told me to go and see Dr. Pyne and J. J. Foy with reference to the book and to meet him next time at his rooms in the Grosvenor House. On the following Sunday morning I had an interview with Dr. Pyne at his residence and on Monday I had an interview with J. J. Foy in his office on Church street in the city of Toronto. Both of these gentlemen coincided with Mr. Whitney's view of the matter and said that they thought the idea of such a book was a splendid one. Mr. Foy had a copy of the American book in his office and told me that he talked the whole matter over with Mr. Whitney. Dr. Pyne advised me to go and see A. W. Wright about it, as Mr. Wright had had considerable experience in American campaign work and ought to be able to give some valuable assistance. . . . . I went several times to the Conservative headquarters to see Wright but the office was always closed and it was a week or ten days after the above interview that I succeeded in finding Mr. Wright. He and Dr. Beattie Nesbitt were together and I introduced myself to Mr. Wright. He in turn introduced me to Dr. Nesbitt. I asked to see Wright alone, but he said he knew all about it and that we could talk quite freely before the doctor. They were both very enthusiastic about the book and said it should be issued as soon as possible. Mr. Wright said that the Mail Job Printing Company would print it and take the financial risk. I prepared some of the matter for the book myself and some was furnished me by Mr.

Wright, Mr. Whitney, Dr. Pyne and others, and I put this into shape. I remember that Mr. Whitney supplied me among other things, with some matter about the cost of maintenance of public institutions and the Royal Commission for the investigation of the financial standing of the province. As I got the proof sheets from the printer I handed them to Mr. Wright who read the proof and made corrections in his own handwriting, and told me that he in turn handed them over to Mr. E. B. Osler, M.P., Mr. Whitney, M.P.P., Mr. Foy, M.P.P., Dr. Pyne, M.P.P., and others. Finally Mr. Wright told me that the literature committee of the Conservative party had approved of the matter contained in the proofs and had decided that the book should be issued at once.

How does that correspond with the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that the Conservative party repudiated and would not have anything to do with this man ? He made this solemn declaration ; and if his affidavit were false or incorrect in any way, it was the duty of those implicated to see that he was prosecuted.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ? I do not propose to make a speech and go into all the details brought up by him in connection with this matter, but as he alludes to myself, he will allow me to interrupt with a brief explanation. Mr. Mabee did send me some book, but I do not remember whether I replied to him or not. It was discussed by me and some others, and I said that as far as I was concerned I would have nothing to do with that book in my riding, and that I would write warning our people at headquarters that this man was, from what I had heard of him previously, not of a character to make it desirable that anybody should have anything to do with him. I would not go into the history of the matter, but I think that a sufficiently clear statement of it is due to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). It was proven by the investigation that took place that the Conservative party did not take the book and the Reform party did.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It appears from the statement of the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that Mr. Mabee's declaration that he had written to that hon. gentleman is correct. To that extent Mr. Mabee's statement is confirmed, and, to that extent presumption is raised in favour of the correctness of the whole statement. I am only trying to show that the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that the Conservative party had nothing to do with this pamphlet and that they had entirely repudiated its author, was wholly erroneous. Mr. Mabee goes on :

During the time that the book was in course of preparation, I received from the Mail Job Printing Company several sums of money, partly in cash and partly in cheques on the Molsons bank, and I also received from the said company money for travelling expenses, paid to me partly in cash and partly by cheques on the said Molsons Bank. I also received, about May or June, either three or four cheques from Dr. Beattie Nesbitt, payable to my order at a branch bank on Spadina avenue. These were given to me by Dr. Nesbitt, as he said, on the side, and to help along with the book. He asked me to give him anything that I thought would be 'red-hot' and new in the way of material for a speech.

I have always thought that the doctor was red hot enough, without requiring any material of that kind from Mr. Mabee. He seems to have been greedy and to have required even more of that material for his speeches than he himself could supply. Mr. Mabee further says :

And he said he would like to have me prepare some material for him on personal expenses of cabinet ministers—cab-hire, street car tickets and that kind of thing. He said this was great stuff to catch the voters.

Then he goes on to detail a lot of inside history of the Tory party, the quarrellings and jealousies amongst them, and the disposition amongst them to throw over Mr. Whitney and appoint a new leader. All this it is not necessary for me to read here.

Mr. BARR. What was the date of that affidavit ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I gave it before, but I will give it again. The declaration was sworn to in the county of York on the 15th of November, 1901—sworn to before Donald MacDonald, a commissioner in the city of Toronto. It would appear that the Tory candidates were very anxious for money in that election, for Mr. Mabee says :

When at my home in Vittoria during the summer, I came in contact with Mr. John L. Buck, the Conservative candidate for South Norfolk. We talked over the political situation and he informed me that Whitney wanted him to run again at the next election, but that he could not take chances again unless his election expenses were put up for him. Knowing that I was in contact with the leaders in Toronto he asked what I thought the chances were for financial help. I agreed to let him know when Whitney was expected in Toronto. I wrote him afterwards from Toronto that Mr. Whitney would be in the city on a certain day, and he wired me that he was coming down. I met him at the Union depot and we went together to the Conservative headquarters and saw Mr. Whitney. Mr. Buck afterwards told me at lunch in Nasmith's restaurant that he had arranged matters all right and that Mr. Whitney had assured him that he would have $1,000, the whole amount to be paid to his brother at least one month before election. Mr. Buck repeated this again at the Union depot that same evening to myself and three others. Mr. Buck told me that he had told Mr. Whitney that he wanted the money sent to his brother so that the Tisdale crowd in Simcoe would have nothing to do with it.

Then, he details the general dissatisfaction with Mr. Whitney, giving as one ground of it that Mr. Whitney had spent $76,000 in protests in the province of Ontario, which had done no good but had

mostly gone to Tory lawyers in Toronto, some $15,000 of the fund still remaining for the use of the Conservative party. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) stated that Mr. Mabee had gone over to the Liberals, and the Liberals had taken him up and had issued the pamphlet. Now, I want to read what Mr. Mabee says on that subject :

I do not pretend to possess any great political virtue, nor am I pharisaical like Organizer Wright. I confess that my sympathies always were, and still are with the Conservative party. I found out, however, that the weight of argument in the coming campaign was on the side of the government. I went to Alexander Smith and told him that I proposed to get out a pamphlet setting forth the condition of affairs as I studied them while working with the Conservative organization, and commending the forward policy of the government. I found that Mr. Smith had known about the Conservative book for months, which somewhat surprised me. He told me plainly that neither the government nor the Liberal party would have anything to do with my proposed new book, but that if I would go ahead and get out a book on my own responsibility he would write the Liberal candidates, for whatever came to his notice of value to them he made it his business to advise them of the same that they would be posted on everything that concerned them in their campaign. This was not exactly what I wanted him to do, but I found that he was firm in his attitude, and I decided to go ahead on this plan with all speed, for I felt that 100,000 copies of the book compiled in the Conservative headquarters would be issued by the Conservative organization by November 1. The new book 'Our Progress,' was issued by Hunter, Rose & Company shortly after October 1. The sale of the book has been large and is increasing, and the matter contained in it speaks for itself.

Now, this sworn statement of Mr. Mabee's has gone abroad throughout the country. If there was any allegation in it that was not true, if anything injurious to the Conservative party or any of its members appeared in that statement which could not be substantiated, why has no action been taken against Mr. Mabee ? The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) charged my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) with speaking altogether aside from the facts in reading from this pamphlet, and he read my hon. friend a lecture that was quite uncalled for. The statement of the hon. member for Hamilton that the Conservative party had repudiated Mr. Mabee is contradicted by Mr. Mabee's declaration, which is in part supported to-day by the statement which we have heard from the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). Therefore, it seems to me, that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) owes an apology not only to this House but to the hon. member for Cape Breton, seeing that he made this charge without foundation in fact and, no doubt, in complete ignorance of the merits of the case.

Sir, I was struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) last night. He stated that he did not believe in the tu quoque argument and he enunciated some very fine sentiments. I am sorry that after enunciating these fine sentiments he started off in a violent attack upon the Liberal party for the corruption that has taken place in some constituencies in Quebec. I find that in the district of Quebec in 1891 no less than $112,000 was spent by the Tory party to carry the elections, and was distributed by a minister of the Crown at that time. I do not agree with the statement of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt); I believe, Sir, that in this Dominion of ours, our elections, whether they are conducted by Conservatives or by Liberals, are conducted in the main purely and honestly, as purely and honestly as any elections in any country in the wide world. There are instances as I have shown where the Conservatives have indulged in gross corruption; I am sorry to say that there are some instances on our own side, but on the whole the people of Canada are, I believe, as pure and as honest and as faithful in the discharge of their duty as the people of any country in the wide world.

Why, Sir, the whole history of the Liberal party has been in the line of purifying the elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In 1878, when the government was led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, what was the first thing he did? He passed a law that in every county in this broad Dominion, the sheriffs and registrars should be the returning officers, men of standing, men of ability, men who had a reputation, who had a stake in the community and the Liberal government enacted that these men should be charged with the conduct of elections in the different counties. Our Conservative friends, the moment they came into power in 1878, immediately repealed that law, and they appointed then any harum-scarum man they chose. They did not want the sheriffs and registrars, they wanted men who would carry out the instructions issued by their organizer, Mr. Robert Birmingham. Purity in elections has been the aim of the Liberal party throughout its history. It was they who gave the Franchise Bill to the people of this country; it was they who gave the secret ballot to the electors, it was they who enacted that all elections throughout the Dominion should be held on the same day. They have repeatedly passed laws of this character. They have passed laws taking away from the Tory papers the printing of the ballots and to-day it is impossible for any man to get a ballot. The history of election trials in our courts shows that the Liberals have facilitated the investigation of corruption in every case. They have punished men in Ontario, in South Ontario. Why, Sir, if the investigation there had gone on

very much longer, the whole Tory party in South Ontario would have been in jail. As it was, a large number of them served their time in the prison houses of Ontario. And so, Sir, the conduct of the Liberal party all through has been in the line of purifying elections and conducting them so that the majority vote, no matter whether it is cast for the Conservative candidate or for the Liberal candidate, should be final and that the will of the people should be carried out.

Sir, I cannot conceive of anything more infamous, more diabolical, than switching ballots or stealing seats, or bribing electors. I think it is the duty of both parties in this House, and I am glad that the government has announced that they will bring in a Bill to, if possible, still further purify elections in this country. I suppose that as long as there are spots on the sun so there will be in this Dominion of Canada some contest in heated elections where the strife is strong and the rivalry great, as long as human nature is as it is, as long as the world goes on as it is, we will have some cases where undue influence is used, but I think it is the bounden duty of the Commons of Canada, this great representative body who represent the intelligence and the best of the people of this land to put our heads together and try in every possible way to stamp out this thing that has been causing such injury to the fair name of this Dominion.

Sir, we have a great Dominion; we are only beginning to realize the importance of this country. The work that is before this House of Commons as the years go by is one of the grandest and noblest that any House of Commons ever engaged in, the work of developing this great rich country, so vast in its extent, so rich in mineral products, so productive in its soil, with its valleys and hills and mountains, its forests and plains, its rivers and lakes, its shores washed by two oceans where men of every temperament may develop their energies to the fullest extent, dotted over with colleges and schools and churches, and filled with all the elements of social progress. Where Sir, in this wide world if not here should man asert his true nobility and rise to the loftiest heights of which he is capable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I cannot anticipate the future, but as I gaze down the long vista of years, I see this young Canadian giant conscious of his strength, guided and directed by the noble man who has been guiding him so successfully for the last ten years, moving forward in the work of civilization and humanity, and as he advances I behold the vast prairies of the Northwest, the hills and valleys of the east, and the slopes of our western main, filled with an intelligent, a united, a rejoicing people, one in sympathy, one in government, the inheritors and possessors of the same institutions the noblest and freest and brightest the world has ever known.

Mr. TISDALE. Will the hon. gentleman give me the document from which he read?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Mabee affidavit, certainly.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, after the speech of the hon. gentleman for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) who has just taken his seat it is difficult to decide just where to commence. He first lectured those who had spoken on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne for not following closely the lines laid down in the address, and then I think of all the sinners in that respect he was the greatest, for he scarcely referred to anything within the four corners of the address. Of course there is one clause which would justify the discussion of purity in elections, but, Sir, I think when that hon. gentleman was dealing with that question he used rather extravagant expressions. Sir, the records of the courts of this country, and they are stronger evidence than any produced by the hon. gentlemen, show conclusively that more members of this House and of the provincial parliament have been unseated and disqualified in the Liberal ranks than in the Conservative ranks.

If you wish to compare the evidence as it came out under oath in the scrutiny of the court you will find that hon. gentlemen opposite appear very badly in the shining light which was thrown upon their actions in the election courts of this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) spoke particularly with reference to one election in Kent, but he might have referred to another. He referred to the election in Kent in 1891. He said that he had some experience and he referred to the fact that his experience was that he had to buy Liberals. No stronger statement could be made by any man on this side of the House or in the country to prove to what extent corruptnon is permeating the ranks of the Liberal party than the statement that they have to spend money to buy their own friends. When a party comes to that pass—and they have come to that because that is a statement of the hon. gentleman himself, and I do not propose to dispute that statement; it is the statement in reference to London made by that hon. gentleman and he said that witnesses had sworn in the preliminary investigation in Toronto that such was the fact—it is high time that the right hon. leader of the government should put into the Governor General's mouth the statement that it is necessary to deal with the question. This hon. gentleman might have gone a little farther back in the history of Kent. There was an election in 1887, there was a protest in which the hon. gentleman himself was particularly interested because he was the sitting member who was unseated and if you

look at the report made by the judge to the Speaker of this House you will find that the statement made there is that there was widespread corruption; not purity, but widespread corruption. It is well known that the mercy of the court allowed the hon. gentleman more latitude in his doings than is generally allowed or otherwise he would not be a member of this House. We find that the evidence shows that two dollar bills were put into the chinks of the barn—those are the cracks in the barn—and the evidence goes farther and says that the hon. gentleman himself said that a Mr. O'Neil was buying a pair of rubbers in a general store and that when he was asked to pay for them he said: You had better charge them and they did charge them to the hon. gentleman. That happened in 1887 and the trial occurred on November 15, 16 and 17 of that year. He could have gone a little farther back in Kent. Then he gets up and tells us that there is very little corruption after all in this country. If the hon. gentleman is sincere when he makes the statement that while there are blots on the body politic that every man deplores in the main it is a healthy, thrifty, clean body, then he ought to repudiate the statements of the English press. He should have stood up in fairness to this country which he says is largely free from corruption and have repudiated the statements of the English press which have been quoted against this side of the House. That patriotism which should imbue the hon. gentleman did not always suit his impulses or make him the man that he ought to be in the politics of this country. Now, I want to go a little farther. There is this pamphlet which was read by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and I thought, from what he said last night and from what he did, that you might almost call him a political misfit in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. A what?

Mr. BRODER. A political misfit. That circular that he read from was repudiated and it is a strange thing that while they claim that it was circulated in 1896, it never appeared in the political life of this country until 1900. It was repudiated by the prominent men in Manitoba and in Winnipeg and by the press in Winnipeg and the press of Manitoba and it was not justified by the Liberal press of Winnipeg or of Manitoba. They admitted that it was a forgery. You can turn up 'Hansard' if you wish—May 17, 1900—and you can read the statements and correspondence in reference to it there. But while it is a forgery and was a forgery and while hon. gentlemen opposite read that circular it is strange that hon. gentlemen opposite, in working in elections throughout the country, should have carried out the identical suggestions contained in that circular. Now, if you look at the election in West Elgin, you find Duncan Bole acting as the deputy returning officer at a certain poll in the township of Southwold. That poll was about even, politically speaking, but Duncan Bole went too far. Instead of having the poll about evenly Conservative and Reform, he had eighty-five of a Liberal majority there. How did Duncan Bole get there? He got there by the candidate, Mr. McNish, writing a personal letter to the man who was appointed deputy returning officer for that poll asking him to allow this gentleman to act in his stead. He acted in his stead with that result, and the hon. gentleman's friends followed to the very letter these suggestions made in the circular which they quote against the Liberal-Conservative party in this House. Who used to the greatest extent the black lead under the nail? The Liberal party. Who used the outside ballot? The Liberal party They did so in the Brockville election and in West Huron. The hon. gentleman spoke about Hon. Alexander Mackenzie appointing the sheriffs. So he did, but the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was an honest man. What did Mr. Mackenzie say about his party? He said that he had to stand over the chest with his arms in order to protect it. That is the statement made by an honest man and that statement could be repeated to-day with double force throughout this country. The officials appointed by the authorities to carry out the election in Brockville were approached by these men to instruct them how to switch ballots and none of them was honest enough to apprise the public of the danger they were in. Is it possible that gentlemen appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out the law of this country are so corrupt in their ideas of how this country should be governed that they will quietly submit to receiving their instructions against the public good so long as they are protected by hon. gentlemen opposite? They were protected by hon. gentlemen opposite. An investigation was started in this House in the latter part of the session of 1899. It was not finished in that session but next session the investigation was squelched out by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. Why? Because they were apprised of the danger that their friends in Brockville were in. Some of them were out of the country and within the last fifteen days men closely allied with the Liberal party and the candidate at that time have left this country to be secure from being taken before the magistrate in Toronto.

Sir, we talk about the London election. I say that the men who have gone up and down this country doing this nefarious work never would have done it without an understanding with men higher up in the party that they should be protected, that they should be taken care of. They have been taken care of. What do we find? In London we have Lewis, O'Gorman, Mulloy, Pritchard, Reid. Has Mr. Reid any friends

closely allied with the party in power to-day? And, you can go further. Where is Mr. Dan. Stewart an employee of this government who went up to London from the city of Ottawa? He is out of this country to-day if he has not come back within the last three days—to avoid being subpœnaed. Mr. Reid is committed for trial and Mr. Reid is a brother of one of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway under whom Mr. Dan. Stewart was an official. These are facts that stare every honest man in the face. Is Mr. Dan. Stewart still in the employ of this government; he was when he went to London. Mr. White took up four men to London, and Mr. White says he went there with some money. Why was it necessary to take four strange faces from Ottawa to work for the Liberal candidate in a city like London with 40,000 people? Who is Mr. White? Last year he was president of the Liberal Association in Ottawa. Who is Mr. Corry? He is a government contractor, if you please. He went up to London and he did not know how much money he took with him. It is high time these matters should be dealt with in this House, and that men outside the House belonging to both parties should take up the question and deal with it in the interest of the public, not in the interest of party. Mr. O'Gorman was in Toronto; why did he go up to London and stay at headquarters—Hyman Hall if you please—for two weeks; he slept there. Did Mr. Hyman not know he was there? Did no one high up in the party know that this nefarious work was going on at the hands of these scoundrels, men known to the courts of this country for years; men known to have been doing crooked work in the interest of Liberal candidates for ten or fifteen years. But they went scathless for years; they were in no dread of justice until a change of administration came in the province of Ontario. Did not Mr. Pritchett say: I make this affidavit and if the Liberal party want to prosecute me I will be in such a place up to such a time. Did they lay their hands upon him? No. What about Mr. Duncan Bole's bail? He jumped his bail of $2,000. Did the Ross government escheat his bail? No, Mr. Duncan Bole and his bail were all right until Mr. Whitney came into power and then Mr. Duncan Bole's bail had to be paid. Why was it not paid before? The danger of this country to-day is that the men who are doing this crooked work throughout the country are immune from harm where hon. gentlemen opposite control the administration of justice, as was the case in Ontario while the Ross government was in power. That is the danger we are in. But the government appointed a commission to investigate the West Elgin election and some of the judges who were on the Insurance Commission were found on that commission. That commission discredited Mr. Pritchett and the ballot boxes were burned inadvertently. What comes out now? Forty men come into court and on their oath corroborate the statement of Mr. Pritchett, and the 'Globe' to-day has to admit that Mr. Pritchett is telling the truth, although a few years ago a government commission declared that Mr. Pritchett could not be credited. The wheels of justice in this country ought to be put in motion to bring these people to justice, in the interest of purity in public life; when the wheels of justice are clogged there is danger to the nation. In Ontario, under the Ross government, the wheels of justice were not put in motion, and these men were left scot free to continue their work. Cap. Sullivan and the 'Minnie M' and all the outfit; they went on with their nefarious practices unmolested by the law of the land, and if an attempt were made to prosecute any of them they gave them due notice to get away before the prosecution came. And we have men out of this country to-day because they are afraid of justice. That sort of thing should not be allowed to exist in any country, and when we come to deal with the matter we should sit down with the Prime Minister and make an honest attempt to bring about the best possible state of things, under existing circumstances. But, Sir, so long as the government party or the opposition party have a large campaign fund and the rank and file know that fund is in existence, the rank and file want some of it and they think they have a right to get it. You have to start at the top; you cannot build this building from the bottom; and until we do start at the top and deal with those in high places who control these things and to whom those men lower down look up, we will not rid the politics of this country of that which every true Canadian should be glad to see it rid of. And under what escutcheon do they do all this mischief? They do it under the word 'prosperity,' and they think that if they have the word 'prosperity' hanging up all over the country they can do any nefarious thing they please. What have the Liberal party done in this country—no man can truthfully dispute the statement I am about to make—they have written across every ballot box that goes into every poll in the land the word 'doubtful.' No man knows when he deposits his vote in that box whether it will be counted or not. I thank God that in the province of Ontario the Hon. Mr. Whitney and his government have taken that word off the ballot box and have written upon it instead the words: 'truly expressed public opinion.' And, Sir, that motto shall stay there in the interest of the people so long as Mr. Whitney and his government remain in power. The Liberal government

cannot get away from the charge of having written the word 'doubtful' on the ballot box. It is but too true and it is high time that a remedy should be applied. No one will gain more when that remedy is applied than the men on this side of the House. The government with its cupboard full and its friends surrounding it and handing out this and that to every asker for office or to every man who wants political advancement, has gone too far along the line of preferring the interest of party to the interest of the public.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking in this debate, but, since the discussion has turned on the purity of public life in Canada I think every true Canadian should express an opinion. I know of no one thing so important to the people of Canada to-day as that they should have an opportunity to exercise their franchise freely and honestly. It is better for us at this stage that we should devote ourselves to providing a remedy for the existing conditions than that we should indulge in recriminations one against the other. I frankly express my own opinion that the time has come when both parties should join together for this good purpose for both parties are not without blame. As is shown by the decision of the courts, since the Liberal party came into power, to say the least, they have just done as wicked things as ever they charged the Conservative party with doing. What good citizenship is most concerned about is the remedy. I am speaking the sentiments of my heart, because I feel that the present is an epoch most pregnant for the future of this country. I have arrived at the time, both in politics and in life, when I am most concerned about what the next few years will bring to the country. I cannot hope to live to see the great development which I believe will come to my native land, which is blessed by Providence, by nature, by constitution, by affiliation and association with the greatest empire of the world. That is my greatest regret in leaving. The London investigation in some respects I regret. I sympathize, not politically but personally, with the gentleman who has suffered most from that investigation. But whatever its results may be, it has at last lifted the lid and revealed things that have happened in elections which the honest men in both parties deeply regret. My belief is that on this question we should not attempt to legislate on moral principles only. We must all admit with some shame that a disgraceful and lamentable state of affairs exists in this country in the conduct of elections, and neither political party is free from responsibility. Will the party on the opposite side of the House—I throw this out not as a challenge, but as a request—follow up what they have at last undertaken, what the committee of mixed politics last session recommended? The responsibility is no longer on the committee, because the government have taken it up. If they will deal with the question frankly, I will support them, if the party on this side does not. Now, what are the remedies? Let me suggest three or four. Do not let us flatter ourselves that we have not a very serious task before us. I have experienced a great many hard contests in the last twenty-five years, and I have had the support of a great many true and honest young men. When I have suggested remedies to them for these evils, they have said to me: What is the use? If we do not resort to some devices to meet those of our opponents, to fight the devil's fire, what is the use of fighting at all? Suppose you attempt to fight honourably, and you are beaten, what can you do? That is a hard question. There is no satisfaction in unseating your opponent; that is easily done if any bad methods have been practised, and I am sorry to say that they are growing and widening. With regard to the remedies, one of the first suggestions I make is to return to the old law, which was not to punish the party who accepts the bribe, but the party who offers the bribe. Though perhaps not a good moral law, it was and it is in my opinion a good law for the prevention of the greater evils and crimes. In framing laws, we sometimes have to adopt the principle of expediency, and in this case we should aim at the greater criminal, the man who offers the temptation. That is good gospel as well as good law. The man who tempts the other is the greater sinner; this is true in morals, in business and in God's book, and the present is a good time to apply it.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Which is the greater tempter, the man who gives money or the man who asks for money?

Mr. TISDALE. I do not think there is much difference. I know of two ridings where we had some of the greatest political fights in Canada, and in those ridings for many years I will venture to say that neither the Liberal party nor the Conservative party spent $600. To-day no man on either side has any chance of election who does not expend from $5,000 to $10,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TISDALE. That is the index of many ridings. There are hundreds and thousands of people in many of the counties who do not know or believe such things; but the courts have made a rude showing when some gentlemen came to be unseated.

An hon. MEMBER. That is wrong.

Mr. TISDALE. Let us not say who is wrong or who is the worse. Let us admit the facts and see if we cannot remedy the evil. I believe we can if we take up the question in earnest. Now, what is necessary? First of all, a tribunal, maintained at the

public expense, with simple and summary powers, with no intervention of juries—a tribunal which can lay a rude hand on all those who commit these crimes, whether there is an election protest pending or not. Instead of the present cumbersome procedure, let us adopt the idea of having a public prosecutor who would try all those who fall into evil ways and are guilty of electoral frauds. What are the two great evils from which we suffer most? They are the buying of votes either by cash or otherwise and the still greater evil of stealing mens' votes by ingenious means devised by scoundrels. Is it possible to stamp out these two great evils? One means would be the establishment of a court such as I have mentioned whose sole business would be the detecting of fraud and the punishing of the guilty party.

Talk about public opinion! It makes me sad to hear an hon. gentleman so experienced in election contests as my hon. friend from York (Mr. Campbell) making the peroration he did about public opinion, familiar, as he must be, with the means taken to secure the return of this government. I have still an abiding faith in the majority of the voters of this country if they are only given a fair show. I have reason to believe in their honesty and good faith, because my experience has been that in speaking frankly to the people I have gained friends. I have gained support, not because I have very strong party views, but because I have never hesitated to give my opinions freely and frankly and have not hesitated to point out shortcomings where I believed them evident. I have come up against hard propositions; I have had to contend against dollars and fraud, and have never been slow in denouncing practices intended to prevent an honest expression of the views of the people. In my county, I am happy to say, neither party has had occasion to charge the other with fraud, except in some minor matters; and in only one or two instances had we the evidence to bring these charges home. So that I have not much fault to find with the conduct of elections in my constituency on the ground of fraud. I have great faith in public opinion: but it is sad to find that men who should take an active interest in politics, either take no interest at all or look for some compensation for doing what it ought to be a man's pride and pleasure to do. If I am not speaking the truth, let gentlemen here who are representing the people gainsay my statement. I express my opinion because it is my belief, and in the hope that it may have some influence in this important matter which may possibly be the last great subject I shall take part in. I have great sympathy, particularly with the young men in our country, whether they think as I do or differently—men who are simply like myself trying to be honest and right in a rough and ready sort of way, trying so to guide their actions and conduct that they will stand judgment and give them reason for hope in the future. In this matter of electoral frauds, I am going to make a suggestion which I am afraid the majority of this House and possibly the majority of the people of this country will not approve of. If we cannot put an end to these frauds by law, let us change the law. From what we have heard in this House on both sides, and from what we read in the papers, from the knowledge we have of what is going on both in the United States and Canada, it is evident that the fraudulent tampering with the ballots has increased more rapidly than the primitive method of bribery, because the manipulation of the ballots is cheaper and can be more easily concealed. I am referring particularly to frauds in connection with the ballot boxes and the stealing of votes after the ballots have been deposited. To prevent this evil, I would be in favour of a return to open voting. If I were a young man I would take this up as a propaganda. I was against the ballot on principle, but I believed that it was necessary in order to prevent voters being coerced. But we have grown past that stage in which employers can use coercion on their wage-earners. The great classes of labour to-day, by their unions, are far more independent than many of us who are bound by social or business and other ties. They can laugh at their employers, and no great employer dare interfere with them to any extent. True, there will always be some men who will be influenced by coercion, but the effect of that influence will be very slight as compared with the frauds now practised on the voters by which the honest voters are deprived of their votes. You may amend the law as much as you please, you may devise what precautions you may to prevent these ballot frauds, the ingenuity of the sharp rascals who devise them will outwit you. It has always been a wonder to me why these ingenious schemers do not give their time to honest avocations in which their ability could not fail to make them a success. But they are so constituted that they prefer making their living by shady ways. The only corrective, in my opinion, is open voting. When we had not the ballot we had scarcely any corruption in the ridings with which I was acquainted. And until I became somewhat of a public man and was given a public position which required me to go into other constituencies, I did not go outside the ridings I knew well.

I loved just to stay and work and talk in my own place; I was satisfied with my own people. I say that, under the ballot, we have had ten cases of corruption for every one we had before. Is not that a lamentable state of affairs? In view of that state of affairs, I would urge three things—first,

appoint a public prosecutor; second, improve the procedure in these cases in our courts; and third, let us get back to open voting. If we cannot get this last, at least, let us have the other two, so that every man who goes to the poll and marks his ballot may know that that ballot, will actually be counted. It is because it promotes this feeling of security on the part of the voter that I favour the open ballot. So far as secrecy is concerned, my strong opinion is that the vast majority of the voters would much prefer that everybody should know how they vote. If we return to open voting, the danger of coercion of voters will be less than it formerly was. No large railway company, no large manufacturing establishment will venture to interfere with its men. If there is no other reason for this, there is the great and important fact that the labour unions will not allow it. I believe that the bulk of opinion amongst workingmen can be relied upon with confidence. In spite of their faults, in spite of their inconsiderateness at times, in spite of the unreasonable things they at times may have done, my sympathies have always been with the men who literally earn their bread 'by the sweat of their brows.' They are the most independent class, and the best elements among them are disposed to stand for justice and for public liberty. But, as I say, if we cannot have the open vote, let us have the public prosecutor, and let our courts be so directed that a candidate may declare that he means to conduct an honest and fair canvass and election and feel sure that, if anything wrong is done in the election, it can be followed and exposed in the courts and proper punishment meted out to those who are guilty of interfering with the people's sacred right to exercise their franchise freely. If this were done, I believe we should have a new revelation of clean and honest politics. I invite the Conservative party to do its share towards this end. And, I am sure that the members of that party will agree with me in this matter. I am not authorized to speak for them, and I recognize that every man of them is as fully entitled as myself to form and express his opinion. But I believe we should follow this matter up and not be content until we have made the necessary changes in our system. We might be defeated even under a fair vote, but I believe that it would not be long until we were successful. I trust that hon. members will not find fault with me for taking part in this debate. I had not intended to speak. And the condition of my voice, as well as my age, cause me to wish rather to allow the younger fellows to take the lead, while I sit here and listen. But, I am sure I shall not be accused of unduly taking up time when I explain that in all the years I have been in parliament, this is the first time that I have ever taken part in the debate on the address.

Mr. TISDALE.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very much interest to this discussion on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I had not originally intended to take part in the debate, but certain points have been made, and I think it is my duty, as the representative of a large constituency, not to allow the debate to close without making some observations upon the motion now in your hands. I think that we are all agreed, both those on your right, and those on your left, Mr. Speaker, in rejoicing at the general prosperity which now prevails throughout Canada from ocean to ocean. I do not need to dwell upon that subject. I think we also congratulate ourselves that the time has gone by when this country has to put forth very serious exertions to induce immigrants to come to this country. I believe in immigration, but I think that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) yesterday sounded a true note when he cautioned the government that we should look to the quality rather than to the quantity of the immigrants coming to the shores of our country. I shall not discuss that question further than to say that I thoroughly agree with the view expressed by the hon. member for Labelle.

I was somewhat struck by one or two observations of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with respect to the public expenditure of this country. Apparently, with that right hon. gentleman, all depends upon the point of view. According to his argument it was gross extravagance when his predecessors in office expended about $38,000,000 a year, but it is splendid economy when, under his administration the country is expending over $78,000,000 a year. It depends I suppose upon the point of view and upon the circumstances of which party is in power; whether the government of the country is led by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or by the leader of the great party in this country which is opposed to him, and to many of his policies. It was also thrown out to me that I should not object to expenditures in my own constituency, that no member of this House should object to expenditures in his constituency. I wish to say, Sir, that I want no expenditure in my constituency unless it is needed and is for a work of utility, and if it is not actually needed in the public interest and is not a work of utility but is merely an expenditure to catch votes then it is an extravagant expenditure and should not be tolerated by this or any other government. I was asked what I thought about the construction of a grain elevator at the mouth of the harbour of St. John. I suppose the hon. gentleman who asked me that question imagined that he had put to me a poser and that I would be unable to answer such a magnificent question as that, that it might

possibly lose to me votes in the constituency, if I should happen to answer it as the hon. gentleman thought I might answer it. Well, Sir, let me say that the expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000 at the mouth of the River St. John on the north side of the harbour of St. John, six or seven years ago, has been absolutely a dead expenditure so far as this country is concerned. We have the grain elevator there and the appliances to ship grain from the north side and the east side of the harbour of St. John, but thus far, Sir, although it has been there for six or seven years, no grain, except a few bushels at the time of a Dominion election have passed through that elevator. I do not know whether that will become a work of utility or not in the near future. My hon. friend who propounded this question to me with prophetic insight is of the opinion that it will be a work of great utility. Unless it is taken hold of by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I fear that for the next six or seven years it will remain as it has remained for the last six or seven years. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I am happy to say, has acquired the railway bridge spanning the falls at the mouth of the River St. John, and when their trade is congested on the west side of the harbour they are in a position now to use that elevator and I believe my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) although he is not in a position to use it himself on behalf of the people of Canada, is about to permit the Canadian Pacific Railway to use that public work to avoid congestion on the western side of the harbour.

But, Sir, let me suggest in the mildest manner possible that if the transportation policy of the hon. gentleman who suggested that question to me is carried out that elevator never would be worth anything, the people of St. John may always have an opportunity of looking at it as a dead letter, money improvidently expended and I believe I can appeal to hon. members from the river counties of the province of New Brunswick, irrespective of their party affiliations, to corroborate me in the statements I am making.

I come back to the question, are all expenditures commendable? No, they must depend on utility and general result. I want to show from the mouth of a gentleman who is supporting the government—and I regret that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place so that I might bring it to his notice—that the money voted by parliament in one instance has not been properly expended. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) was in the city of St. John a short time ago; he is frequently there and we are always glad to see him. He was interviewed by one of the newspapers in the city of St. John with reference to the Nova Scotia fisheries. This interview appears in the 'Daily Telegraph' of St. John, of the 18th of October, 1906. He said:

> They are not as good as last year, in fact they are falling off considerably of late, a condition that has been in evidence for the past two or three years. This condition applies to the whole of the North American fisheries and it is a great pity that it is so.

I commend this to my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the absence of his Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). But that was not all, Sir. The member for Digby (Mr. Copp) said:

> As to the cause of this he said: The real cause is that the money apportioned for the preservation and protection of the fisheries is not properly expended.

Now, Sir, that brings me back to my other question, are all expenditures commendable? No, they must depend on utility and general result. Is it commendable to vote money on the floors of this House for the fisheries of Nova Scotia and the Atlantic provinces of this Dominion, if the money is not properly expended? And according to a supporter of the government the money is not properly expended. I say Sir, that expenditure of that kind is extravagant and is a vigorous indictment against the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

I have a note upon my minutes with respect to that steamer 'Arctic,' put there in consequence of something that was said by some gentleman who was speaking on behalf of the government, saying in fact that that expenditure did not amount to anything in the millions that we were collecting and expending, that it was only a small item, not worth the consideration of the legislators of this country. But, Sir, a principle is involved. That principle is that the money of this country should only be expended upon public competition and public tender. Just one specimen brick in reference to the investigation into the 'Arctic' last year, Sir. I happened to be on that committee. It is not a large matter, it is true, but it points a moral and adorns a tale and I am bringing it forward to support the principle that I am advocating. In the committee we discovered that $1.25 per pound had been paid by the government of this country for pemmican. We brought an expert witness to that committee to state to the committee and through the committee to this House and to the country what that article was worth on the market and I was refused the privilege of putting that witness upon the stand to prove what it could be purchased for. He belonged to one of the most respectable firms and he made an affidavit afterwards that that article, at the outside, would not be worth more than 35 cents per pound. It may be a small matter but it is the principle that I am trying to advocate and that I am trying to bring before the notice of this House.

Now, I am glad that the government, led by my right hon. friend, has put certain

things into the speech from the Throne. If it had not been for one or two things in that speech, I, Sir, should have remained silent during this discussion. It is well known that I was a member of the special committee appointed last year with respect to election matters, that that special committee met day after day taking valuable evidence and that we were agreed on a great many principles which should be put into a Bill when it was desirable that they should be put into the shape to be enacted into law. The present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was a member of that committee. The present chief justice of Canada was a member of that committee until he was elevated to the bench and I ask my right hon. friend, when he comes to consider the provisions of his electoral Bill, to see to it that many of the principles which were unanimously agreed upon in the special committee shall be introduced into the Bill that he is about to bring into this House for consideration, and, I believe, for adoption.

The very fact that the right hon. First Minister has deemed it necessary that some action should be taken with respect to electoral corruption in this country shows that he recognized the gravity of the situation at the present time by promising remedial legislation. I think that the right thinking men upon both sides of the House are agreed that legislation of somewhat drastic character should be crystallized into law to prevent many of the occurrences which have—I had almost said—shocked the moral sense of the Canadian people during the last few months. I agree with a great many things that the First Minister has said. The First Minister thought that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), under the evidence which had been adduced to the country, acted wisely in resigning his seat in this House as the member for London. I think that the right hon. gentleman is right in that view, but, Sir, the hon. the Minister of Justice if correctly reported in a speech delivered a short time since, saw no reason why the hon. Minister of Public Works should resign—a difference of opinion, apparently, between the first minister of the Crown, the leader of the government, and the Minister of Justice and allow me to add, Sir, that it is not the first occasion in this House when we have witnessed a difference of opinion between my right hon. friend and his Minister of Justice.

Now, I want to refer, for the purposes of my argument, particularly to three, possibly to four, cases which have been prominently before the public of Canada in the newspaper press and otherwise for some little time past,—first, what is known as the Gallery case ; second, the Queen's-Shelburne case; third, the London case ; and possibly, but for a particular purpose, the Halifax case. We know that the case which is known as the Gallery case was fought through all the courts. Able counsel availed themselves of all possible legal technicalities and machinery to delay the case, but the result was not only to declare the election void but to disqualify the gentleman, who at the time, carried the Liberal banner to victory. Now, I regret in one respect the result of the Queen's-Shelburne case. I regret that it was not as creditable as it might have been in respect of electoral purity. Difficulties were interposed and I am not saying anything personal against my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I am speaking entirely, or shall speak entirely by the record. I am appealing to my right hon. friend the leader of the government and I am endeavouring to appeal to every hon. member on the floor of this House, irrespective of his party affiliations. I say that difficulties were interposed at all stages to delay the proceedings and prevent the final adjudication. Counsel for the Finance Minister, I presume, had the right under the law to avail themselves of all difficulties, but I mention this case so that when we come to legislate upon this question in future we may put such machinery upon the statute-book that we can have more rapid proceedings and I hope that the proposed legislation will give this. Now, take the evidence of the hon. Minister of Finance on his examination before Mr. Justice Meagher on the 24th of January of this year. I have the evidence here. I think it is necessary for me to refer to it, not at length, but just to quote some of the evidence which was taken and that is with respect to the expenditure which was made in connection with the election of 1900. When counsel pressed the Minister of Finance with respect to that expenditure, question after question was asked and time after time the minister replied:

Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

I quote from the evidence of the Hon. Mr. Fielding:

Q. After the election of 1900 would you tell me whether you received or were called upon for any unpaid election bills ?

Objected to on the ground that all the charges in connection with the 1900 election had been struck out of the petition.

Again :

Q. Did you, after the election of 1900 receive any unpaid election bills ?—A. I refuse to answer the question.

Q. Did you within three months after the election of 1900 receive any bills for election expenses?—A. I have no recollection of the particular time of receiving them. I did receive some bills but not at any time in relation to the following election. I did receive bills soon after the election of 1900.

Q. Who presented them to you ?—A. Under the advice of counsel I refuse to answer.

Q. When did you pay them?—A. I paid them shortly after the election.

Q. How many bills were presented to you?—A. Under the advice of counsel I refuse to answer that question.

His Lordship. I do not suppose I am in a position to do anything except to report to the court.

Q. How much did you pay?—A. Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

Q. How many separate bills were sent to you?—A. Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

Q. Who made these claims upon you?—A. Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

Q. Were any of these claims made by any of the persons whose names you have mentioned as supporters of yours at the election of 1904——

——which I would think Mr. Speaker would be a somewhat pertinent question:

A. Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

Q. You won't tell us what they were for?—A. My answer is the same as previously.

Q. What was the amount?—A. Under the advice of counsel I adhere to my answer.

Q. Who made the demand on you?—A. I adhere to my answer.

Q. You won't give us an idea of the amount?—A. I adhere to my answer.

And so on down, until Hon. Mr. Drysdale his counsel says:

I have instructed him not to answer.

Then His Lordship said he thought it would be legitimate to answer and the examination continued:

Q. Having heard the judge do you decline to answer?—A. Under the advice of counsel I decline to answer.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the judge?

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not know who the judge was. Now, I regret that that condition of affairs should exist. I am not going to say one word against the personal character of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but on his own account I regret that such evidence is spread upon the record. Then, take the evidence on the trial with respect to the money that was paid to Mr. Farrell, the Speaker of the Nova Scotia Legislative Assembly. I quote from the evidence of the Minister of Finance:

Mr. Farrell informed me there were unpaid expenses of the election campaign and he wanted to know if I would pay them. I objected, and told him so. On further consideration I determined I would pay them. I thought it would be shabby if I allowed my friends in the county to pay them. Very reluctantly I agreed to pay the amount he mentioned. Mr. Farrell stated that amount was due and I paid it. I did not ask any questions as to what it was expended for, nor whose bills were paid.

Q. Give us the amount of the bill?

Objected to.

Their Lordships decide the amount does not go to the proof of agency.

This is from the evidence in the Queen's-Shelburne case, and I think it ought to impress the Prime Minister that it is high time that some further legislation should be had with respect to the conduct of elections in this country. I am not reflecting at all upon the character of the Minister of Finance, I do not wish to do so. But it stated that Mr. Farrell, this speaker of the House of Assembly, gave about $600 to a Mr. John F. Seldon (as it appears in the evidence) who sent it to two places, Kent and Caledonia, and it turns out that in this district there were about 600 votes. If you could calculate that 10 per cent of the voters of that district were of a purchasable character that will come to about $10 per vote—the current rate paid in the London election. I quote from Mr. Seldon's evidence:

Q. Would you mind telling me where you got this $100 that you paid to Henry Tupper?—A. From Mr. E. M. Farrell.

Q. E. M. Farrell is the local member for Queen's county?—A. Yes.

Q. And Speaker of the House of Assembly at that time?—A. I do not know.

Q. He has represented Queen's for a number of years in the local legislature?—A. Yes.

Q. How much money did you get from him altogether?—A. I cannot tell you exactly; somewhere in the neighbourhood of $500, between five and six probably.

Q. Not any more than that?—A. Not any more than that, I don't think.

Q. When did you get it from Farrell?—A. Some time before the election, probably a week.

Now, we say, and probably truthfully, that the Finance Minister did somewhat chivalrously when he paid election bills which he felt he ought not to be called upon to pay, when he did not wish to put his supporters in the position of being at an expense on account of his election; but there is this to be said with respect to that—and I am perfectly satisfied that it did not occur to my hon. friend the Finance Minister—that in doing that he was rendering himself liable to an indictable offence and would have been so liable if it had not been for the lapse of time. But it brings these matters before the notice of this House for the purpose of impressing upon the House the desirability of having a proper legislation. We are about to consider the electoral laws, and we want now proper, drastic, rapid legislation with respect to our elections.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STOCKTON. Before the House rose at recess, I was making some observations regarding the Queen's-Shelburne election. It is not my purpose to make any further remarks upon that subject, except to say that Mr. Farley, to whom I had referred, found it beneficial to his health to depart from the country and remain out of Canada until after there had been a conclusion of the legal proceedings. I also stated at the start

that there were some things said by my right hon. friend the First Minister in which I cordially agree, but that there were some others in which I do not agree with him. It is possible that my right hon. friend referred to some of these election matters in a jocose spirit and not with that seriousness which probably he otherwise would have done, if he had supposed that any of his impetuous and injudicious followers might be misled by the tenor of his remarks—such followers, for instance, as the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) or the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell). My right hon. friend said practically that you must meet the devil with the devil's fire. These were his words :

I do not know, but Mr. Gibbons told us that the friends of Mr. Hyman, having fought two elections and won fairly and having been deprived of the seat by unfair and fraudulent methods, came to the conclusion that they would fight the devil with the devil's fire. Well, no great mistake could be made if the Grits should undertake to fight the enemy with his own fire. I do not know how it is, but it appears that the Tories can always use the devil's fire. They seem to have been made for it.

Salamanders, I suppose.

It seems to be congenial to them. They can do it almost with impunity. But when a poor misguided Grit undertakes to deal with the devil's fire, he burns his fingers every time.

If my right hon. friend, in a spirit of jocoseness, made that observation, I have not a word to say ; but if he made it in all seriousness, then I certainly take exception to it, because it appears to me that my right hon. friend does not quite appreciate the gravity of the situation which is facing the Canadian people to-day. I look upon the problem as a very serious one, and I am bound to say that I think my right hon. friend looks upon it as one of great gravity so far as our people are concerned. There is another point upon which my right hon. friend dwelt, and in which I agree with him fully and cordially. He said :

There is a great difference between the classes of offences which we find by late developments to have taken place. Bribery is bad, but ballot switching is ten times worse ; and although it is impossible to have any sympathy with bribery or the briber, still there is not for them the same contempt that there is for the ballot switcher, and if the law is to be affected it must be made absolutely severe and provide the severest penalty possible for any one attempting to tamper with the ballots.

In that statement of my right hon. friend I agree, and I think the people will agree. That brings me to the consideration of some of the facts which have been disclosed by the investigation into the third election case I have mentioned—the London case. The facts are fresh in the minds of the people, and need not be rehearsed by me at this time at any length. But in that case there was not only bribery, Sir ; there was the unblushing theft of ballots as well. And it is the right hon. gentleman's condemnation of that feature of the case with which I cordially agree. As to the switching of ballots, every one must himself admit that it is a crime which should be put down with a strong hand. Let me say that in this country we must have a secret ballot and an honest count. Unless we have these under representative institutions, the election is a fraud and a farce ; and the people of the country, no matter what the legislation may be, will admit that the ballot must be secret and the count honest, and that when an elector puts his ballot into the hands of a returning officer to be deposited in the ballot box, there must be the assurance that it finds the place to which the voter has determined it shall go. There is another position with respect to the law which should be carried out, and that is that the candidate should have no right to appoint deputy returning officers. In that position I am fortified by an editorial taken from a Toronto newspaper, Liberal in its tendencies, supporting the government of the day, and holding the government responsible for the electoral corruption which is taking place in this country by reason of it not having better supervision over the returning officers. Let me read this article, published in the Toronto 'Star,' which, I believe, is a Liberal newspaper, and from which it was copied into the St. John 'Daily Telegraph,' of date October 29th last :

The government of the day is absolutely responsible for the character of the election officers, the returning officers and the deputies. It can insist on these being men of good character just as it insists on the honesty of clerks in the post office.

It can insist on the returning officer maintaining his independence, and refusing to submit to the dictation of politicians and patronage committees. It is within the power of parliament to eliminate fraud and tampering with the ballots with almost absolute certainty.

The government can put a stop to public corruption, that is to the offer of public works in return for votes. It is not enough for a minister to say that he is not personally making these appeals. He can repudiate them, not generally, but specifically, to-day in North Bruce. He can declare as often as the appeals are made that the government will treat North Bruce with impartial justice, no matter whether it may support or oppose the government. He can declare that the government respects the independence of the electors of North Bruce and will not seek to destroy it by threats or by bribes. He can declare that the ministers are servants and trustees of the people and have no right to use the trust funds for purposes of bribery. He can repudiate all those who seek to place the government in the position of committing that breach of trust and of making that assault on the liberties of the people.

The public are tired of generalities and platitudes about corruption. They want definite

speech and definite action. The government of the day, as the chief holder of political power, is the right body to make a beginning. If fraud and tampering with ballots can be abolished, if the corrupt appeal to vote for the government in return for public expenditures can be abolished, that will make a good beginning and set a good example. Then it will be easier to deal with the other fellows who are 'just as corrupt' and with that corrupt fringe of electors to which the politicians ascribe their own temptation and their own fall from grace. The only way to stop corruption is for each man to do his own duty. Let each of us call upon his own party leaders to set the example.

I commend these manly utterances to my right hon. friend the leader of this House. They embody the correct political principle. And, to a certain extent, they are an indictment against this government for its appointment of returning officers who have been proved in the courts, under sworn testimony to have violated their trust and to have been guilty of actual fraud in connection with the ballots.

Now, I wish to make a remark with regard to a certain document which has been read more than once by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. This has been characterized here as a forged document, and every hon. gentleman on that side of the House knows that it is not a genuine document. And every respectable member on that side of the House must, in his heart, feel ashamed that such political warfare should be resorted to in the interests of his side as the reading of such a document on the floor of parliament. It has been stated, and I believe that it has been shown that this document was—well, I was going to say, fashioned in iniquity. It was brought to the light only of late years. It is the foundling of one or two gentlemen opposite, who have dragged it to the floors of parliament for the purpose of discrediting the political party to which I have the honour to belong. Is it necessary, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen on either side of the House should resort to tactics which discredit and degrade our public life? Ought we not rather to feel the responsibility of our position and pursue that course which will elevate the tone of public life in Canada? I say it has been stated that this is practically a forged document. And, yet, in the face of that statement, it has been again read on the floor of parliament, in order, if possible, to discredit the Conservative party. Now, ballot folding, ballot switching and fraudulent count must be stamped out at all hazards. Every honest man, I care not what his politics are, must be in favour of that course; all decent men, on both sides. of the House should and must unite to accomplish that end. These rascalities must not be allowed to be raised to the dignity of a fine art. I understand that, in the Hastings election, a man was brought from Chicago to use his electoral arts to steal the sacred right of the franchise supposed to be enjoyed by every Canadian citizen. Can any decent, respectable man justify that? Let such perpetrators of fraud be hunted down, let them be brought into court; and, let us have the pledge of my right hon. friend the First Minister, to this House and to this country that, when they are sent to prison, they shall be kept there to pay the penalty of their crime. Now, that is all I wish to say, just at present, with respect to the London election. I know that every respectable public man feels as if a wound had been given to the public life of this country by the disclosures that have been made. I believe that there are men on both sides of this House who are willing to join together to promote legislation to prevent such rascalities in the future. Now, further, what ought we to do with respect to the discovery and punishment of violations of the electoral law? The law's delays are proverbial. I cite the Halifax case not for the purpose of going into a discussion of the merits of that case, but in order to point out to the House the great delays that have taken place and that can take place in relation to proceedings in election petitions. I believe that the following is a complete chronological record of the case of the Hethrington petitioner against Roche, the hon. member for Halifax. That record speaks eloquently of the efficiency—or, should I rather not say the inefficiency?—of our election law:

December 13, 1904—Petition filed against election of Wm. Roche. Eighteen days later,

December 31, 1904—Preliminary objections to the petition presented. Six months subsequently,

July 7, 1905—Chief Justice Weatherbe gives judgment dismissing preliminary objections. Another five months elapse and

November 28, 1905—An appeal from Chief Justice Weatherbe's decision dismissing the preliminary objections argued before the Supreme Court of Canada.

December 1, 1905—Minutes of judgment of Supreme Court of Canada affirming the decision of Chief Justice Weatherbe finally settled.

Then there is no further proceeding until January 20, 1906, at which time an order was made by Mr. Justice Meagher, fixing the 30th February as the date of examination of the respondent in aid of discovery, and on the 7th of February, of 1906, a motion was made by counsel for the respondent to appear before the court en banque to dismiss the petition upon the ground that the time for the trial of the same was not properly expended and on February 13, 1906, counsel for respondent asks for an adjournment of examination until February 16, on the ground that the Supreme Court had not yet given judgment on motion to dismiss the petition and the application was granted. Exactly 14 months had then elapsed since the original petition was presented for unseating and disqualifying the respondent. On February 16, 1906, counsel for the respondent asks for another

adjournment of examination until March 27, as the court had not yet given judgment on motion to dismiss the petition and the application was granted.

On March 27, 1906, counsel for the respondent asks for a third adjournment of examination until April 27, as the court had not yet given judgment on motion to dismiss the petition and the application was granted, and on April 20, 1906, judgment was given by the court en banque dismissing the respondent's motion for dismissal of the petition. On April 27, 1906, respondent did not appear in obedience to the subpoena and the examination is adjourned sine die.

On July 17, 1906, the trial of the petition to unseat and disqualify the respondent finally comes to trial after one year and seven months of preliminary technicalities when the respondent's counsel objects to the jurisdiction of the court to try the petition.

On July 18, 1906, the judges dismissed the petition on the ground of want of jurisdiction and ten weeks later, on October 4th 1906, the Supreme Court of Canada reverses the decision of the trial judges dismissing the petition against the respondent and sends it back for trial, and on October 22nd, 1906, the minutes of judgment in appeal are settled by the Supreme Court of Canada.

On November 15, 1906, an order is issued by Mr. Justice Townsend fixing the date of the examination of respondent for Saturday, November 17.

On November 17, 1906, the respondent does not appear in obedience to the order and a letter is produced from his counsel saying that he does not know where the respondent is.

Meanwhile, Sir, nearly two years have elapsed since the machinery of the law was put in motion and apparently we are no nearer the end of the hearing of that case than at the beginning, two years ago.

What I wish to impress upon this House, upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), upon my hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), is that when legislation is brought before this House for the purpose of being put upon the statute-book there should be such machinery as to prevent such delays as this, that if possible the machinery should be simple, it should be expeditious, it should be certain and there should be no trifling with charges of electoral corruption by such legal technicalities as I have disclosed in the statement which I have made.

I want, Sir, to refer to a statement that was made by the member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) last night with respect to an election which took place in the county of King's, in the province of New Brunswick, and in which the present member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was a candidate. The hon. gentleman more than insinuates, Sir, that there was something wrong, something discreditable on the part of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in connection with that election. Does not the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) Sir, know, or does he not want to know that the stamp of falsity was put upon that statement years ago? Does he not know or has he shut his ears, Sir, so that he cannot hear, that a somewhat similar insinuation found its way into a leading Liberal paper in the city of St. John and that newspaper soon apologized for making the statement, retracted the statement and made the amende honorable. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know that and yet he revamps that old story just as that forged document has been dragged before the House and brings it before the country as a fresh charge against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I think it is only just to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that I should make that statement, and I know whereof I speak. When the hon. gentleman, Sir, was discussing questions relating to the county of King's in the province of New Brunswick, I would mildly suggest to him that he might have carried his researches a little further and have given this House some little information respecting what is known as the Rothesay election frauds when in one day or one night 400 names were put upon the list in the parish of Rothesay, within 10 or 12 miles of the city of St. John. This was found out by mere accident, taken to the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and set aside because it was begun in fraud and completed in fraud.

Sir, I am not going to charge the whole Liberal party with a piece of rascality such as that. Some of them, however, are chargeable with it, and let me say, Sir, that one or two of the men who were implicated in practically the forgery of that list are officials under the local government of the province of New Brunswick to-day. That is the way they have been punished. The list failed to do its work but the truth of the fraud was brought home before the full court of the province of New Brunswick.

I want to say just one or two words with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell). I am glad to see that he is in his place and I may say that no gentleman on the floor of this House listened to his venerable peroration with more pleasure than I did. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Smith, William D. Smith, I think it was, spent in an election in South Ontario the sum of $1,200 and the fact of that expenditure resounded around the world. Well, we have been told upon many occasions of late years that these are expansive times under the government of my right hon. friend and $1,200 would be almost too small to be considered either in connection with an election or any other matter of public interest. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) also spoke

about the spoiling of a lot of ballots in certain constituencies but he did not tell the House for whom they were polled or how they were spoiled. It would be interesting to know from my hon. friend as to whether all the ballots which were spoiled had been polled for the Liberal candidate. My hon. friend is quite silent upon that phase of the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What election do you refer to?

Mr. STOCKTON. The one that you referred to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I referred to a good many.

Mr. STOCKTON. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman attempts to speak with respect to that election again I hope he will be a little more definite and state how many ballots were spoiled for the Liberal candidate and how many for the Conservative candidate. My hon. friend referred to an American book but there was no evidence of what was in that American book or what kind of a book it was, but he endeavoured to leave the inference upon the minds of the members of this House that that American book was of a character similar to the pamphlet from which he was reading. He took very good care though, Sir, not to say that in plain English or that that was the fact. I join with my hon. friend with respect to one or two matters that he referred to. But, he will pardon me if I say that I did not think he was quite logical in the expression of some of his views. For instance, he says that he thinks that the great majority of the people of this country, in so far as elections are concerned, are absolutely pure, and then on top of that he says that the Conservatives are about one-half and that if they had their desserts they ought all to be in jail. Well, if that be so, there cannot, in the hon. gentleman's estimation, be that general electoral purity which he stated in the first part of his sentence. Now, I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to rehearse ancient history. I do not think it would do very much good to go extensively into that branch of the discussion. I hold, however, a pamphlet in my hand which refers to a certain election at one time that took place in the city of London, some years ago, which has attained some degree of prominence in consequence of certain disclosures and one gentleman who was a supporter of the Liberal cause said this and it is a matter of record in the courts of Ontario :

> Come along, John ; come and help put down bribery and corruption. We have lots of money, so come along.

Well, I think that that would be a very doubtful way of putting down bribery and corruption at elections, but that is a statement which has been proved, as I understand it, under oath and is part of the record in one of the high courts of the province of Ontario. I am quite satisfied that my right hon. friend has somewhat changed his views upon this and some other questions within recent years, but I have a statement here that was made, or stated to be made—I am not prepared to say that it was—by my right hon. friend at the Club Nationale in 1877:

> I would have you rely mainly on the justice of our cause.

I believe in that thoroughly. It is the proper doctrine to preach.

> Yet, I have learned by experience that we must not forget those human devices that are so essential to victory.

Of course I will leave to my right hon. friend the interpretation as to what he means by the two words 'human devices.' I do not put any interpretation upon these. Now, I wish to say, Sir, that I hope the government will see its way clear to bring in a comprehensive and stringent Bill for the purpose of accomplishing what all the respectable public men of this country want irrespective of party. It ought not to be a question of party politics. In so far as I am concerned I tell my right hon. friend that I shall not make it a question of party politics, and when we had our special committee last year on which was my hon. friend the Minister of Justice he will tell the First Minister that there was no division of opinion to speak of on that committee with respect to the work which should be done by the government for the purpose of putting down bribery and corruption at elections in Canada. We cannot afford, Sir, to allow this matter to go on further. The people of the world are looking at us. They are wondering what position we are going to take, what we are going to do with respect to this matter. In some countries, bullets, not ballots, control the adminstration of the country and to do what we must, as I have already said, have a secret ballot—and I am in favour of the ballot—and an honest count and if we have that, Sir, we will soon wipe out the stain which is upon the public life of this country in consequence of the extensive disclosures which have been made in our courts during the last few months.

Motion (Mr. Pardee) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

> That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself in a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That this House will, on Thursday next, resolve itself in a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY :

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved minute of Council appointing the Hon. William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, the Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. William Paterson, Minister of Customs, and the Hon. Henry Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada intituled an Act respecting the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, November 24, 1906.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1906.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1906—Fisheries—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The Trade and Navigation Returns—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Postmaster General—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Department of Labour—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Inspection of Weights and Measures—Hon. Wm. Templeman.

ADJOURNMENT—FUEL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I ask the Prime Minister whether or not there is any further information in respect to the matter mentioned by the Minister of Labour this afternoon, viz., the position of the coal strike at Lethbridge ? This undoubtedly is a question of very urgent moment. The circumstances have been brought to the attention of the government by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), and the latest accounts from the west in the press indicate that my hon. friend has not at all described the situation in exaggerated language. A despatch in the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' of to-day says:

The matter is one of life and death to the settlers who are enduring zero weather and burning valuable lumber, willow bramble, twisted hay and grain for fuel. All schools are closed.

We would like, under these circumstances, to know whether or not the expectations of the Minister of Labour are likely to be realized, and what the government proposes to do in regard to the matter. It is of great urgency. Life is threatened in the west, schools are closed, the people are obliged to burn even their grain for fuel. It seems to me that neither the government nor parliament can afford to sit idle and take a calm and philosophic view of the situation. The suffering is intense, even if life is not threatened, but apparently life is threatened. The situation has been brought about by a strike which has lasted since the month of March last. During that period of eight or nine months it would appear that the efforts of the government, whatever they may have been, through the Department of Labour, have been absolutely unavailing. It is said that there is some hope of settlement, but that settlement has not yet been reached. Would the Prime Minister be good enough to inform the House whether there is any further news and whether the government has under consideration any means to avert the calamity with which the people of the west are threatened.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The last information received upon this very important subject is a telegram from Mr. King, addressed to the Minister of Labour, informing the Minister that he is making progress and expressing the hope that the basis of settlement which has been agreed to between masters and men will be approved by the authorities which control the union ; and that perhaps to-morrow a settlement may be effected. While this is the latest information I would not like for my part to be too sanguine ; I would say that there is some strong probability that the strike will be settled as indicated in that telegram. Should, unfortunately, that result not come about the situation will become more serious than it has hitherto. I must say frankly that I am at a loss to know what measures should be taken by this government to overcome the difficulty. The Northwest provinces have several sources of supply whence they can draw their coal from. They have been depending chiefly upon Lethbridge for coal, and that source has failed them for several months past. There are coal deposits in different parts of the provinces: in Alberta on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and on the Canadian Pacific Railway—but as I understand it this coal is not available for domestic purposes. A supply of coal could be obtained from the American side but that is far away also, so that the main source of supply must be from Lethbridge. At present the strike is not gen-

eral. Many months ago when the strike first originated an appeal was made to the government to give police protection for the men who wanted to work, and to protect the colliery property. We complied with that request and there has been police protection ever since. I have been in communication with some of the authorities in the Northwest Territories and we have informed them that so far as police protection is concerned we would lend the whole strength of the force at our command to protect the men in their efforts to operate the mines. From the latest advices we have I understand that the collieries are supplying 500 tons of coal per day. That statement was disputed yesterday by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who said that he thought the daily production was not more than 200 or 300 tons per day.

Mr. OSLER. I think it is 200 tons a day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot dispute the statement of my hon. friend who is perhaps better informed on the subject than I am, but the information I have is that at present the mines can turn out 500 tons per day. If 500 tons a day can be turned out and if the railway accommodation is adequate to distribute them, I think the immediate danger of dire distress may be averted. But this is only partially successful, and if the efforts which we have now under consideration at Lethbridge are unavailing, I do not know what further measures may be taken. We shall be very glad to receive suggestions from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but it seems to me that we ought to supply all the necessary police protection to enable the work to be carried on successfully.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think the government would be justified in taking charge of the coal supply in the west for the purpose of preventing loss of life and the horrible sufferings that may be confronting those people. It strikes me that the emergency would justify that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will realize that that is more easily said than done. You must have labour adapted to that kind of work, and moreover I do not know that the government would have a right in putting a high hand on private property. It would require very serious consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be a question of jurisdiction, but there are only two governments that could act, the government of the province or this government, and I am putting the case before this government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, in this country the government would not be justified in laying a high hand on any private property. I still think the ordinary laws of the country ought to be sufficient to cope with such an evil.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the provincial government have taken the position that it was not for them to act, but for this government and I also understand that they have had communication with this government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then my information is not correct.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 9 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 28, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

On the order being called :

Introduction of Bills,—Bill intituled An Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903—Mr. Maclean.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I would introduce one of my Bills to-day if the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) were in his place. I will allow it to stand over for the present.

QUESTIONS.

PURCHASE OF RIFLES.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor— asked:

1. How many rifles have been bought by the government from the Ross Rifle Company, of Quebec ?

2. What is the price of rifle No. 1 and No. 2, respectively ?

3. How much was paid altogether by the government to the Ross Rifle Company for rifles No. 1 and 2, respectively ?

4. Is it true that after a few days of practice at Bisley the Canadians had to change their Ross rifles for the Lee-Enfield ?

5. Is it true that the Mounted Police has to abandon the Ross rifle and take the Lee-Enfield again ?

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

1. 52,000 rifles have been ordered, of which 20,500 have been delivered and paid for.

2. $25. The same price for both.

3. Mark I, $262,500. Mark II, $250,000.

4. Both the Lee-Enfield and Ross rifles were issued to the Bisley team, the latter not having been previously issued to the militia and very few members of the team had had an opportunity of practising with it. Most, if not all the matches at Bisley this year were shot with the Lee-Enfield rifle.

5. It is not true.

RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Were any of the Dominion lands agents notified when to accept entries for the even-numbered sections in those townships recently taken out of the Riding Mountain timber reserve ? If so, what was the date mentioned ?
2. Were those instructions subsequently cancelled ? If so, for what reason, and at whose request ?
3. When will those lands be available for homesteading ?
4. Will squatters who have located on the lands, either before or since the lands were taken out of the reserve, have priority in making entry ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. (a) Instructions were sent to the agent of the Dominion lands at Minnedosa to grant entries for even-numbered sections in the tract taken out of the Riding Mountain timber reserve. Similar instructions to the agent at Dauphin were, through a clerical error, sent to Yorkton. The mistake was not discovered in time, but the advertisement which appeared in the press correctly stated the facts.

(b) The date mentioned was the 1st of October, 1906.

2. Owing to the closing of the Minnedosa land office on the 1st of October, 1906, entries were not granted. Action on the instructions was therefore stayed.

3. That question is under consideration.

4. An investigation is being held by officers of the department as to rights of squatters on the land in question, and action will be on the merits of each case.

DENATURED SPIRITS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

Is it the intention of the government to enact a measure to permit the extension of the manufacture of spirits, having in view the denaturing of the same for power purposes ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This matter is one which will more probably come within the consideration of the House at the time of the budget. At present it is under consideration.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then, the question stands ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I have answered it.

DRILL SHED IN LINDSAY, ONTARIO.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to erect a suitable drill shed in Lindsay this year ?
2. When is it intended to be completed ?
3. What is the proposed cost thereof ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). This matter is being considered, and I will ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to wait until the estimates come down, when I shall be glad to discuss the subject.

RIFLE RANGE IN VICTORIA COUNTY, ONTARIO.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

Is it the intention of the government to secure and fit up a rifle range in Victoria county this year ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The proposed site for a rifle range at Lindsay has been examined and reported as unsafe. An effort will be made to secure a suitable site as soon as possible.

MEDALS FOR NILE VOYAGEURS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the government re-examined into the question of having medals granted to the Nile voyageurs from Canada ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to endeavour to thus recognize the services of that deserving body of Canadians ?
3. What objections, if any, are there to having such medals issued ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). A similar question to this was put to me in the House last session. The answer then given still holds good—that these men received the Soudan medal given by the British government, and also the Khedive's bronze star, but they did not receive any scrip. The government has seen no reason to re-open the matter.

REPAIRS TO TORONTO POST OFFICE.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

1. What was the date named in the contract for the completion of the repairs to the Toronto general post office, made necessary by damage to the building by fire ?
2. Who is the contractor, and who is the architect for the said work ?
3. When does the government expect that the said work will be completed ?
4. Is the government aware that at the present rate of progress of the said work the building will not be completed in time to handle the Christmas and New Year's mail matter ?
5. Is the government aware that the present temporary building is not large or adequate enough to handle the Christmas and New Year's mail matter, and that if the old general post office is not completed in time there will be great delay, loss and inconvenience caused to the citizens of Toronto in connection with the handling of the Christmas and New Year's business aforesaid ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). As questions 4 and 5 refer to my department, I answer them. We have received, in the Post Office Department, the following letter :

CHIEF POST OFFICE SUPERINTENDENT.

Toronto, Ont., Nov. 24th, 1906.

Sir,—I have the honour to report that the Toronto general post office was this day re-

moved from the temporary quarters corner of Front and Lorne streets to the post office building, 36, 38, 40, Adelaide street, east.

You will, I am sure, be gratified to learn that the removal was accomplished in such a manner as to cause no interruption to postal business—all of the outgoing and incoming mails were dispatched and received on schedule time, and the letter carriers made their full compliment of deliveries.

On Monday every branch of the service will be in full operation and the public may as formerly utilize the office to the fullest extent.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
GEORGE ROSS,
Chief Superintendent.

And on the 26th, instant, the following message was received :

Toronto, Nov. 26th, 1906.

In full running order this morning at general post office, in ample time for Christmas rush.

T. C. PATTISON.

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

1. The total work to be done was divided in order to have it quickly expedited and the instructions to each contractor were to forward his share of the work as quickly as possible.

2. The contractors are: Alfred Gardner & Co., expanded metal and concrete flooring; McGregor & McIntyre, Limited, steel beams; Bennett & Wright, heating apparatus, wiring and fixtures; William Munroe & Son, carpentry; Hudge & Son, plastering; F. C. Davis, painting and glazing; architect in charge, G. S. Curry.

3. It is expected that the whole of the work will be completed by the 15th of December.

Questions 4 and 5 have already been answered.

LONDON ELECTION INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What assistance is the government rendering the local authorities towards bringing to justice those who illegally took part in the recent London election ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). If legal proceedings in respect to the charges referred to had been taken under the Statutes in that behalf, it would have been the duty of the Attorney General of Canada, under Revised Statutes, chapter 9, section 73, to have instructed counsel to assist the local authorities in the due prosecution of the accused. Proceedings of a different character having been instituted, and no assistance having been requested by those in charge of the prosecution, none has been offered.

PURCHASE OF SUB-TARGET MACHINE GUNS.

Mr. STOCKTON asked :

1. How many sub-target machine guns have been purchased by the Department of Militia in each year to date, from whom were they purchased, and what was the price paid therefor ?

2. What distribution has been made of these machines ?

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

1. 200 sub-target guns were constructed for June 30, 1904, and delivered during April, 1905. 50 additional guns were purchased during October, 1906. These guns were purchased from the Sub-Target Gun Company, Limited, Toronto, and the price paid therefor was $250 each.

2. Details of issues machines sub-target guns :

M.D. No. 1, London :

Issues—	
Auburn Rifle Association	1
No. 1, Regimental Depot	1
1st Hussars	1
7th Regiment	1
8th Co., 26th Regiment	1
21st Regiment	1
24th "	1
25th "	1
26th "	1
27th "	1
28th "	1
29th "	1
30th "	1
32nd "	1
33rd "	1
In Ordnance charge	10
Total	25

M.D. No. 2, Toronto :

97th Regiment	1
38th "	1
91st "	1
13th "	1
7th Field Battery	1
2nd Regimental Depot	2
34th Regiment	2
2nd Queen's Own Rifles	6
23rd Regiment	2
35th " No. 2 Co	1
35th "	1
44th "	1
37th "	1
19th "	1
2nd Field Company, Engineers	1
31st Regiment	3
77th "	2
2nd Dragoons	4
9th Light Horse	2
7th Company, 36th Regiment	1
In Ordnance charge	10
Total	45

M.D. No. 3, Kingston :

Cobourg Garrison Artillery	1
57th Regiment	2
40th "	1
14th "	2
In Ordnance charge	14
Total	20

M.D. No. 4, Ottawa :	
Ottawa Collegiate Institute	1
41st Regiment (I think this should be the 43rd)	1
Ordnance charge (eight subject to order of D.O.C.)	13
Total	15
M.D. No. 5, Montreal :	
4th Field Company, Engineers	1
53rd Regiment	1
65th "	1
84th "	1
In Ordnance charge	26
Total	30
M.D. No. 7, Quebec :	
11th Hussars	2
8th Regiment 'Royal Rifles'	1
In Ordnance charge	17
Total	20
M.D. No. 8, St. John, N.B. :	
8th Hussars	2
Ordnance charge	23
Total	25
M.D. No. 9, Halifax, N.S. :	
Royal Canadian Regiment	2
In Ordnance charge	13
Total	15
H.M. Gun Wharf	25
Total	40
M.D. No. 10, Winnipeg :	
Field Battery	1
Canadian Mounted Rifles	2
Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles	1
90th Regiment	1
Ordnance charge	5
Total	10
M.D. No. 11, Victoria, B.C. :	
5th Regiment, Canadian Artillery	2
6th Regiment Rifles	3
Rocky Mountain Rangers, No. 1 Co.	1
" " " No. 2 Co.	1
Fernie Rifles, No. 1 Co.	1
In Ordnance charge	7
Total	15
M.D. No. 12, Charlottetown, P.E.I. :	
3rd Company, 82nd Regiment	1
In Ordnance charge	4
Total	5
Recapitulation :	
Issued to Regiments	83
Subject to order of D.O.C. 4	8
In Ordnance charge	159
Total	250

RETURN OF SUB-TARGET GUN MACHINES ISSUED TO CAMPS, 1906.

District.	Used in Camp.
M.D. No. 1	1
" " 2	10
" " 3	9
" " 4	8
" " 5 and 6	5
" " 7	8
" " 8	13
" " 9	16
Total	70
M.D. No. 10	Nil
" " 11	"
" " 12	"

The above as far as known. Guns may have been used, but not reported, at camps in Districts 10, 11 and 12.

Issues are being made to regiments and other units by the D.O.C.'s and it is expected the whole of the guns except a sufficient reservation for the camp of instruction will shortly be distributed.

SUSPENSION OF C. F. JUST.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. When, by whom, and for what cause was C. F. Just, an officer of the immigration offices in London, dismissed ?

2. Has this officer been restored to his position ? If so, by whom, and for what reason ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Mr. Just was not dismissed. He was suspended on December 13, 1904, by Mr. W. T. R. Preston, late Commissioner of Emigration in London.

2. Yes. By Mr. W. D. Scott, Superintendent of Immigration, because it was not considered necessary in the interest of the service to continue the suspension.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not answered the third clause of the question for what cause was he suspended or dismissed.

Mr. OLIVER. The question is, was he dismissed ; there is no question about his suspension. He was not dismissed, he was suspended.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister does not know the cause of his suspension?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman has not asked the question. If he will ask it, I will give him an answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the hon. gentleman the question now.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take means to get an answer for the hon. gentleman.

W. T. R. PRESTON AND PHILIP WAGNER.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What position in the service of the government is now held by Mr. W. T. R. Preston, and at what salary ?
2. Is Mr. Frank Wagner still in the employ of the government ? If so, in what capacity, and under what salary ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) :

1. William T. R. Preston has been appointed as a trade commissioner or agent of the Dominion government to visit China, Corea and Japan with a view to ascertaining to what extent and in what manner an increase of trade between the Dominion of Canada and China, Corea and Japan can be brought about ; his remuneration to be at a rate not exceeding $300 per month and such actual, reasonable expenses as he may necessarily incur in making such investigations.

2. There is not any Frank Wagner employed, but Philip Wagner is employed as assistant immigration agent and interpreter at Edmonton and he is paid $100 a month.

CANADIANS IMPRISONED IN URUGUAY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Are there any Canadians or person sailing from a Canadian port or under Canadian register, imprisoned by the Uruguayan or other foreign government ?
2. When were these persons, if any, arrested?
3. What is the nature of their offence, if any?
4. What steps have been taken to secure their release ?
5. Is it the intention of the Canadian government to send the Canadian navy to effect their release, in case justice should be longer delayed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The Canadian government has been informed that four sealers from the Canadian sealing schooner 'Gertrude' of Halifax, Nova Scotia, are under arrest at Monte Video, Uruguay.

2. The first intimation received by the Canadian government was dated 30th October, 1906. No date of arrest was given.

3. They were seized in open boats inside territorial waters, apparently not sealing, but making for the land in a fog, having lost their ship.

4. The government is arranging that they shall be defended by counsel before the courts of that country.

5. I hope the hon. member does not expect me to give him any answer to this question.

REPORT OF W. W. MOORE.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Has the government received the report of Mr. W. W. Moore, chief of the markets division of the Department of Agriculture, on his investigation into the condition of the packing houses of the Dominion ?
2. If so, does such report generally reveal a satisfactory condition of affairs?
3. Is it the intention of the government to place the report on the table of the House ? If so, when ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. While the report deals favourably with the packing houses generally, it refers to certain features in a few individual establishments which were considered more or less objectionable. As the owners of these establishments showed a readiness to at once remove the objectionable features when these were pointed out, and gave every assurance to the department that they would not be continued, and as the publication of the report, with these references, would cause injury to the owners referred to, while no interest would be served by such publication, it is not deemed advisable to lay it on the table.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL SURVEY.

Mr. BRABAZON asked :

1. Has the government received an interim report from the chief engineer in charge of the survey of the Georgian bay canal ?
2. What will be the approximate cost of such canal, as shown by the reports already received ?
3. When may the final report on the survey be expected ?

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

1. Two progress reports have already been received.
2. No approximate cost yet submitted.
3. Final report expected to be ready by the end of January next.

PINETTE HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Does the government propose to dredge Pinette harbour, in Prince Edward Island, as prayed for in a petition presented here last session ?
2. Has the government engineer's report been received ? If so, what is the nature of it ?
3. Has the work been recommended by that report ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Yes, report has been received, and the matter is now receiving the attention of the department.

LIFE SAVING STATIONS, P.E.I.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the government taken any steps to provide life saving stations along the coast of Prince Edward Island, in order to prevent a recurrence of the losses of life and property such as happened during the recent severe storms on the eastern coast of Canada ?

2. If so, where does the government propose to place them, and how many ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. This question is receiving careful attention. Stations will be selected near where the most shipping is exposed to danger of wreck, how many is not yet decided.

EVIDENCE CONCERNING GRAIN STANDARDS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the evidence taken during last session before the Committee of Agriculture upon the question of grain standards and kindred matters, been printed ?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to have it printed for distribution ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The printing and distribution of this evidence is in the hands of the House, the government having no control over it. But I have inquired from the clerk of the committee, and find that the evidence is printed and is almost ready for distribution.

POSTMASTER AT HAMPTON, N.S.

Mr. STOCKTON asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the conduct of Zachariah Hill, postmaster at Hampton, N.S., during the provincial elections of Nova Scotia, held in the month of June, 1906 ?

2. Has the attention of the government been directed to the fact that the said Zachariah Hall was find the sum of $400 for corrupt practices committed by him in the last provincial election ?

3. Is the said Zachariah Hill still in the enjoyment of his position as postmaster ?

4. Does the government consider that the unanimous resolution of this House, passed on the 17th July, 1905, has any bearing on relevancy to the action which should be taken in this connection.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. No. Zachariah Hill (or Zachariah Hall) is not postmaster of Hampton; but a Mr. Zaccheus Hall is postmaster at St. Croix Cove.

2. The department has no information on the subject.

3 and 4. See answer to No. 1.

RETIREMENT OF LAND AND SUB-LAND AGENTS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Have the services of any land agents or sub-land agents or homestead inspectors, or other officers connected with the Dominion lands, been dispensed with since the 1st July, 1906 ?

2. If so, what are the names of such persons ?

3. Why were their services dispensed with ?

4. Were any of them punished ?

Mr. A. MARTIN.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1, 2 and 3. The services of F. I. Houser, as sub-agent at Humbolt, Saskatchewan, were dispensed with because of the abolition of the office ; the services of Paul Ross, as sub-agent at Pembina Crossing, were dispensed with because of his having been convicted of selling liquor to Indians; the services of Miss Florence Cotingham, as a clerk in the land office at Red Deer, Alberta, were dispensed with as a reduction of staff.

4. No other action was taken by the Department of the Interior in these cases.

SURVEY OF THAMES RIVER.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. What was the actual cost of the recent survey made by the government in the River Thames, from the channel at the mouth of the River Thames to the city of Chatham, with the intention of deepening the channel to a depth of 18 to 20 feet ?

2. Has the government abandoned the idea of completing the work ?

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

1. $2,031.91.

2. No decision has yet been taken upon report submitted.

WIRE FENCING.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Has the government built any wire fencing within the last twelve months on the boundary line in the Northwest between the United States and Canada, or elsewhere in the Canadian Northwest ? If so, to whom was the contract given, the price per rod, and style of fence used ?

2. If none was built, is it the intention of the government to build any in the near future ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government has not built any wire fencing within the last twelve months on the boundary line, but is building a wire fence around Elk Park, a part of a forest reserve, about twenty miles northeast of the city of Edmonton. Three contracts were awarded by tender as follows : Contract for clearing of lines to Geo. A. Cranston ; contract for supplying and planting posts to W. A. D. Lees ; and contract for supplying and erecting wire fence and gates, also to W. A. D. Lees. The price per rod figured upon the total cost under the three contracts is $2.82. The wire fencing used is that manufactured by the H. R. Lamb Fence Company.

2. Answered by answer to No. 1.

WHARF AT JEANNETTE'S CREEK.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. What was the cost of completion of the wharf built recently at Jeannette's creek, in the River Thames ?

2. How was the wharf built, by contract or day's labour ?
3. If by day's labour, who was the overseer?
4. What is the estimated cost of the wharf being built at the lighthouse, at the mouth of the River Thames ?
5. How is it being built ? If not by contract, who is the overseer?

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

1. $4,390.90.
2. By day labour.
3. Jacob Colby.
4. $4,867.
5. Work done by day labour ; foreman, J. B. Lefaivre.

IMPROVEMENT OF ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOUR.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Crocket—asked:

1. Did the Transportation Commission recommend that the government should deepen and straighten the channel into and in the harbour of St. John, N.B. ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with this work during the coming season ? If not, when ?
3. Has the Department of Railways and Canals made arrangements to have the berths at the head of the harbour of St. John, belonging to the Intercolonial Railway, properly dredged out?
4. If so, what arrangements have been made, and when will the work be completed ?

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

1. Yes, the commission has recommended that the entrance to the harbour of St. John be deepened.
2. The matter of what the government will do is receiving earnest consideration.

EXPORTATION OF AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How much American silver has been exported by the banks to the United States, in accordance with arrangements made with said banks by the Finance Minister ?
2. What has been paid in commission by the government to the banks, both in percentage and the total amount ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to continue the exportation of American silver, and to pay a commission on the same ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. $576,660.
2. Three-eighths of one per cent commission amounting to $2,174,88 and $4,250.48 expressage.
3. The matter is under consideration.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has the position of chairman of the new Montreal Harbour Board or Commission, created by 6 Edward VII., c. 33, been offered to anybody ?
2. Has the statute 6 Edward VII., c. 33, been put in force by proclamation ? If not, what is the cause of the delay ?
3. What is the salary to be paid to the chairman of the new board and to the commissioners ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No. The government has not offered the position to anybody.
2. No. The question is now under consideration.
3. Under consideration.

ARRIVAL AND DEPORTATION OF HINDOOS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. How many Hindoos have arrived in Canada, via British Columbia, in 1906, up to date ?
2. How many have been deported, and for what reason, and what are the reasons for such deportation ?
3. Does the Immigration Department contribute in any way to the support of impoverished Hindoos arriving in British Columbia ?
4. Do the present immigration laws provide for the prevention of people coming into Canada without means of personal support ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 2,193 Hindoos have arrived in Canada via British Columbia, from January 1, 1906, to date.
2. One hundred Hindoos were deported from British Columbia between January 1st and October 31st, 1906.

They were deported for the following reasons:

Trachoma	74
Trachoma and partial blindness	1
Conjunctivitis and partial blindness	5
Likely to become public charges	8
Partial blindness	10
Conjunctivitis	1
Cataract	1

Since that date twenty-five were deported on the 14th of this month, but we have not yet received a detailed report as to the cause of deportation.

3. No.
4. Section 28 of the Immigration Act provides that,—

No immigrant shall be permitted to land in Canada who is a pauper, or destitute, a professional beggar, or vagrant, or who is likely to become a public charge ; and any person landed in Canada who, within two years thereafter, has become a charge upon the public funds, whether municipal, provincial or federal, or an inmate of or a charge upon any charitable institution, may be deported and returned to the port or place whence such immigrant came or sailed for Canada.

TEMPORARY LOANS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What temporary loans have been made by the government since the first of January, 1906, from whom, and at what rate of interest ?
2. What temporary loans outside of these are still outstanding, and at what rate ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. (a) The 28th March, 1906, £600,000 due 28th September, 1906, from the Bank of Montreal at 3¼ per cent. This loan was paid off at date of maturity.

(b) The 1st November, 1906, £250,000 due 1st May, 1907, at 4⅝ per cent.

2. The only temporary loan outstanding is that of the £250,000 last referred to.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTIES ON MACKENZIE AVENUE.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government, within the past two years, purchased properties situated between Sussex street and Mackenzie avenue?

2. What are the properties thus acquired by the government in that locality, what is the name of the vendor, the date of the purchase, as well as the price agreed upon in each case, and what is the superficies of each property so acquired by the government?

3. On what date did the government take possession in each case?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). I have a partial answer to this question, which, in itself, is very long, but I cannot obtain all the information at once. If the hon. gentleman will move for a return I will cause the return to be prepared and laid on the table of the House immediately after the adoption of his motion.

VACANCY IN NOVA SCOTIA SUPREME COURT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. On what date was the Honourable D. C. Fraser appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia?

2. What is the reason for the delay in filling the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, occasioned by the appointment of Mr. Fraser to the lieutenant governorship?

3. When will the vacancy be filled?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. The Hon. D. C. Fraser was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia on the 27th March, 1906.

2. The appointment of a successor to the position on the bench previously filled by the Hon. Mr. Fraser is still under consideration.

3. I deem myself safe in saying that the administration of justice in the province has not suffered in the meantime. No complaint in that behalf has been made, and notwithstanding the vacancy, there are six active judges of the Supreme Court of the province discharging all the duties of the court.

NON-PERFORMANCE OF SETTLEMENT DUTIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. Are there any persons in the vicinity of New Ottawa, in the province of Saskatchewan, who have held lands for several years without performing any settlement duties, or without performing full settlement duties?

2. If so, how many such persons?

3. What are the names of such persons?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) would define a certain area we would be able to give him the information he asks, but we are not able to comply with the request in the form in which the question appears.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the question can stand and I will endeavour to see if I have any information which will enable the hon. minister to answer it without any difficulty.

Question allowed to stand.

QUEEN'S—SHELBURNE ELECTION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. Are J. L. Bain of Liverpool, N.S., fishery overseer, and J. O. Campbell, of Port Mouton, N.S., lighthouse-keeper, still in the employ of the government?

2. Is the government aware that these two persons acted as scrutineers and agents for the Honourable W. S. Fielding, at the recent election for Shelburne and Queen's?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. The department has received no communication on the subject, and has no information beyond what has been stated in this House. Mr. Fielding states that he never signed any authorization for these officers to act as scrutineers. He signed, as he has generally done, powers of attorney in blank, to be filled in, and if these officers acted as scrutineers it was without his knowledge or consent.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Has any nomination been made to the Harbour Commission of Montreal in accordance with the law passed at the last session of parliament? If not, why not?

2. Has any nomination been proposed? If so, to whom?

3. Has there been any refusal to serve as commissioner? If so, what reasons, if any, were given?

4. Is it the intention of the government to make any such appointment? If so, to whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No, because no proclamation has been issued putting this law in force.
2. The government has not proposed any nomination.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. The question is under consideration.

MONTREAL HARBOUR—ERECTION OF SHEDS.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Was a contract given by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the erection of sheds along the harbour front of said city ? If so, for how many sheds ?
2. To whom was the contract given, and on what date ?
3. What was the contract price ?
4. Are the sheds completed ? If not, why not ?
5. Was any money paid by the Harbour Commission ? If so, how much ?
6. Have the plans been changed ? If so, by whom, and what are the alterations ?
7. What are the sheds finished, by numbers ?
8. Is there any difficulty between the Harbour Commission and the contractors ?
9. Have the contractors increased their price ? If so, how much, and for what reasons ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes, for 14 sheds.
2. Messrs. Peter Lyall & Sons, Montreal, July 20th, 1904.
3. $2,305,000.
4. No, on account of alterations in the plans to meet the wishes of the shipping agents.
5. Yes, $1,174,327.69.
6. Yes, by the Harbour Commissioners. The principal alterations being the taking out of the centre longitudinal row of posts in the sheds, and the changing of the floors from scoria blocks to concrete.
7. None of the sheds are finished, but Nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 12 have been used by the steamship agents with the consent of the contractors, during the present season of navigation.
8. No, but questions have arisen during the construction of the sheds which have been settled from time to time, and questions are pending at the present time.
9. No, but the contract price has been added to on account of alterations made by the commissioners, and approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the hon. gentleman give the increased price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract has been added to on account of alterations made by the commissioners. I will get the amount.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In view of the intention announced by the Minister of Finance to deliver his budget speech to-morrow, I have given notice of a motion, which, with the consent of the House, I will move :

That government orders have precedence on Thursday next immediately after routine business and that the budget debate when commenced be continued from day to day and be the first order of the day after routine business until concluded.

To-morrow (Thursday) is private members' day, and we cannot take it for government business unless this motion be passed.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The debate this year will include both the financial statement and the tariff schedules as well. The discussion on these two may take half a month or it may take a month, and I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman that there should be a provision by which unopposed motions may be called each day in order that information which is required for the work of the session later may be brought down ; otherwise we may find ourselves in the middle of January without having the information which we want. Of course, questions should also have precedence.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would it not be a good idea that after the budget speech has been delivered, three or four days should intervene before the discussion, in order to give deputations a chance to be heard ?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; let us go on.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). My right hon. friend does not contemplate that we should continue and deal with every item in the tariff schedules until that is disposed of, but that the budget debate, which is the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, should be continued from day to day until it is finished. After that, when we go into committee, the details of tariff may be discussed, and it is a matter for future consideration as to what course will be adopted with regard to that. In the meantime this motion only applies to the budget debate proper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When do you propose to go into committee on the tariff schedules ?

Mr. FIELDING. We would be ready for our part to go into committee immediately on the completion of the budget debate, but if there are any good reasons why there should be delay in committee, that is a fair matter for consideration and for the interchange of opinions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, there may be no reason for delay at all. We do not know in what form the revision of the tariff will come down, but the Minister of Finance will understand that if there should be any extensive or elaborate changes, it would be desirable before we go into com-

mittee that sufficient time should be afforded to enable hon. members to understand them and to make comparisons with the present tariff, in order that the full effect of the proposed amendments should be comprehended before hon. gentlemen are asked to discuss these specific items in committee.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite reasonable, and on the completion of the budget debate proper we shall be very happy to adapt ourselves to the convenience of hon. members on the other side. I merely say that, so far as we are concerned, we are ready to go on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand, this is simply the usual resolution that the budget debate shall proceed from day to day; it does not refer to the work to be done in the Committee of the Whole afterwards.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not think there could be any objection to it under these circumstances, provided the right hon. gentleman will make the modifications suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, that will be done. Generally the budget debate is late in the session, when all days are practically government days, and such a motion as this is therefore not needed. But this year the budget is brought in early, when three days of the week are private members' days, and this motion becomes necessary. The clerk of the House can arrange the motion so as to meet the views expressed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing : 1. All sums of money paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company or on their order, to 1st November, 1906, with dates, sums and names of persons to whom paid.

2. All correspondence between the North Atlantic Trading Company and the government, or any member thereof, or any department, since 1st January, 1906.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and other papers had or passing between the government of the province of Ontario and the Dominion government relative to the application of the Ontario government for a subsidy to aid in the construction by the Ontario government of the Temiscaming and Northern Ontario Railway.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, writs of supersedeas, and other papers, relating to the standing and different grades in the civil service, from time to time, of Henry J. Morgan, and his superannuation.—Mr. Stewart.

For a copy of all orders in council passed during the last three years, relating to the formation of any new territory or district, or the alteration of the boundaries of any territory or district in Canada.—Mr. Sifton.

For a copy of all letters, communications, memorials, petitions or documents, received during the past three years from the government of any province in the Dominion, or any member thereof, by the government of Canada, or any member thereof, relating to the extension or alteration of the boundaries of any province of Canada.—Mr. Sifton.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of Australia, or any officials thereof, with reference to tariff preferences between the two countries ; and all orders in council in reference thereto, for the years 1904, 1905, 1906.—Mr. Foster by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, agreements, papers and correspondence in connection with the sale of 380,600 acres, more or less, of land in Southern Alberta, to the Robbins Irrigation Company; and the list of shareholders of the company, and its officers.—Mr. Foster by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing : 1. The names of fire insurance companies which have received their charters within the past five years. 2. The names of the parties applying for the same. 3. The amount of subscribed capital required under the charter. 4. The amount of paid-up capital required under the charter. 5. The proposed location of the head office in each case.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

For a copy of all reports and plans of engineers regarding the line and location of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway between the city of Quebec and Edmonton, N.B., and more particularly the city of Quebec and Lake Pohenegamook, in the county of Kamouraska.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers since the year 1896, between the city of Toronto, the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto, or any other persons, and the Dominion government, relating to, (a) the dredging or deepening of Toronto harbour and the approaches thereto at the eastern and western gaps, or the shoals outside of said entrances; (b) the building of breakwaters, piers or other works for or in connection with such entrances at the eastern and western gaps to said harbour.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence in connection with the Buckingham strike riots. —Mr. Bourassa.

For a copy of all orders in council, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda, letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents and papers, touching, relating to or concerning the grant by or on behalf of the government of Canada, of any lands in southern Alberta, under conditions contemplating or requiring the construction of irrigation works, and all such documents as aforesaid relating to any concessions or grant of about 380,575 acres of land to the Robins Irrigation Company.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda. letters, telegrams, correspondence, documents and papers, in connection with the sale or grant by the government of Canada, or any department thereof, since 1st January, 1905, of any public lands or public domain, other than to actual settlers.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, valuations, letters, telegrams, correspondence, memoranda, conveyances and other documents and papers, from the first day of January, 1900, to the present time, relating to the proposal to acquire lands at Truro, Nova Scotia, for the Intercolonial Railway, and especially all such documents as aforesaid relating to the acquisition of land purchased by the Crown from H. W. Yuill by deed bearing date on or about the 17th October, 1904; also a copy of conveyances bearing date in October, 1904, under which the said Yuill acquired the said property. Also all reports touching the question of sites for the construction of a round-house at Truro. —Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, reports, documents and papers, with respect to filling the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, occasioned by the appointment of Honourable D. C. Fraser to the office of Lieutenant Governor.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, memoranda and other documents and papers, relating to or in any way touching the purchase or acquisition of land in or near the city of Halifax, since 1st January, 1902, for the purpose of constructing thereon a round-house or machine shop.—Mr. Barker.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, memoranda and other documents and papers, relating to or in any way touching the purchase or acquisition of land in or near the city of Halifax, since 1st January, 1902, for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway.—Mr. Barker.

For a copy of the correspondence between the imperial naval authorities and the government of Canada, relating to the relinquishment of the naval dockyards at Halifax by the imperial authorities, and the transfer thereof to the government of Canada.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

For a return showing the number of commercial agencies for the Dominion in operation during the fiscal years 1905 and 1906, the names of the several agents, where located, their salaries, contingent expenses, the total cost of each agency, and the aggregate cost of all the agencies combined.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government, or any member or official thereof, and any member of the Royal Insurance Commission, or Mr. Shepley, K.C., or Mr. Tilley, barrister, or any other person employed by or on behalf of the government, relating in any way to the work of the commission, to the subjects and methods of conducting the inquiry, to suggestions as to what witnesses be called, what information be sought, and from whom; together with any reports received or transmitted in reference to the above. And also for a copy of all instructions issued by the government, or any member thereof, to the commission, or any counsel employed thereat.—Mr. Foster.

WATER POWERS OF THE DOMINION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Copy of the contract or agreement by which the government has leased or alienated the water-powers on the Soulanges canal ; of the tenders, if any were invited, before the disposal of said water-powers ; and of any and all correspondence concerning the said powers before the disposal of the same by the government.

2. A copy of the order in council disposing of said water-powers.

3. A copy of all transfers of said water-powers since the original alienation of the same ; of all correspondence relating to said transfers ; and of orders in council authorizing or ratifying said transfers.

4. A copy of all reports and estimates in the possession of the government in regard to the extent and value of water-powers on the Soulanges canal.

Copy of all correspondence, tenders, offers of lease or purchase or occupation, of water powers under the control of the government of Canada, and of any deed of alienation of the same, whether by lease or otherwise, situate within one hundred miles of the city of Montreal, within the last ten years.

Copy of the report furnished to the government by Messrs. Brunet and Duff, of Montreal, regarding the water-powers on the Lachine canal.

He said : The short observations I have to make apply to these three motions. The House will no doubt remember that last session in the month of March I moved for a statement which would give us information of considerable value concerning the water powers under the control of the Dominion government throughout Canada, what those water-powers were, where they were situated, what power they were capable of developing, and what reports were in the hands of the government concerning those water-powers in each province, in fact, any information in the possession of the government regarding them. At that time I mentioned that at the present moment a full, complete and detailed knowledge of all these natural powers at our disposal throughout the Dominion was absolutely necessary for this House, and for the people in general. That motion and the order consequent upon it, were adopted by the House towards the end of March last. I think on the 22nd, 25th or 26th of March. On that occasion the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) heartily concurred in the object of the motion, and if I mistake not—I have not his exact words before me—he promised that the order would receive prompt attention from his own department, which was the interested one. I find, Mr. Speaker, that no return has been made to that motion. Without unduly blaming the government—because no doubt they have been occupied with some very serious matters since the month of March last—it seems to me that the government must have in its possession, and immediately available, sufficient information at any rate to place a partial report containing some of this valuable information at the disposal of members of this House.

Now, the government of the province of Ontario has named a commission which has reported in connection with the water-

powers of that province, and the people of the Dominion are to-day in possession, within a very brief delay indeed, of full, extensive and most interesting information in connection with the water-powers of the province of Ontario. That report might have been obtained by the government and placed in the hands of the members of this House. Although we have not in the province of Quebec, I regret to say, taken any such valuable inventory as that to which I have just referred in connection with the province of Ontario, I have no doubt whatever that the provincial government of Quebec has considerable information at its hand, and that, with the information now in possesion of the government, would have enabled, as I said a moment ago, this government, had it really had this matter at heart, to place before this House the substance, at any rate, of a report concerning our water-powers. I may mention that when I moved this motion in the month of March last, the government of the province of Quebec had advertised for sale many very important water-powers in our own province. That matter was specially brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works by myself about that time, and I am informed that the Department of Public Works made a protest at Quebec at the time of the sale and adjudication of these water-powers. So far as my information goes, that protest was without avail, and a considerable number of water-powers were disposed of at that public auction held under the direction of the provincial government of Quebec.

Now the object of these three motions, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain information of very great importance indeed to the city of Montreal, the largest manufacturing centre in the Dominion. We have in the vicinity of that city a great wealth of water power, and the question of supplying electricity not only interests a very large population, not only the manufacturng class of that population, but all the people of the city of Montreal and of its important outlying municipalities. I do not believe that, at the present moment, there is a question of greater moment or greater interest for the city of Montreal than this. Not that Montreal is alone interested in the availability for the public in general, on favourable terms, of the natural water powers which our country affords ; for what I have to say in regard to Montreal applies in almost equal degree—though not quite in the same degree—to all the cities and towns, and many of the villages of this Dominion which have in their vicinity natural water-powers which, if developed, can be used for industrial and other purposes. As I stated a moment ago, we have around Montreal a very considerable number of water powers. The object of the motions as placed upon the notice paper is to call for all the correspondence and all the information regarding water-powers situate within a radius of one hundred miles from the city of Montreal. There are a very considerable number of smaller water powers, but I may mention only some of the more considerable. We have large and important water powers still available for the public on the Lachine rapids at a few miles from Montreal. There are great water powers on the stretch of water starting from Coteau and down to Beauharnois upon the St. Lawrence river. These are on each side of the river, and the whole length of these water powers is under control of the Dominion government. But they are not natural water powers, being the result of the construction of the canals on both sides of the river. We have behind the Island of Montreal, in that part of the Ottawa river which goes the whole length of the island, water powers which, I have no hesitation in saying, if fully availed of would give us almost all the electrical energy we require in Montreal at the present day. There are water powers still available, if I am not mistaken, at Chambly and others on the Ottawa river above the Island of Montreal. There are also other water powers on the smaller rivers within a radius of one hundred miles of Montreal, including those of Shawenegan Falls. Having this immense wealth of water power within a short distance of Montreal, it becomes for us a very important matter to know, in the first place the extent and availability of these powers, and in the next place—considering the immense development of electrical discovery and the great variety of uses to which electrical power can be put—the policy of the government in regard to the disposal of these water powers. And why ? Well, in the vicinity of Montreal, some of these water powers have already passed into private ownership. They are out of the control of the government and are actually used by companies, or by a company, that distributes electrical power in the city of Montreal. Not a word would I say against the parties who at present distribute electrical energy in Montreal. They obtained control of these water powers legitimately through legislation, and they are making a practical and proper use of them. But they aim at profit, and what we desire is that these powers that still remain undisposed of in the vicinity of the city should be so handled by the government that the electricity which they can produce will be placed at the disposal of manufacturers and others who desire to use that electricity under the most favourable conditions possible. Now, I am informed that, in the city of Toronto, whose situation in regard to the want of electrcal power can be contrasted—because it is a large and important city—with that of the city of Montreal, electrical energy is

sold at from 30 per cent to 50 per cent less than in the city of Montreal. And, in Toronto, as I am informed, the electricity is produced not by natural water power, but by steam power. I do not know if I am absolutely right in that statement, but it is one that I have seen in the public press of Toronto. If that statement is correct, it seems very singular that, when we have all around the city of Montreal such great water powers which could be made available for the production of electrical energy, we are still obliged to pay so much dearer for our electricity than they are in the city of Toronto. I am informed also that the company which furnishes electricity for use in Toronto is able to pay dividends of some twenty per cent. I have risen, therefore, to move, in the first place, for a statement concerning the water powers of the Soulanges canal, which are at present under the control of the company to which I have referred by transfer of, by appropriations of charter and otherwise and are at present being used by that company which holds to a certain extent, a monopoly in the city of Montreal. I think that it is proper that, in so important a question, we should know how these water powers have been disposed of in the first instance, and how, at the present moment, by virtue of what transfers and sales or leases, approved of by the government, these water powers are found in the possession of the company which is at present using them to convey electricity to Montreal under conditions, which, as I say, involve a practical monopoly.

I may mention that the monopoly enjoyed in Montreal by the company to which I have referred has been created in a singular manner. It was not granted by the citizens of Montreal or their municipality. The municipality of Montreal has a contract with that company which gives the company the exclusive privilege of furnishing electric light to the city during a certain period. And here is a point to which I would draw attention. That company enjoys the monopoly of conducting electrical energy into the city of Montreal, through streets and by-ways within a radius, if I am not mistaken, of a hundred miles, and it enjoys that right by virtue of provincial legislation. As a singular evidence of the indifference of public opinion to what our provincial legislatures may do, is the fact that although special privileges have been granted that company by the Quebec provincial legislature, no very serious protests were made by the large number of citizens interested against the measure, and the government which countenanced it still continues to receive the support of a large number upon the Island of Montreal. Undoubtedly, it seems to me, the time has come—whatever may be our views regarding government ownership of public utilities, and that is a principle which, in my opinion, must ultimately obtain and does obtain with very excellent results in some other places—the time has come when the government should have, if not the ownership, at any rate the absolute control of those public utilities and the sources from which they come, so as to prevent any monopoly in that connection and the enrichment of certain people at the expense of the general public. At present we have considerable difficulty in the city of Montreal regarding the gas contract, which has attracted public attention to the question of electricity. A number of companies are ready to undertake the development and sale of electrical energy, and therefore it is of the utmost importance that we should know, before any franchise is given to any of these companies, what is the policy of the government regarding the disposal of water power. We should known how the government intends to dispose of these water powers, whether by public competition or otherwise, and what restrictions, limitations and charges the government may impose upon those who may acquire them. These water powers are gradually being acquired and going out of our hands. Some of these, covered by the return asked for, are already in the hands of speculators who no doubt have failed to observe the conditions regarding development. In such cases the deed of alienation may be easily resiliated by the government, and it is of the utmost importance that we should know what is to be the policy of the government in this connection and what are going to be the conditions under which these important sources of power are to disposed of. The second motion of which I have given notice covers not only the case of the Soulanges canal but of the Beauharnois as well. The latter is a canal which, we are informed, has cost some $6,000,000. It is in the vicinity of Montreal, and if properly utilized could furnish a very large amount of power; and we have had published in the press a story regarding it which I find it difficult to credit but which has only been denied in a semi-official manner by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). If that story be a fabrication, it ought to be denied in this House without delay by the government itself. What is that story? It is that the government has absolutely, in a clandestine manner, without inquiry, without calling for tenders and for an infinitesimally small consideration, disposed of that important water power. I have difficulty in believing it, but it has been only feebly denied, and we should have a denial from the government itself. The report went on to say that the object of the disposal of that water-power was to enable the government to acquire the control of the largest and most important French newspaper published in that city, and that there was a close connection between this clandestine alienation of the water power

of the Beauharnois canal and the acquisition by the government, or by men acting on its behalf, of the control of that newspaper. I do not like to credit that story but it was given very circumstantially in one of our newspapers. I therefore think it is the duty of the government to inform the House, without delay or equivocation, that that water-power has not been disposed of in any way, that there has been no correspondence regarding its alienation, and that the government will not dispose of it before giving a declaration of its policy and making public the conditions under which any such alienation will take place. Although this question has a local aspect, although it regards particularly the city of Montreal, it is one which interests the whole country. All along the St. Lawrence river, from the moment it enters the St. Lawrence until it empties into the gulf, you will find numbers of places—some large like the cities of Quebec, Three Rivers and Sorel and some smaller—which are vitally interested in this matter.

The same thing applies, perhaps to a greater extent, to the larger towns in the province of Ontario, the maritime provinces and the whole country. We are entitled to know what we have in the way of powers controlled by the Dominion and we are entitled to know from the government, because it is a vital question in regard to our industries and indeed to all our national wants, what is the policy of the government with regard to the disposal of these powers. There is a motion of which I have given notice with respect to the water powers on the Lachine canal. This is a smaller question but it is an interesting one. The government, I think properly, has caused an examination to be made into these very important water powers situated within a very strong industrial part of the city of Montreal in order to ascertain what they are and how they are held, because many of them are held under old titles, which, I think should be changed, because I do not think it is fair that private individuals, without themselves requiring electrical energy, should hold these powers, speaking generally, and they themselves dispose of them at a profit which they make out of the man actively engaged in carrying on some industry for his own use and for the benefit of the country. I think these electrical powers should go direct from the government, having control of them, to the parties to whom they may be of use, and I venture to hope that the government will be able to devise some policy by which in the vicinity of larger centres of industry and where there is a very considerable population, as not only manufacturers, but the poorest classes will require cheaper electricity, no particular company or special individual will unduly—I say unduly—profit by these water powers and by which they will be conveyed directly to the mass of the people interested without any too great loss by passing through the hands of middlemen who very often are disposed to make the most of their privileges.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words in reference to what my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has brought up I will ask the forbearance of the House in allowing me to follow the hon. gentleman's example in treating the three motions practically as one subject of debate. First, may I say a word in reply to the hon. gentleman's remarks about the Beauharnois canal ? He said that the rumours which he described as existing in the city of Montreal in regard to this, and of which he gave some details, had received a feeble denial on the part of the government. I confess that I am not prepared exactly to differentiate between a feeble and a strong denial. A denial seems to be sufficient whether it is feeble or strong provided it is explicit and I am prepared to-day to tell the hon. gentleman that the government has not alienated its powers or rights in respect to the Beauharnois canal to anybody. I would say further that the question as a whole which the hon. gentleman has brought up has been receiving most earnest consideration on the part of the government. As my hon. friends in the House know I am only acting Minister of Public Works and although these questions were discussed last year until quite recently I did not make any particular investigation into them personally.

Mr. MONK. May I ask my hon. friend if there has been any proposal for the alienation of water powers ?

Mr. FISHER. There have been various proposals for the alienation of a number of these water powers. Applications have been received from many people asking for these privileges which the government have not yet seen their way to grant. I can only speak, however, in general terms and I will say at once, in regard to the return that the hon. gentleman asked for and which the House ordered last year, that I will see what stage it has reached in the department of Public Works, and I will try to expedite its being laid on the table of the House as it should be as soon as possible. I have not given these matters any great personal investigation, but in a general way I appreciate very much the statement of the hon. gentleman touching the situation in the city of Montreal and in the surrounding country in regard to these water powers and privileges. We all know the municipal question which is being so constantly discussed and agitated in the city of Montreal, where apparently there is a monopoly of lighting and power which seems to have fastened itself on the city, but we also know that very strong agencies are at work amongst the

people, amongst the rate-payers and amongst the consumers of power and light to try and defend themselves from the exactions of any monopoly. The question is being surrounded by a great deal of difficulty. The natural inclination will be at once, when power is available, to say that this power should be put up to auction, that it should be given to the highest bidder and that the Dominion of Canada should make as much out of it as possible. But, while that is the first and natural inclination, and one not always by any means acted upon in days gone by—I regret to say very seldom acted upon in days gone by—there are dangers in doing that. The very monopoly which my hon. friend has alluded to might very easily, if it were done without any safeguards, acquire all these powers and might continue the monopoly, increase it and make it more omnipotent in the city and district of Montreal. There is probably nobody who could bid as high to-day for any of these powers as the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company; bid in a perfectly legitimate way, in open competition, because they could make a better use of the power perhaps and make more money out of it than any other rival company could, and by doing what would be the natural and first inclination of the government and probably the first demand of the people of the country that these powers should be put up to public auction and tender it might very easily result in riveting still more strongly the fetters of the monopoly upon the district and city. These questions are receiving the most earnest consideration of the government. The desire on the part of the government is to see that these great water privileges shall be conserved and disposed of in the interests of the people at large, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole, n which a revenue might be received, and in the interest of the community in a particular district so as to try and create a fair and legitimate competition in the service of the people so that the rates and charges and exactions may not be undue. Now, I would like to point out this: a great many of these powers are taken from the government canals. In regard to these powers in days gone by there appears to have been no care exercised for safeguarding the public interests. It is in consequence of finding out something of this situation that this government, a little while ago, appointed a commission to carefully investigate everything connected with the taking of water from the Lachine canal. The report which was referred to by my hon. friend in his third motion, the report of Mr. Brunet and Mr. Duff, will be presented to the House. I am prepared to say that the motion of my hon. friend will be adopted—we ask that it should be adopted—and the report will be laid on the table so as to give the House the information that the government now have. I would just add that in consequence of certain revelations contained in the report actions at law have been taken by representatives of the Justice Department to see that the rights of Canada are conserved and maintained. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) limits the scope of his motion to ten years, but I may tell him that a great many of these leases were issued a good deal more than ten years ago, and for a full understanding of the question it would be necessary to omit this time limitation from the motion so that all such leases may be included in it.

Mr. MONK. If that be done, I am afraid we shall have to wait a long time for the return.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. MONK. Water-power has really only become valuable within the last ten or fifteen years for the purposes referred to. However, if the minister says it will not delay the return I have no objection.

Mr. HAGGART. Most of them have been brought down already.

Mr. FISHER. It may possibly take a day or two longer, but not more. There is really no party question in the matter, because leases have been granted by the Mackenzie administration, by the Conservatives, and by ourselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says they have all been brought down up to 1896.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the case it will simply be a copy of the old return to that extent. I will be glad indeed to facilitate the passage of this motion and I shall see that the information is collected and laid on the table of the House as soon as possible.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier suggests the idea of public ownership of these great utilities, but I fear he has little reason to hope that the present government will adopt that principle, because we have the confession of the Prime Minister made in the House some two or three years ago that when he stood on the bleak shores of the Georgian bay at Parry Sound and looked at the cold waters he had some kind of shivers against public ownership; and from that day to this he apparently has not changed his mind. The Prime Minister does not believe in public ownership of any kind, although public ownership seems to be the natural principle that ought to underlie the control of these great water powers. We are going to have public ownership of these water-powers, at least in the province of Ontario, and if we are not going to have in the Dominion we should at least attach to these leases a condition that

in no case are they to be used to strengthen monopoly, and in no case should there be any alienation of these water-powers unless the government retains the right to regulate from time to time the charges made for the supply of this power. Some years ago, the great water-power monopoly that exists in Hamilton—and which is intimately identified with certain conditions that prevail there to-day—came to this government for a renewal of its lease, and I then made the suggestion that the charges that might be made by that company should be regulated by the government. Unfortunately my suggestion was not adopted at that time. The more we see of these things the more it is patent that if we cannot have public ownership, as we ought to have, then the government should retain power to regulate the charges made to the public. I agree with the minister (Mr. Fisher) that the public interest would not be advanced by selling these powers at a high price, but my idea is that the competition between tenderers for these privileges should be a competition as to the lowest price they would charge for the service to the public. The offer of the company which guarantees to supply power to the public at the lowest is the offer that should be accepted. I regret the delay that has been shown by the government in regard to this question. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier made his motion last session, but we have not yet received the return. What is the cause of that delay? The United States is more than active in dealing with this question of the water-powers and in order to enlighten the government on this matter I shall read the following which I find in the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day:

Washington, November 27.—The hearings upon application to the Secretary of War for permission to transmit to the United States power developed on the Canadian side of Niagara river were closed to-night. Additional data will be filed, and Secretary Taft announced that he would not be able to reach a decision in regard to the applications until he has conferred with Secretary Root. This conference is necessary, because of the effect the contracts may have upon an international treaty, providing against any perceptible interference with the grandeur of the Niagara Falls. He said he would award privileges about January 1st, if possible. The hearings before Secretary Taft were for the purpose of enabling him to find a way equitably to distribute 157,500 horse-power, the estimate's limitation on the amount of electric power to be admitted, among half a dozen or more corporations, each of which thinks it must have a third or more in order to exist. Morris Cohen, representing the International Railway Company asked for only 2,500 horse-power immediately, and additional amounts as business develops, up to 8,000 horse-power. Francis Lynde Stetson, of the Canadian Niagara Power Company, proposed dividing the power to be admitted equally between his company and the Electrical Development Company of Ontario, and the Ontario Power Company, the three corporations having franchises from the Canadian government to develop power. General F. V. Greene, representing the Ontario Power Company, opposed the equal division on the ground that his company was able to get one-fourth more power from the same amount of water diverted than the other companies are getting, and he said the division should be based on the amount of water used. At the same time, he declares that the three concerns named were the only ones really entitled to consideration. J. G. Johnson, of the Electric Development Company, has entered a combination between General Green's company and one of its customers, the American-Ontario Company, which is prepared to transmit power to Lockport and Syracuse. P. H. Cravath had made an argument for the latter concern, declaring that General Green's company should not be limited to an extent that would interfere with a contract to furnish the American-Ontario Company with 90,000 horsepower. The arguments by the three companies holding franchises from the Canadian government suggested a combination against applicants dissimilarly situated, though no representations to that effect were laid before Secretary Taft.

Here is one of the members of the American government actively engaged in dealing with this question. He has been for months holding conferences at Washington and at Niagara Falls with the great electrical concerns in the United States with regard to taking over the power generated by the Canadian falls. If the government of the United States is so active in regard to the water-power of this country, why should not our own government be formulating a policy on the subject? As I said the other day, it is up to the government of this country, by a proper system of national policy, to prevent the export to the United States of power generated in Canada. We hear of a coal famine in the west; we are told that we have a poor supply of coal in some provinces of Canada. In Ontario we have no coal, but we have an immense store of this white coal, as it has been called—this electrical energy—and the Americans are proceeding to distribute that in their country. Why should not the government of this country be developing a policy for the distribution of that power in our own country and among our own people? If there is one class in Canada who want that power, it is the farmers of Ontario. There is enough power already in process of generation at the Falls to light and heat the homes and drive all the machinery of all the farmers of the province of Ontario, and yet it is proposed that this power shall be exported to the United States, and if it is made the subject of international treaty, the result may be that the Americans will claim the right to keep taking our power if this government should interfere later on to prevent the export. Now is the time to interfere, although last session it was coolly proposed in this House that the companies already incorporated should be allowed to export their power to

the United States. I trust that the government will not allow that to be done, but will keep in our own country every horse power generated in any portion of Canada. If that is done, that power can be used to electrify all the railways of this country. But if it goes to the United States, it will be used to drive their railways and their factories, and we shall be furnishing the raw material to build up great industries and to reduce freight rates in the United States instead of retaining it in our own country to light Canadian homes, to drive Canadian factories, and most of all to run Canadian railways. The electrification of railways is at hand. The New York Central and Pennsylvania Railway Companies have their plans for the electrification of their systems, and they are depending on obtaining their motive force from Canada. I regret that the government has not seen fit to consider this matter seriously, and have not the returns to present to the House to-day. I regret that the so-called Liberal party, who profess to be the great friends of the people, seem on all occasions to be aiding and abetting monopolies. The Liberal government of Ontario gave away the water-power franchises of the province for a very small consideration. A Conservative government comes in and proposes to conserve these great utilities for the benefit of the people. In the province of Quebec the Liberal government hands over these great water-powers to the corporations without imposing any return, and makes an attack on municipal rights the like of which was never heard of in this country before. They step in against the wishes of the people of Montreal and hand over to a great corporation the absolute control of the electrical power in that city, the result of which is that the people of that city are paying, I am told, from $60 to $100 a year per horse-power; and if the monopoly befriended by the Liberal party in Ontario had its way, the people of Toronto would be paying about as much, just as the Hon. J. M. Gibson, of Hamilton, when Attorney General of Ontario assisted in doing up his own city for the benefit of his own company and compelling it to pay $80 a year for lighting that city. The two chief organs of the Liberal party in Toronto to-day, the morning and the evening paper, are the champions of the electrical monopoly headed by Senator Cox, Colonel Pellatt and William Mackenzie. These two organs of the Liberal party are trying to head off public ownership in the province of Ontario. They too have the shivers in regard to public ownership which the right hon. gentleman felt at Parry Harbour when he looked out on the lake. If he shivered on that occasion, he will shiver the other way if he is a party to the alienation of these water-powers. The people of Canada think the time has arrived when the control of all these great utilities should be in the hands of the government as representing the people. They do not want middlemen to control these powers. The farmers of this country do not want middlemen to stand between them and cheap light and power. Let me tell you what took place in regard to one of these companies at Niagara Falls in the province of Ontario. Their common stock is $6,000,000, but not one dollar was paid on that; it was distributed as a bonus with the bonds, and in the first statement they gave out it appeared that this $6,000,000 did not amount to anything. But they kept manipulating their figures, and according to the last statement they gave out last year, the expenditure up to date was put at $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 on the plant, the $6,000,000 of stock being included in that expenditure; and when it is suggested that their tolls should be regulated, they say, we want a substantial dividend on an investment of $11,000,000 or $12,000,000, whereas the real investmnet was less than $6,000,000. Yet the Minister of Justice says that it does not concern the public at all whether the stock is watered or not. I say it does, and this is the significant proof of it, that the great water-power company that has been organized in Toronto in connection with Niagara power has injected this watered stock into the enterprise, and the public are asked and expected to pay a dividend on that watered stock. Now, the government must stand between the people and such an outrage as that, and must see that in regard to any water-power it controls, and it does control immense water-powers, all such things are eliminated. It must deal with these water-powers so that those who desire to avail themselves of them shall be able to get the power at the lowest possible rate. If they are the farmers' friends, and one of the farmers' friends is sitting on the left of the right hon. gentleman now—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am one myself.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No doubt. If they are the farmers' friends, these gentlemen should see that the farmers get cheap light for their houses. To-day the waters of Niagara are making wheels go round in the city of Toronto some eighty miles distant, and are lighting many houses and business establishments in that city. If that can be done at a distance of eighty miles, the same thing can be done in every farmer's house in Ontario, and every farm house, both in Ontario and Quebec, can have abundance of light at a price less than that of coal oil. You can have abundance of power for driving all the machinery on the farm, and such power is in greater demand every day. The most likely source from which the farmer can get that power is electricity. But that will never be ac-

complished if these great corporations are allowed to intervene. If there is one thing more in evidence than another in the history of the United States to-day, it is the intervention of the coal barons of Pennsylvania between the people and the limited supply of anthracite coal in the United States. These coal barons, with their immense capital and their control of the railways, compel every individual in the United States, from the highest to the lowest, to pay them tribute. But a greater combine still than the coal combine is immediately in sight in this country. If we allow these very clever gentlemen, these great financiers, to corral all these water powers, they will be able to make the people pay through the nose for electrical energy just as the coal barons have made the American people pay three times what they ought to pay for coal. It is an easy matter for these men, with the great capital at their disposal, to buy up legislatures and city councils and newspapers and in this way secure their ends. Unless a strong government is seized with the real situation and applies the remedy now, an electrical combine will gain possession of Canada just as the coal combine got possession of the United States, and no legislature or parliament will be able to cope with it. Therefore I trust the government will at once announce as their policy that they intend having the cheapest possible distribution of electrical energy for the benefit of the people, and that they are opposed to the export of electrical energy for the driving of American factories. We should keep that energy in our own country for the benefit of our own industries and provide the cheapest possible power for our farmers and everybody else interested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is always a stalwart, and although he calls himself a Conservative, I have always looked upon him as a very advanced radical.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When I read his paper, the Toronto 'World,' which I do every day, I find that he is always very oracular in his statements. But in this matter I am not so far apart from my hon. friend as I have unfortunately been on most occasions. He is in favour of the cheapest electrical energy being furnished the people at the cheapest possible rates. In that I quite agree with him. He is also in favour of public ownership, and on this point his ideas are much broader than mine. I am not in favour of the public ownership of all kinds of public utilities ; but in so far as such utilities as water and light are concerned, I see no reason why there should not be public ownership provided it is vested in the municipal authorities. I would not care to have this government the owner and distributor of electrical energy, but have no objection—on the contrary I think it would be a good idea—to public ownership in this connection if vested in the municipal authorities. This motion has chiefly to do with the waters of the Beauharnois canal. That canal was built some sixty years ago as an aid to navigation, but as such it has become a thing of the past. It is not now used for the purposes of navigation. All the navigation passes through the Soulanges canal, and the question arises : What are we to do with the waters of the Beauharnois canal ? There can be only one answer, and that is that we should use them for the purpose of industry. The extent of that water power is not so very great—not more, I understand, than 10,000 horse power, and we have had several applications for it. How should we dispose of it ? The government does not propose to go into the business of developing that water power, but intends letting that be done by private or municipal enterprise. We have received no communication from any municipal body but have several applications from individual companies. It would be well to sell the power to somebody who would develop it and have it distributed in the cheapest possible manner. We can either sell it by public competition or directly to one of the applicants. I may say at once that no matter what course we may take, the government must retain the power of regulating the price of distribution. It may be said that the best way would be to sell by public competition but, as my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has pointed out, at present all the water powers in the vicinity of Montreal—the water powers on the Richelieu, the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers—are in the hands of a single company which is charged—and I believe rightly—with being a monopoly. It is, I believe, a fact that in the city of Montreal electrical energy is retailed at a higher price than in any other city, certainly higher than in Toronto, and the people of Montreal are looking not unnaturally for some competition. But if we call for tenders, it may happen, as my hon. colleague (Mr. Fisher) has pointed out, that this water power may fall into the hands of that monopoly. Certainly that monopoly is in a position to bid higher than any one else. It is on the ground, and it might be to its advantage to buy this water power and keep it undeveloped.

Mr. MONK. But you may take the power to control.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We must have that power. I say we must not dispose of these water powers unless we keep in our hands control over the rates. What we have to determine is whether this shall be done in one way or in another way ; but, whether done one way or any other way, our policy is fixed and determined that we must keep, either in the government or in some such body as the Railway Commission, the authority to determine the prices

at which the power shall be disposed of to the public. I take advantage of the present opportunity to confirm what has been stated by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) concerning the statement made a few weeks ago in one of the Montreal weeklies, that there was a big scandal in the disposition of these water powers, because the sale had been made by the government to a company, and that the money was to be applied partly to the purchase of 'La Presse' newspaper. The story was absurd and was without a shadow of foundation. And the best evidence that there was no foundation for the story is the fact that the water power has not been disposed of, but is still under our control, and the application made to us is still under advisement. Now, one word with regard to what has been said about the use of the electrical energy of Niagara. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has not stated the case very fully. He is of the opinion that we should prohibit the export of electrical energy to the United States. But he did not state that, under the Act of Congress to which he referred a moment ago, the importation into the United States of electrical energy from Canada is prohibited after a maximum of 160,000 horse-power has been reached. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) would say that even this is too much. Looking at it from the Canadian point of view, he demands that we shall prohibit the exportation of electrical energy from Canada into the United States altogether. I am not prepared to say that that is not a good suggestion. On the other hand, I am not prepared to say that it is so good a suggestion that we ought to accept it. All these matters are under consideration by the Deep Water-ways Commission, an international body which has already done a great deal for the benefit of the two countries. Both Canada and the United States are interested in the question of the development of the energy of Niagara Falls and in the question of the due restriction of that development. There are three or four companies which have been incorporated by this parliament with the privilege of developing energy, not only for consumption in Canada, but also for export into the United States. It would be a serious proposal indeed, at this time, after a great deal of capital has been invested in these enterprises, that they should be prohibited from exporting their energy into the market for which they have developed it. I have only to say to my hon. friend that it is altogether premature for us at this moment to decide what should be our policy on this subject. The question is: should we allow the exportation of this energy, or should we restrict or prohibit it? My hon. friend would prohibit it, without giving to the subject the consideration which I think should be given. He simply jumps at a conclusion, and, without waiting for the report of the commission, would prohibit the export of a single horse-power.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A national policy cannot be settled by commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no opinion to give at this moment as to the policy. It may be a good one—I do not intend to offer an opinion upon it. I simply say that we have referred these questions to a commission composed of representatives of the two nations, a commission which has done excellent work in the past, and which has the matter under advisement. Until we have received the report of this commission, I do not think we should be called upon to determine our policy.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). May I ask the Prime Minister a question? Is it not a fact that the commissioners have declared that they do not regard it as part of their duty to deal with this question, and that their duty extends only to the use of the water for navigation purposes? As I recollect it, that is covered by their last report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), I take it, has seen the report. In that case, he is better informed than I am. This matter was in the hands of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), and I depended upon him to advise me upon it. He has not advised me to the effect stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). All I can say is that we have not received the final report of the commission on this subject. I am not advised as to when we may expect it, but I suppose it will be before us soon. Until we receive the report of the commission, which has given great attention to this and allied questions, I do not think the government should be called upon to settle its policy with regard to the question. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will agree that the safest course to follow will be to await the report of the commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I hardly think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is well advised in the view he has expressed as to the necessity for delay. In fact, that was not the opinion of the government last year. Hon. members will recollect that a Bill was introduced by the then Minister of Justice to deal with the very question which the Prime Minister now says cannot be dealt with until the report of the commission is received. Though that Bill was withdrawn, its withdrawal was for quite other reasons than that suggested by the Prime Minister. It excepted a certain company, and the Minister of Justice, in speaking on the Bill—I am quoting from recollection entirely—proposed to add amendments which would except certain other companies from its operations.

But the point was raised on this side—I think by myself—that no question of vested rights could arise in respect of a consideration of this kind. It was proposed to give the Governor in Council authority to put a duty on power exported—if one may use that term in this connection—from Canada to the United States. It was pointed out on this side of the House that a duty on export of that kind no more concerned vested interests than would a customs duty on goods entering the country; that the increase or reduction of customs duties, though it may interfere with the business of certain people, could not be regarded as affecting vested rights. So I do not think that the consideration which the Prime Minister has mentioned is a paramount one. And, as has already been suggested, it seems that the work of the International Waterways Commission is not very much concerned with that phase of the subject. So far as the other question is concerned, the one drawn to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) during the past session, and again to-day, I agree entirely with what has been said as to the possible use of the water power on the Beauharnois canal. The Prime Minister seems to think that there is great difficulty about it. I do not see in what way that difficulty can arise. It is evident to all that to hand over this water power—even though it be only of 10,000 horse-power—to the already existing monopoly, would serve only to increase the strength of that monopoly and aggravate the situation which is said to exist at the present time. The Prime Minister expresses himself as being embarrassed in deciding whether or not we should deal with this water power by way of public competition. Is it not possible for the government to establish the conditions under which these water powers shall be operated? Is it not possible to provide that the person or corporation taking over the water power shall within a certain period develop power to a certain extent? You might go further, and provide that the water power shall be sold to the public at a certain rate. Or, at least, you could say, as the Prime Minister has suggested, that the rates paid by the public for the power shall be such as are fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Then, when you have fixed the conditions in the public interest on which the water-power may be developed, you can put the water-power up for public auction, offering to hand it over to the parties who will agree to pay the best terms for it under the conditions named.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And subject to revision from time to time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be a very desirable condition to attach also. I think that if the attention of the government were given in earnest to this question, there would be no difficulty in working out the details in such a way as would develop, for the public benefit, water powers now lying dormant. The water powers would be used, and the public alone, and not any monopoly, would gain the benefit.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In view of the great importance attaching of late years to the natural resources of our country which furnish power, I think it is well that this question should engage the attention of the House at this time. It is not only for the purpose of inducing extra caution on the part of the government in contracts which they may make controlling these powers, but also with regard to the necessity of retaining such control over them as is absolutely necessary in the interest of the public, in the event of changes taking place in the manner of using water-power in the future.

The Prime Minister has said that the government is in favour of the cheapest electrical energy for the people. That may be their aim now; but if so, I would like to ask him how long has that been their aim? Was that the aim of the government when they made a contract with M. P. Davis for the surplus power of the Cornwall canal and extended it from twenty-one years to eighty-four years? It does not seem to me that they had that object in view, otherwise they would not have locked up these great natural resources for nearly a century for the purpose of satisfying the avarice of an individual. I have always thought that was one of the most imprudent things the government ever did; that contract entered into by the government with regard to the Cornwall canal, is to my mind one of the strongest evidences of the unwisdom with which the government are dealing with our waterways. Compare that action with what is being done in Ontario to-day. Under their electrical commission, the people of Ontario can generate and supply power, I think, within one hundred and twenty miles of Niagara Falls, for from $12 to $15 or $17.50 per horse power per year. That can be used either by individuals who desire electricity for light, heat or power, or by the farmer who desires to use it on his farm, and there are many farmers now who desire to use electricity if it can be supplied to them cheap enough. Now put that alongside the contract that was entered into with M. P. Davis, where the government give a lease of all the surplus power of the Cornwall canal for $1,000 a year, and then turn and buy back the same power from that man at $63 per horse-power per year, agreeing to take a stated quantity of it every year, whether it is needed or not. I say that is no evidence of the wisdom of this government. While the government may reply to me that the same thing was done

by our friends, that makes the action of this government neither better nor worse. But I chiefly blame the present government for coming in as they did, and, with the knowledge of the advancing demand for power that became apparent year by year, they tied up that power; instead of leaving the contract as it was before for twenty-one years, with the power of cancelling the lease in the event of their desiring to do so, the government tied it up for eighty-four years. I do not think that shows that the government are very anxious for cheap power for the people.

There is another question that might engage our attention, that is, how far the federal authority is justified in taking over for canal purposes water powers belonging to the provinces, and then selling them to individuals or corporations to the detriment of the province. Take, if you will, the Trent canal. I am told that a few people up there, headed by Senator Cox, control most of the water powers along that canal, that this is done by virtue of contracts entered into between this government and Senator Cox and his friends. Well, after a while the farmers along that canal will require this power, and they will find it tied up permanently, to their disadvanatge, by a contract entered into by the government and this individual. Now how far were they right in doing that? What equitable or legal right had they to take one of the great assets of a province and tie it up so that the province can get no advantage from it? I think the government should not be allowed to do that. I am told that most of the water powers along that canal, arising either from streams or from lakes, are tied up to-day by virtue of that contract. I say these water powers should belong to the people of the province where nature has located them, and where they would be available for the requirements of the people in each locality.

Then the next question that arises is with regard to the diversion of power to these canals. Take the Trent canal, take the Cornwall canal, take the Welland canal, take the Soulanges canal, or any other—the water that belongs to the province in many cases has been taken from its natural channel and diverted into these canals, whereas, if left in its natural channel, power could have been generated and transferred to the needs of the people under the control of the provincial government. How far is it justifiable for the federal government to control it for all time to come? I do not think that is a proper thing, nor have this government a legal right to do it. But when they do make a contract with regard to the generation of this power, I never could see the wisdom of doing it without reserving the right to cancel that contract at any time when it became necessary in the public interest to do so, by reason of changes in the methods of generating power that might occur in the future or the needs for which it is required. I think the government ought to have retained the power of cancellation in their hands. I am glad to hear the Prime Minister say that they intend to keep control of the price that will be charged to those who use that power in the future. That they should always do, because it will be the only safeguard, and a valuable safeguard, against unjustifiable charges. I am opposed to the principle of locking up these great resources of nature for so long a time as the government have done in some of the contracts they have entered into, and this refers to contracts entered into by the later provincial government as well. I know it has been done many times in years past by the Ontario government, and I fought against it as vigorously as I could, but no remedy came until there was a change of government. This federal government ought to take warning by that experience and they cannot move a moment too soon in taking and retaining control of these utilities in the interest of the public. Whenever persons get the use of these water powers they should only get it for a limited time, and there ought always to be retained the power of cancellation of the contract. It is true that the power should be given for a sufficient length of time to justify an individual or a corporation incurring the expenditure necessary to put in a plant, and to get a reasonable return.

The government should also reserve the right to control the pernicious habit which has been indulged in in the past, and is still, by these corporations, that of floating schemes in which there is a large share of watered stock, and afterwards making use of the amount for which the scheme is floated as evidences that the utility must be represented by that amount of money when dividends are to be paid, when perhaps three-fourths or eight-tenths of it is watered stock which did not represent a single dollar put into the enterprise. I think the government should hold such a power in their hands. They should compel the corporations to show how much money they put into the enterprise, how much the enterprise was floated for, who holds the stock of the company, how much they paid for that stock, and how they became possessed of it.

Now, in regard to the international waters I think that is a different thing. There are many other questions involved which perhaps are scarcely germane to the subject under discussion to-day, but in so far as the government are dealing with the question of water powers whether they are to be found in the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario I hold that the first right to the use of these powers belongs to the people of the province in which these powers are, that the government should retain the use of these powers for the people of that province as far as possible and

that when the government deal with them in any way or give them under any contract they should always reserve the right to cancel that contract if in the interest of the people it be requisite that it should be cancelled.

Mr. MONK. Before putting the motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe to my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that if he has been informed that on the Beauharnois canal you can only develop 10,000 horse power, he has been misinformed. With the progress of modern electrical science I have no hesitation in stating that the power you can develop with machinery on the Beauharnois canal is practically unlimited.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the information we have and when the papers come down I expect that we will see that my hon. friend has been misinformed.

Mr. MONK. I move that the second motion be amended by striking out the last five words.

Motions, as amended, agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY QUEBEC-MONCTON SECTION.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET moved :

For a copy of all orders in council, surveys, reports, documents and papers of every kind not already brought down, touching, showing or relating to the route of the National Transcontinental Railway between the city of Quebec and the city of Moncton.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I do so in the hope that it will result in the government's bringing down with as little delay as possible a full and complete return that will show the people of New Brunswick exactly where they stand in reference to their interest in the Grand Trunk Pacific railway project. I need not, I think, at this time, speak, in view of the circumstances as they have already been disclosed in this House, of the great dissatisfaction which exists in that province over the extraordinary and manifestly inexcusable delays that have taken place with respect to the Quebec-Moncton section. In view of the great precipitation with which this contract was negotiated in the summer of 1903, in view of the flood-tide speech of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in introducing the Bill to give that contract immediate effect and in view also of the almost startling speed with which the country was over-run with engineering parties and purchasing agents on the eve of the last general election it is not surprising that at this time, when we are within a few days of the year 1907, there should be more than ordinary disappointment and dissatisfaction at the fact that we are no nearer constructon work in so far as the Quebec-Moncton section is concerned than we were over two years ago. Why, Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of October, 1904 within two weeks of polling day in the last general election, the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, the late F. B. Wade, in a public intervew at St. John, stated that the commission would be in possession within two months of that date of sufficient information to enable a decision to be made as between the two New Brunswick proposed routes and that the surveys would be so far advanced that contracts would be let on both ends of the line, from Quebec east, and from Moncton west, in the early spring. That was in the spring of 1905. Needless to say at this late day that prediction was not realized. Then, the Transcontinental Railway Commission itself officially declared in its interim report of March 31, 1905, which was laid upon the table of this House during the early part of last session by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that they were then in possession of sufficient data to enable a decision to be made as between these two routes and that they proposed to begin the location surveys during the first week in May and to complete them so that contracts might be let in the early autumn. That prediction also, Mr. Speaker, failed of realization. Then, in the month of August of the same year the Minister of Railways and Canals, in a newspaper interview at Halifax, stated that since he had left Ottawa the final preliminary surveys had been completed and would be considered by the government during the following week, that the location of the line in New Brunswick would depend upon the report of the engineers and that he hoped that contracts would be let before the end of the year. That statement also, Mr. Speaker, went the way of all false predictions. Now, on the twelfth day of March last I obtained an order of this House for copies of all papers and correspondence had between the Transcontinental Railway Commission and the government in reference to the surveys and location of this line in the province of New Brunswick. The Minister of Railways and Canals laid upon the table of the House, in response to that order on the 6th of April, a return which he assured the House was a complete and full return containing absolutely all the correspondence which had passed between the government and the commission in relation to this subject. Now, I have, Mr. Speaker, in my hand, that return. It consists of three letters which passed between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission between the 26th April, 1905, and the 29th April, 1905, and in addition to that the report of Mr. H. B. Lumsden, the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission,

addressed to the commissioners under date also of April 29th with a route map or sketch annexed thereto. That is the return which was brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals and which the Minister of Railways and Canals assured this House contained absolutely all the correspondence that had taken place upon this important subject between the government and the commission—three letters, the House will bear in mind, which passed between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway commission between the 26th of April and the 29th April, 1905. The Minister of Railways and Canals last session rather resented a suggestion which I made that this return could not upon its face be a complete return of the papers. I wish, just for a moment, to call attention to these letters and I think that any member of the House who peruses this return will be very much surprised after such perusual at the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that it contained all the correspondence. The first letter which is signed by Mr. Wade, chairman of the commission, is dated April the 26th, and is as follows :

The Commission of the Transcontinental Railway,

Office of the Chairman.
Ottawa, April 26th, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I now beg to inform you that the commissioners consider they are possessed of sufficient information to enable a decision to be arrived at as to whether the central route across the province of New Brunswick should be adopted or the alternative route via Fredericton and the St. John river.

We will be ready to commence location the first week in May, and are making preparation with that end in view. If we are not to be delayed it will be necessary that a decision in this matter be reached at once.

There does not appear to be anything in the Act that specifies who is to make this decision, but we assume that it rests with the government.

Would you, therefore, be good enough to bring this matter before council, in order that such steps may be taken as may be deemed desirable.

Yours respectfully,
F. B. WADE,
Chairman.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson, P.C.,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Two days later, on the 28th of April, the Minister of Railways replied :

Department of Railways and Canals.
Ottawa, 28th April, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th instant, in which you intimate that the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners regard themselves as being now possessed of sufficient information to enable a decision to be arrived at with regard to the route to be adopted for that railway through the province of New Brunswick. You state that matters are in readiness for the announcement of location, and desire a decision accordingly.

In reply, I would ask you to be good enough to furnish me with a concise report on the results of the surveys made of the several suggested routes, giving me your advisory opinion as to the route between Chaudière Junction and Moncton, that it will be advisable to adopt. At the same time stating the grounds and reasons that have operated in leading you to such opinion.

It will, perhaps you will allow me to suggest, tend to make the matter clearer if you would be good enough to accompany your report with a small route map or sketch.

I am, dear sir,
Very faithfully yours,
H. R. EMMERSON,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

F. B. Wade, Esq., K. C.,
Chairman,
Transcontinental Railawy Commission,
Ottawa.

That is the only letter that appears on this return to have been written by the Minister of Railways in connection with this subject. On the 29th of April, Mr. Wade replied to the letter of the Minister of Railways as follows :—

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway.

Office of the Chairman.
Ottawa, April 29th, 1905.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour of the 28th instant, re alternative routes across the province of New Brunswick, I beg to say that I will have your request complied with.

Our chief engineer has been directed to make the necessary report.

Yours respectfully,
F. B. WADE,
Chairman.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Then we have under the same date the report of Mr. Lumsden, which was read in this House last session, recommending the adoption of the back route and which seems to have been prepared with remarkable expedition.

When I was discussing this subject last session I had this return before me and I feel quite certain that the return consisted only of the papers which I have now referred to. I applied to the clerk of the records last night for the return to look it over in connection with the motion I am now making, and to my great surprise I find that it contains a document which I certainly did not see in it before and which it is hardly possible could have escaped my attention in view of the examination which I gave the return last year. I may say that I have consulted several other members of the House who are particularly interested in the matter, and who examined the return last session, and not one of them noticed this document in the return at that time. And by the way, this paper was not asked for and was not covered by the motion which

I made in the House. My motion was simply for the correspondence that had passed between the commission and the government in reference to the location surveys of the railway in New Brunswick. But this paper of which I have been speaking is a memorandum signed by the Minister of Railways and presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council and bears date the 3rd of May, 1905. And for the first time upon reading it last night, I discovered that this 'concise'—this unfairly concise and concisely unfair report of the chief engineer that was referred to in the debate last session, had been adopted and approved by the Transcontinental Railway Commission. This is the memorandum :

Department of Railways and Canals.
Ottawa, May 3rd, 1905.

Enclosed, papers and plan in No. 110,617.

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Memorandum :

The undersigned has the honour to submit herewith, for the consideration of your Excellency in Council, a communication from the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, dated the 1st instant, covering a report from the chief engineer of the commission, with plan attached, relative to the two alternative routes for the portion of the proposed railway from Moncton westerly across the province of New Brunswick, the two routes being respectively indicated by the names, the 'back route' and 'river route,' the river being the River St. John.

The chairman states that the said report, which advises the adoption of the 'back route,' has been approved by the board.

Respectfully submitted,
H. R. EMMERSON,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

Now, the House—if hon. gentlemen have paid attention to the letters I have read and which with this document which I have just now read constitute this full return—the House will notice that notwithstanding the statement which appears in this memorandum to the Governor General in Council to the effect that the chairman had stated that the board had approved of the engineer's recommendation, there is no correspondence in that return showing any such action on the part of the board or any such statement having been made by the Chairman of the Railway Commission. It is very clear, therefore, that the return which I obtained last session is not by any means complete. The correspondence begins on 26th of April with a request from the government for a decision upon the ground that they wish no delay and that such decision must be had immediately, and yet the only action which the department, according to this return, had taken, was to ask the commission for a concise report on the surveys and for an advisory opinion, so that the matter could be determined. In reference to the engineer's report, upon the return as it appears, it seems to have found its way into the hands of the Minister of Railways without any letter from the Chairman of the Commission or note of any kind as something of which the commission, and the minister, and everybody else than the engineer was afraid. There was not even an acknowledgment by the Minister of Railways of so important a document, and I thought when I read this return last session —without reference to the memorandum which was presented to the Governor in Council and which I saw last night for the first time—I thought it a most remarkable thing that the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners should forward to the government the recommendation of the engineer without intimating to the government the board's own opinion in respect to that matter. It is very clear now that there has been a very important omission from this return, and when the papers are brought down that are now asked for I trust that the Minister of Railways will see that the letter of the Chairman of the Railway Commission accompanying this report of the engineer, and also any letters that the Minister of Railways may have written in acknowledgment of the communication will be embodied in that return.

There is just one other thing which strikes me in reference to this correspondence and it is in connection with the interview which the Minister of Railways gave to the press in the city of Halifax in the month of August, 1905. I have already stated that the Minister of Railways then said that since he had left Ottawa in the month of August the final preliminary surveys had been completed and that the government would consider them the following week and that the location of the road would depend upon the report of the engineer. I want the House to bear in mind that at the time the minister made that statement he had had in his possession for over three months the report of the engineer and the recomendation of the Board of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners approving of the back route—if this return is correct, and of course I assume it is.

Furthermore, with reference to the apparent incompleteness of this return, it is a matter of public knowledge that some months after the date of this correspondence, but before the report of the engineer, Mr. Lumsden, was disclosed—for I believe it was not disclosed until it was brought down to this House on the 6th of April last, when it was nearly a year old—the government ordered a resurvey of the two alternative routes in New Brunswick; that survey was entered upon in the fall of the year 1905, and that the work was no sooner fairly begun than it was abandoned, and not resumed until some time after. I brought the subject before the House last session, and all this apparently without any written instructions from the government to the commission, and

without any correspondence of any kind having passed between the government and the commission, which seems to me, to say the least, to be rather remarkable. Now, this matter of the New Brunswick routes was referred to the House again on the 12th of June last, when the vote of $10,000,000 for the construction of the western sections of the road was under consideration. At that time I asked the Minister of Railways as to when construction work on the eastern division between Moncton and Quebec would be begun. The minister stated that he expected that tenders would be called for in July, and on being further questioned he stated that construction work would probably be begun before the end of the present year. Notwithstanding that statement we are here again at another session of parliament to vote, I assume, another year's supplies, and no doubt another large amount for the Transcontinental Railway, which no doubt will be applied to pushing on the work in the western sections, without up to the present time having received any intimation as to the completion of even the preliminary surveys between Quebec and Moncton. I called the attention of the House last session to the provision in the Transcontinental Railway Act requiring that the construction work should be commenced simultaneously from Winnipeg east from Quebec west, from Quebec east and from Moncton west, and to the fact that that statutory provision had been violated by the government in pushing on the work on the western sections and in delaying the work on the eastern division, as they have been doing, between Quebec and Moncton, and that in that respect they have broken faith with the people of the maritime provinces. The Minister of Railways attempted to explain that there was no urgency for the construction of the Quebec-Moncton section; but I think he will find, in view of the facts I have stated, with which the people of New Brunswick and the maritime provinces are familiar, that that explanation will not very easily go down in that section of the country. I think the government cannot fairly ask for the assent of the representatives of eastern Quebec or of the maritime provinces to any further appropriation for this work until we receive a definite assurance—an assurance which can be relied upon, that the work on the section between Quebec and Moncton will be pushed forward simultaneously with the work on the sections west of Quebec, as was distinctly provided by the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There can be no objection at all to the motion of my hon. friend being granted, and if I can expedite the matter at all, I will speak personally to the Minister of Railways to have the papers brought down at the earliest possible moment. I have followed my hon. friend very closely, and I was surprised to hear from him that he supposes that in bringing down the papers the Department of Railways did not deal in perfect candour with him and did not lay on the table of the House the whole of the papers. The Department of Railways can have no objection to taking the public into their absolute confidence on this question and producing all the papers they have in their hands. The only object the government has on this question, as was stated at the outset, is to secure between the bridge at Quebec and Moncton the shortest and best route. If the work of construction on that section has not already been started, my hon. friend himself has just stated the reason, namely, that the engineer of the government, Mr. Lumsden, had reported to the government in favour of the back route, but my hon. friend knows that there was a strong protest made against the selection of that route and in favour of what is called the river route. The question was too serious to be lightly passed over, and, although the government engineer had reported in favour of the other route, and the commissioners themselves had agreed to that route, I think the commissioners acted wisely in having a new survey made. The papers when brought down will show this to the satisfaction of everybody. For my part if it should be found that the river route is the shortest and best route, there are many reasons why it should be selected in preference to the other, but if, on the other hand, it is found that the interior route is the best route, I do not think the government has any option. As to which is to be the route selected, at the present time we have no information, and for my part I have no opinion to express. The information may be complete or not, but such as it is, it may be sufficient to enable us to form a judgment, and it will be brought down for the inspection of my hon. friend and everybody else.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not complaining of the resurvey having been ordered. I am complaining of the delay which has taken place in connection with that resurvey. It has been in progress now for something over a year, and no result has yet been communicated either to the commission or the government, notwithstanding the fact that the original survey which the commission in their first interim report of March 31, 1905, stated was exhaustive and complete, had occupied not half that time. I have already referred to the statement of the chairman of the commission of the 17th of October, 1904, when the surveys were in progress only three weeks, that he expected all the information necessary within two months from that date. Notwithstanding that, we have now been oc-

cupied over a year with the resurvey, and no report of any kind as to the results seems yet to be in sight.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Regarding this survey from Quebec East as far as the county of L'Islet, I would advise the right hon. the First Minister to watch it himself personally because I have been told time and again that both the local and the federal members for Bellechasse have been insisting upon having the road surveyed in a direction to suit themselves. Personally I do not know whether that be the case or not, but the warden of the county, who is a strong supporter of the government, is very much opposed to the route the engineers are now surveying. Just before I left home a week ago he asked me if I thought Sir Wilfrid Laurier would give him an interview if he came to Ottawa himself. I told him that was a question I could not answer. Well, he said, will you find out if the First Minister will give me an interveiw, and if so I will go to Ottawa and show him that the route proposed by you is the one that should be adopted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will give him the interview.

Mr. MORIN. Thank you. Then I will write him to that effect. I know that he is a supporter of the right hon. gentleman and a smart intelligent man as well. The route which the engineers surveyed at one time goes through the county of Dorchester, at its northeast corner, and runs up to the Abenaquis river, and then to the counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny and so on. But that route was found impracticable. My right hon. friend knows that three years ago I asked him not to adopt any route before having the one examined which I had proposed, and he promised he would not and he sent his engineers over that route. The engineers went on that route but they came back again and did their very best to run up the route to the Abenaquis river. It appears that they were determined not to go by the Etchemin river route. For some cause or other they were bound to take the route up the Abenaquis river and what did they do ? As I have said before, the railroad should be built from the Quebec bridge, and for seventy-five miles there would not be a bridge required over twenty feet long from the Quebec bridge clear into the county of Bellechasse. If there should be a bridge required over twenty feet long, I said I would build it at my expense, and I repeat that statement now. The route the engineeers are now proposing will start from Quebec bridge, go through the north east corner of Dorchester and run up the Etchemin river, and then cross the river at St. Malachi hills, where you will have to build a very long and high bridge. They go on the west side of the river St. Malachi, then cross the river and go right down the river again, thus doubling the road and doubling the curve. It appears they are bound to go to the Abenaquis river and in doing so will strike it at its head. I do not know whether the two members from Bellechasse object to the route I propose because I am a Conservative, but I do not see why any one should revenge himself on me on that account. I am only a man and will be here perhaps, the same as a great many others, but an hour or two, and why should the people and county of Dorchester be punished because of political spite against me. What do I care personally where you build the road ? I am alive to-day and may be dead to-morrow, and all I want is a road for the people, and that is my object whether I be a Liberal or a Conservative. Whether you take the route I propose or the route somebody else proposes, you cannot help going through the counties of Bellechasse, L'Islet, Montmagny and so on, and if you do not go through them at one place, you will at another. What then is the difference ? Here are my fingers, whether you touch one of them or the other that will hurt me just the same, and it is the same with that road. I have been blamed sometimes because I did not vote for the road. Well, I want to settle that thing here and now, for now is the time. When the leader of the government read his Bill for the building of that road, on the 30th July, 1903, beginning at 3.15 and ending at 5.45 p.m., during all that time he never mentioned the county of Dorchester and he has never offered to build a road through the county of Dorchester. If you do not care to take my word, 'Hansard' will bear me out. To the charge that I had not voted for the road, I replied that nobody had offered me a road. How could I refuse a thing that was never offered me? Is not that plain enough ? More than that, when I found out that the road was to start from the Quebec bridge and go through the counties of Lévis, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska to Temiscouata, Mr. Fitzpatrick came to me in the corridor and asked me if I would vote for that road. I said to him: 'You can answer that question as well as I. He said: 'How can I' ? Well,' I replied, 'will you build the road through Dorchester ? Why,' he said, 'most undoubtedly. Well,' I said, 'the leader of the government never said so. Yes,' he said, 'he did.' I replied : No he did not ; let us look up 'Hansard.'

He said : 'I tell you the road will be built.' 'Very well,' I said, 'I will vote for it ; I would not be mean enough, if a road was offered to the county of Dorchester, to refuse it.' Very well. Mr. Fitzpatrick said : 'It will be built through Dorchester.' I said : 'Will you give me the same answer in the House that you are giving me now ?'—mind you, this was in the corridor, right at the door of the chamber—'I assure you I will vote twice for that road if I can. He said :

'No, no; I can't do that.' 'Why not?' I asked him. He said: 'I am not the First Minister.' 'But,' said I, 'you are a minister; at least you are a minister when it comes to disappointing me, but you do not appear to be a minister when it comes to making me a promise. Now, we will go beyond this. Will you go to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the government, and get him to make the promise that you are now making me?' 'Oh,' said he, 'I can't do that.' I said: 'You want to bluff me, that's what you want.' And I would give a ten-dollar bill if Mr. Fitzpatrick was here now. But he is gone, and I can't help it. Then it must be remembered—and it can easily be proved—that I had moved four motions on second and third readings of Bills, asking the government to run the road up the Etchemin river, and every one was voted down. If I did not want the road run that way, why should I move the motion? An accusation was made against me once, and I want the man who made it to know that I spoke in the House about it, and I want him to read what I will say. His name was Taschereau, from Quebec — Alleyn Taschereau. He was a bluffer, of course. At the time of the election he came and spoke where I was, and I am going to repeat, word for word, what he said, because I want him to know that I have mentioned his foolishness. He came, like a bluffer, and said that I was to blame because there was no road. He said: What did Sir Wilfrid Laurier do? He took the Bill and went to every seat in the House and asked the members to sign, telling them that he wanted to build the road, and unless they would sign he could not build it. And when he came to Morin's seat and said: 'Will you please sign this; I would like to have your permission to build the road through Dorchester,' Morin says: 'Go away, go away; I do not want you to build a road in Dorchester.' I would not bring that before the House, but I want this man to read and to know what I said. And the people who were there—I want them to know it, too. Of course, I told them then that he did not know what he was talking about, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier never went from seat to seat to ask the members to sign such documents. I told them that he had the right to build the road or not. That is enough, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). As my name has been mentioned by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) in connection with this matter——

Mr. MORIN. I did not mention any names.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) mentioned the two members for Bellechasse—I am one of them. In order to elucidate matters, and for the edification of the hon. member for Dorchester, as well as for the information of the House, I may briefly explain the situation. The surveys asked for by the hon. member for Dorchester were made. The whole of his county was surveyed to ascertain whether the proposition he made to parliament was a feasible one. The report made after these surveys was that the proposition was not feasible, because, if the road were built that way, they would have to go through the state of Maine to reach New Brunswick. I may state that three surveys have been made, and when the papers for which the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) moved, are laid on the table, it will be found that the last survey discovered a route through Bellechasse which makes a shorter road by thirteen miles and which will save the country about $250,000 in construction. When the papers are brought down, I think everybody will be satisfied with what the government has done, and what the commission has done, with regard to these surveys.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Morin) having spoken, has no right to speak again without the consent of the House.

Mr. MORIN. I will be very brief in what I have to say. I am not anyways greedy about that road. The matter will be explained when the papers come out. There is a book published by the government giving the elevation of all the stations and water tanks on the railways throughout the country, and another book gives the elevations throughout the country generally. Some day I will give my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) the figures, which will show that the highest point on the route I propose is not a thousand feet above the Quebec bridge.

Motion (Mr. Crocket) agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Ordinances of the Yukon Territory, passed by the Yukon Council in the year 1906—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 29, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT—CONTROL OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES, &c.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: The chief object of this Bill is to extend

the application of the Railway Act and make it apply, in the first place, to sleeping car companies and telegraph companies. My proposed amendment is to insert the words 'telegraph companies and sleeping car companies' in the clause that regulates the application of the Act. I have ascertained from inquiry from the railway committee that they have no jurisdiction over telegraph companies, and that a grievance exists to-day at North Bay where telegraph companies join, and there is no provision to compel them to interchange messages. I propose to compel them to do that, as is done with telephone companies. I also propose again to introduce a clause compelling all railway companies in this country to give a two cent maximum passenger rate. I also propose to compel telephone companies to interchange all business, as well as long distance messages.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets. He said: In brief, this Bill is to repeal the law which now makes it a crime to sell a railway ticket in this country. Some years ago we passed an Act which made it a crime for anybody to sell a railway ticket who was not licensed for that purpose, and it is now a crime that anybody who owns a railway ticket to sell it; he must go to the railway and have it redeemed. I propose to repeal that law so that a railway ticket shall be like a bank note, and can be transferred from one person to another. The result of the legislation we now have to entrench the railway people in an unfair position against the public who use their roads. If you buy a railway ticket now, you get a reduced fare, provided you return in the same way you go, that is, if you go from Ottawa to Toronto on a reduced fare, you must return by the same way you went. My idea is that a railway passenger should be allowed to get the best possible rate and go by one road and return by another if he wishes. I know of no country which has a law such as we have to-day, which declares it to be a crime to sell a railway ticket once it is purchased. It ought to be good at any time, and be used by anybody other than the passenger who purchased it. This is the law in the United States and it ought to be the law here. I especially wish to carry that Bill in view of the fact that the railways to-day do not comply with their original charters. The Grand Trunk Railway to-day, I believe, is bound to give people all along its lines a penny a mile rate, which it refuses to do. It does not obey the law in this respect, yet it enforces the law against the public and makes it a crime to sell a railway ticket.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MARCHE CHAMPLAIN STATION AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Montmagny):

1. Is the government aware that the National Transcontinental Commission intends building a station on the Champlain market, at Quebec?
2. If so, what is the estimated cost of the work required in such construction?
3. Is the government aware that the city council and the Board of Trade of Quebec, the navigation and railway companies have given expression to an opinion against the building of such station?
4. Have any representations in this sense been made to the government?
5. Has another and more advantageous site for the erection of a central station been suggested to the government?
6. Is the government aware that the building of the intended station on the Champlain market would be a blot on the beauty and a menace to the prosperity of Quebec?

The Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways): I am informed that such correspondence does not exist.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all circulars sent out by the immigration office during the present year to agents of the department in the United Kingdom, and on the continent of Europe; also to booking agents in the United Kingdom and on the continent.—Mr. Chisholm.

For a copy of the proclamations used in the elections of 1904, in the constituencies of Selkirk, Provencher, Macdonald, Lisgar, Marquette, Souris, Brandon and Portage la Prairie. —Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a return showing the names, places of residence, places or ports where shipped, and dates when shipped, of the officers and crews of the steamers 'Minto,' 'Stanley' and 'Princess'; and also of the dredges 'W. S. Fielding', 'St. Lawrence' and 'George McKenzie'.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

COAL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask whether the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has any news as to the expected settlement of the coal strike at Lethbridge.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I had yesterday an interview with the managing director of the Lethbridge Coal Company, who unfortunately is here on a very sad visit, his mother being on the point of death, even if not dead at the present hour, so I could have but a very short

interview with him. But I may say that he is lending his services towards a prompt settlement of the strike. We are in correspondence with the Deputy Minister of Labour and I expect at any moment to receive favourable news.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. ALBERT J. S. COPP (Digby). Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day are called I rise to a question of privilege. My attention the other evening was drawn to an alleged interview in the St. John 'Telegraph' of October 18th last, to which reference had been made in the afternoon by the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Stockton). I shall read the interview Mr. Speaker. It is as follows :

WELDON'S CHANCES POOR SAYS LIBERAL M.P.

Mr. Copp, of Digby, speaks of Fielding by-election—The fisheries

A. J. S. Copp, M.P., for Digby county (N.S.), is at the Royal.

To a 'Telegraph' reporter, speaking of the contest in Queen's-Shelburne, where Dr. Weldon is running against Hon. W. S. Fielding, the member for Digby, gave it as his opinion that the Conservative candidate had not 'a ghost of a chance.' 'To begin with,' he said, 'Weldon is not a resident of the county. A man belonging to the constituency would certainly poll a better vote, but as I have said, in no case would an opposition candidate have any chance of winning. I believe,' he added, 'and the general impression is, that the Minister of Finance will come out with just double his former majority. You can say further, if you like, that the course pursued by the Conservative party in this whole matter has injured them a lot in Nova Scotia.' Asked who would likely be in charge of the Conservative campaign in Queen's-Shelburne, Mr. Copp said that he believed that it would be in the hands of J. J. Ritchie.

As to that paragraph I have no fault to find but further on the alleged interview continues :

On being asked as to the Nova Scotia fisheries this season, Mr. Copp said : 'that he regretted to say that they were not as good as last year, in fact they are falling off considerably of late, a condition that has been in evidence for the past two or three years. This condition applies to the whole of the North American fisheries, and it is a great pity that it is so.'

As to the cause of this he said : 'The real cause is that the money apportioned for the preservation and protection of the fisheries is not properly expended.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I made use of no such language neither did I use any language that could possibly be construed to mean that any money appropriated for the preservation and protection of the fisheries had not been properly expended.

PRINTING OF TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS.

Mr. JOHN W. DANIEL (St. John, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) why on pages 22 and 23 of the Trade and Navigation returns the imports and exports which are brought in for the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are for the years 1903 1904 and 1905, while for all the other provinces the figures given both before and after these pages are for the years 1904, 1905 and 1906. I wish to know whether it is a misprint or whether it is to be taken as it is printed. Later on when the returns are given by provinces the returns are given for the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, and not for 1903, 1904 and 1905. It makes it a little awkward and it is impossible for members to get correct information unless we know whether the matter is to be taken as it is printed, for the years 1903, 1904 and 1905 or whether it is for the years 1904, 1905 and 1906. I shall send the report over to the minister.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, my attention has not been called to this matter but I shall look into it and I will inform the hon. gentleman.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—MAIN ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY

Government House,
Ottawa, Nov. 29, 1906.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 31st March, 1908, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the message of His Excellency, together with the estimates were referred to Committee of Supply.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty. He said : Mr. Speaker, in rising to present to the House my eleventh budget I feel, Sir, that I am in a position to join hon. gentlemen on both sides, for I am sure all will join, in congratulating one another upon the great and continued prosperity

of the Dominion. We have had a series of good years and it is not too much to say that never at any previous moment in the history of Canada was there greater prosperity than at the present moment. Here and there are incidents in connection with our business affairs which are cause for anxiety, but we have every reason to believe they will pass away. In the eastern part of our Dominion very large industrial interests seem to be placed in a position of embarrassment by an unfortunate difficulty which has occurred between two great corporations. Both these corporations owe something to the parliament and the public of Canada and that being the case I feel that I shall but speak the wish of the government and of this parliament when I say that we expect the gentlemen connected with these great enterprises to make every possible, every reasonable effort, and that speedily, to bring about an adjustment of the difficulty, the continuance of which would bring serious disturbances to the business of a large portion of our country. At other points in the Dominion there are, unhappily, difficulties because of the question of labour. But, after all, these are but indications of the growth and progress of the country, for they mean that labour is demanding a larger share of the great wealth which has accumulated through the development of Canada. It is to be regretted that these incidents occur, yet we feel hopeful and confident that they are but spots on the sun of general prosperity and that they will speedily pass away.

Our budget comes this year under exceptional circumstances. Usually parliament meets in February or March and the budget follows a few days or perhaps a few weeks later. This year, owing to a change in our system of the fiscal year, we are able to meet parliament in November and the budget comes on quickly. Hereafter our fiscal year will end on the 31st of March instead of ending, as in former years, on the 30th of June. We are hoping for very great improvements in connection with our public affairs arising out of that change. We hope to have winter sessions of parliament and that the summer or some reasonable portion of the summer may be available to the members for their private affairs or for recreations, if they are fortunate enough to be able to spare the time. But while we hope in future years to meet in November, I do not think it would be reasonable to expect that even under such changed circumstances we can always look for the budget at so early a date as this. There are exceptional reasons why an early budget is desired now, because it is well understood that we are to deal with the important question of the tariff. That being the case, I think the general feeling is that the quicker the matter is dealt with and disposed of the better the country will be pleased. Since the tariff question is the chief matter of the present budget I shall deem it well to curtail my remarks upon other questions in order that I may enter as fully as possible into an explanation of the tariff changes which we propose to submit to the House.

The fiscal year 1905-6 which closed on the 30th June last, and for which the public accounts have just been laid before the House, may be regarded as a year of financial prosperity as well as a year of general prosperity. The estimated revenue for the year was $79,000,000. The actual revenue was $80,139,360.07. There was thus an excess in the revenue over the estimate of $1,139,360.07.

On the expenditure side, chargeable to consolidated fund, the estimate was $66,500,000. The expenditure was $67,240,640.95.

Thus we had an increase of expenditure of $740,640.95, but we had an increase of revenue of $1,139,360.07 so that the net result of the year's operations, as between revenue and expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund was that, whereas I had estimated on a surplus of $12,500,000, the actual surplus was $12,898,719.12. The figures are shown in the following table :

CONSOLIDATED FUND.

—	Actual.	Estimated.	Less than Estimate.	Greater than Estimate.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Revenue	80,139,360 07	79,000,000 00		1,139,360 07
Expenditure	67,240,640 95	66,500,000 00		740,640 95
Surplus	12,898,719 12	12,500,000 00		398,719 12

The revenue shows a remarkable expansion, being $8,956,587.40 in excess of the revenue for the year 1905, or an increase of 12½ per cent, the expenditure exceeded that of 1905 by $3,920,958, or a little over 6 per cent. We increased our expenditure in that year—dealing with the items chargeable to consolidated fund—to the extent of 6 per cent. but we increased our revenue to the extent of 12½ per cent.

There have been only two surpluses larger than that which I have mentioned, namely in 1903 and 1904. The total net surplus in the ten years completed amounts to $77,198,884.97. During that period there has been but one deficit and that was in 1897 and it amounted to $519,981.44.

When we turn to the comparative statement of the receipts for 1904 and 1905 we have the gratifying fact that in every department there was an increase in revenue as the following table will show :—

CONSOLIDATED FUND.

—	1904-5.	1905-6.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Customs	41,433,648 60	46,064,597 89	4,630,949 29
Excise	12,586,474 80	14,010,220 30	1,423,745 50
Post Office	5,125,372 67	5,933,342 53	807,969 86
Dominion Lands	1,292,301 14	1,668,162 35	375,861 21
Railways	7,050,892 11	7,950,552 97	899,660 86
Miscellaneous	3,694,083 35	4,512,484 03	818,400 68
Total	71,182,772 67	80,139,360 07	8,956,587 40

We therefore find that in every department of the government there has been a very considerable and very gratifying increase of revenue. Taking one or two of these services for special comparison, we find that in the post office for the year of 1905 there was a surplus of $490,844. That in itself was a very handsome surplus as compared with the condition of affairs a few years ago when in the Post Office service under a higher rate of postal taxation than we now have, we spent all the earnings and ran short $500,000 or $600,000 at the end of the year. As I have said, in the year 1905 there was a surplus of $490,844, but last year (1906), there was a surplus in the Post Office department of a little over one million dollars.

POST OFFICE.

YEAR 1905-6.

Receipts	$ 5,933,342 53
Expenditure	4,921,577 22
Surplus	$ 1,011,765 31

The financial statement as to the Intercolonial Railway has too often in the past not been a favourable one, and so we should be glad to take notice of the more favourable conditions presented by the Intercolonial Railway returns last year. For the fiscal year, 1905-06, the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway was $7,643,829.90, and the working expenses, $7,581,914.36, so that the Intercolonial Railway for that year shows a surplus over its working expenses of $61,915.54.

The other branch of the government railways, the Prince Edward Island Railway, is not usually self sustaining and hitherto we have hardly felt at liberty to hope it would be so. However, there is an improvement in the Prince Edward Island Railway, for whereas in the fiscal year, 1904-05, there was a deficit of $151.375.19, the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway last year (1906) was only $36,982.59. There is therefore a very decided surplus in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, and a very material reduction of the deficit in the case of the Prince Edward Island Railway, a statement which must be most gratifying to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). The following table shows the receipts and expenditures for the past year of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Prince Edward Island Railway.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, 1905-06.

Revenue	$7,643,829 90
Working expenses	7,581,914 36
Surplus	$ 61,915 54

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY, 1905-06.

Revenue	$257.270 57
Working expenses	294,253 16
Deficit	$ 36,982 59

The capital expenditure of the last fiscal year, that is, the sums apart from ordinary charges on consolidated fund, amounted

to $16,037,000.77, a little over half a million in excess of the like expenditure in the previous year. This outlay was made up of the following services :

Railways (including Transcontinental, $1,841,269.95)		$ 6,102,565 74
Canals		1,552,121 21
Dominion Lands		599,780 01
Public Works		2,359,528 50
Militia		1,299,875 65
		$11,913,871 11
To which we have to add the following special expenditures—		
Railway subsidies	$1,637,574 37	
Bounties	2,400,771 29	
Other charges	84,784 00	
		$ 4,123,129 66
		$16,037,000 77

Out of the abundance of our revenues we were able to provide for almost this entire expenditure. We have provided for the ordinary expenditure and for the capital expenditure entirely, except as respects the sum of $818,000. My estimate was that we might add to the net debt of Canada in the year, $800,000. The actual addition to the debt is $818,000.

Mr. FOSTER. But you hoped to have no addition.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, we do not always realize all our hopes. My hon. friend would have been very fortunate if he had realized as many as I have. Turning now to the fiscal period of 1906-7, that is to say, the period of nine months upon which we have entered, it is perhaps difficult at this early date to make a very accurate estimate of the out-turn of the business of the nine months period which began on the first of July last. Our revenues have been very generous. Up to the 20th of November we have received $33,924,909, being an increase of $4,299,495 over the corresponding period of 1905-6. Up to the 31st March next, which will be the end of what I may call the fiscal period of nine months, I estimate that we may count on a revenue of $65,000,000. If business prospers during the next few months as it has been prospering of late, we may hope to do even better than that—and I trust that my hon. friend will not attach too much importance to that word 'hope' ; but to be on the safe side, I put the estimated revenue at $65,000,000. The expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund is somewhat difficult to estimate, as we have no fiscal period of nine months in the preceding year with which to make comparisons. I am assured, however, that the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund for the nine months will not exceed $52,000,000. If, then, we have a revenue for the nine months of $65,000,000 and an expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund of $52,000,000, we shall have a surplus at the end of the nine months of $13,000,000. The capital and special charges for the period have to be considered, and these I place at $12,500,000. That would leave a balance of half a million dollars in our favour; but, as about a million of the expenditure is a mere matter of account—we do not get rid of the money, but pass it into the sinking fund, where it is credited to our net debt—the result of all these operations, so far as I can see them, is that at the close of the fiscal period of nine months, we shall have paid all the charges of every class and kind for the period, and shall have effected a reduction in the net debt of Canada during that period of about $1,500,000.

We have had considerable sums maturing in the way of loans in England, and I ask the House to bear with me for a moment while I give an explanation in regard to them. In the last three years we have had loans maturing in London to the extent of £9,800,000, as follows :

October, 1903, I. C. R. guaranteed 4 per cent loan	£1,500,000
October, 1903, I. C. R. unguaranteed 5 per cent loan	500,000
April 1, 1904, Rupert's Land 4 per cent loan	300,000
May 1, 1904, 4 per cent loan, 1874	4,000,000
November 1, 1905, 4 per cent loan, 1875	1,000,000
November 1, 1906, 4 per cent loan, 1876	2,500,000
	£9,800,000

To meet these liabilities we held sinking funds to the amount of £3,257,692. With the exception of a portion of the 4 per cent loan of 1874, of which £2,500,000 was extended until May, 1907, and of which extended portion under an option given at the time the extension was arranged, £573,345 have been converted to a 3 per cent loan due in 1938—with the exception of these sums all the above loans have been paid off at maturity without the necessity of going on the market for a permanent loan. It is necessary, however, to explain that our position with regard to our loans has been modified by a transaction with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company arising out of a contract made by our hon. friends opposite in the year 1888. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company at that time received a government guarantee on a loan of $15,000,000 bearing 3½ per cent interest. Provision was made that the government should take a security for its guarantee upon the lands of the company. It was further arranged that as these lands should be sold, the net proceeds of the sales should be paid over to the government, and that when and so soon as these payments should equal $15,000,000, the guarantee on the loan should cease, and it should become a government loan. In this way we have received from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company very considerable sums of money. Owing to the great prosperity of the country, the com-

pany have been able to sell the lands at very desirable prices, and the result has been that they have been able to bring this transaction to a much earlier close, as between themselves and the government, than perhaps they had hoped for. In connection with this arrangement, we might in the natural order of things have looked for some diminution in the rate of interest; and if the rate of interest had continued to fall, this transaction would have been a slight burden on the treasury. I do not say that it would not have been justified; but as it turned out, money has been increasing its interest-bearing power during the last three or four years, and this money came into the hands of the government when it was no burden for us to take it and allow 3½ per cent interest upon it. At all events, up to the current fiscal year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have paid us on that account as follows:

1903—	
July 4	$ 500,000
August 19	500,000
October 8	500,000
1904—	
January 21	500,000
May 2	500,000
July 2	1,000,000
December 3	1,000,000
1905—	
April 3	1,000,000
July 3	1,500,000
1906—	
January 2	1,000,000
May 31	2,000,000
June 12	2,500,000
June 30	1,000,000
July 10	1,500,000
	$15,000,000

So that by the 10th July last the Canadian Pacific Railway had paid into the hands of the government the full sum of $15,000,000. These moneys became available to the government for the payment of its own loans, for the general management of its finances, but of course they became an obligation of the government which we shall have to pay on the maturity of these loans in 1938.

With regard to future loans, on the 1st May next, £1,926,654 sterling being a portion of our 4 per cent loan of 1874, which fell due in 1904, matured. On the 1st May, 1904, you will remember, that loan of £4,000,000 matured, of which £2,500,000 were extended three years at the same rate, the holders of the portion thus extended having the option to convert their holdings into a 3 per cent stock due 1938 at the rate of £105 of threes for each £100 of fours, such option extending to 30th April, 1906. the sum of £573,345 sterling was so converted, leaving in round numbers £2,000,000 to be met on the 1st May next. That is all the indebtedness in London which falls due in 1907. In the succeeding year, 1908, we have £1,500,000 sterling of the Intercolonial Railway guaranteed 4 per cent loan maturing, and on the 1st November of the same year £4,500,000 4 per cent loan of 1879. These are considerable sums which will fall due in London in the next year or two. I need hardly say the government are keeping these obligations well in mind and endeavouring so to arrange our finances that we shall be able at the proper time to make satisfactory arrangement to meet them either by way of redemption or otherwise, so that the very high position which the credit of Canada has had for a great many years may be maintained and continued.

I do not propose to say much to-day regarding the trade of the country, because, as I have already stated, the chief object to-day is to present the tariff schedules, and I am endeavouring to condense my remarks on other subjects. Hon. gentlemen are well aware, from current reports in the press, that the trade returns of the present period are exceedingly satisfactory. The total trade for 1904-05 amoutned to $470,151,289, whereas in 1905-06 it reached a total of $550,872,645, an increase of $80,721,356 equal to 17 per cent. Of this total increase, the imports accounted for $27,451,598, and the exports $53,269,758. For the current period there is every indication of an equally great expansion. To the end of October our total trade increased by over $32,250,000, as compared with the same period last year. Of this increase about $13,250,000 arises from the exports and the balance of the increase from the imports.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these two figures again for that period?

Mr. FIELDING. For this current period?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The increase is $32,250,000 for the current fiscal period as compared with the same period last year; $13,250,000 of this increase is in the way of exports and the balance, which is the larger part, is in the way of increased imports.

Turning now to the question of the tariff, this is the second occasion on which it has fallen to my lot to present to the parliament of Canada a full revision of the Canadian tariff. The revision of 1897 was a task of considerable magnitude and attended by many difficulties. We have now had ten years experience of that tariff. I do not think it is too much to say, looking back to that experience, that the revision of 1897, with the comparatively few amendments since made, has worked well, and that the tariff we then gave was on the whole well adopted to our conditions, a tariff under which we have been able to develop a marvellous condition of prosperity. Just how far tariff legislation has a bearing on the growth and progress of the country always has been, and always will be, a subject for difference of opinion. But so far as we

may admit that the tariff policy of a country may have any effect on its progress and prosperity, I think all will frankly acknowledge that the tariff of 1897 has been a most successful one. Our desire has been to encourage a large degree of tariff stability—not a slavish adherence to every item in the tariff. But we have been desirous that the impression should go abroad that the government were not willing to make changes hastily, that they were rather slow to do anything in that line, and only when a case became of extreme urgency would we undertake to make changes. We have, therefore, from time to time resisted many applications for changes, not because in some instances there may not have been something in the argument, but because it was not wise to make changes too often. And if in one or two cases there was some reason perhaps to justify a change, I do not think anybody has suffered any serious loss by the delay.

Now that we are approaching the question of a general tariff revision, we again wish to keep in mind this idea of tariff stability. We do not desire to make radical changes. We feel that the general condition of Canada to-day is such that no radical changes in the tariff are called for. In accordance with the intentions recently expressed, we are changing the shape and form of our tariff. We are adopting new forms of schedules, but after all it will be found that no very great and no very radical changes are being made in the resolution it will be my duty to present. We have from time to time discussions with hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to encouraging manufacturing industries. I do not think there is, certainly as to the principle, a very wide difference between us. We all agree that we should like manufacturing industries to prosper in Canada, always provided it does not cost too much. I suppose the question of difference between us would be as to where the proper line should be drawn. Some hon. gentlemen take the extreme view that Canada should manufacture everything. They see some article has been imported from abroad and they say you have no right to import these things because you can make them in Canada and should make them. In most instances we can make them, but whether we should is a debatable question. The question is, can we make them economically, and should we attempt to make them or are they things not well adapted to our manufacturing conditions. We are not prepared to take the view that we must manufacture everything in Canada. There are things we cannot manufacture with profit and we think we would do as well to wait until Canada has a much larger population before attempting to force the manufacturing in some lines. Take as an illustration the case of tin plate, and I am introducing it as an illustration only because I am not now dealing with the tariff items. We have been approached, very strong representations have been made to us, to put a duty on tin plate in order that we might manufacture it in Canada. There is certainly no difficulty about manufacturing all the tin plate we want in Canada if we are prepared to pay the price, and some enterprising gentlemen have already taken steps to establish a factory in a town in eastern Ontario. I do not think they have gone so far as to complete their building, but they have made some progress and perhaps are waiting to hear how the government may view the enterprise before they invest further money. We say at once that while it would be a desirable thing to have a tin plate factory in Canada or any other factory that will give employment to the people, what we have to consider is whether the advantages to be derived from establishing an industry of that character are at all equal to the burdens that would be imposed on the mass of the people by its establishment. Tin is an article which enters into the industries and domestic life of the people to a very large extent. Its price affects the price of home utensils and of dairying utensils in a very large degree and the tremendous canning industry we are building up—an industry to which we are looking with pride and satisfaction and hope to see very largely developed.

And as an hon. friend behind me suggests it affects the maple sugar industry, which is a part of the canning industry. This canning industry is a vast one ; and I think it would be a mistake if, because of this idea of making things in Canada, or even for the establishment of a factory, important as it might be to the locality in which it was situated, worthy as the enterprise might be and commendable as might be the spirit of the gentleman who would undertake it, we should cultivate that industry by putting a heavy burden upon all this varied range of industries which require tin. And therefore, we say, as an illustration of our policy, that we are not prepared to put a duty on tin plate.

When we introduced the tariff of 1897, we made very considerable changes in the rates of duty. There were important reductions and a few increases. We made some attempt to improve the classification also ; but not very much was done along the line of changing the form of the tariff. Our tariff, so far as its form was concerned, followed pretty much the form of earlier days. Now, we are proposing a change in the form of the tariff. We propose to classify goods, as near as possible, in groups according to their nature. In the present tariff the free list is given in full at the end. We propose to abolish that and to take each item of the free list which is to be continued as free and put it in its proper class and position. For every item within the group of kindred items there will be set forth the rate of duty imposed ;

and if the item is free, the name will appear in its proper order with the word 'free' after it. I think hon. gentlemen will find that on the whole a convenience. With regard to the grouping of the tariff, we have classified the items according to the following general divisions :—

1. Animals, agricultural products, fish and provisions.
2. Sugar, molasses and manufactures thereof.
3 Tobacco and manufactures thereof.
4. Spirits, wine and other beverages.
5. Pulp, paper and books.
6. Chemicals, drugs, oils and paints.
7. Earths, earthenware and stoneware.
8. Metals and manufactures thereof.
9. Wood and manufactures thereof.
10. Cotton, flax, hemp, jute and other fibres, silk, wool and manufactures thereof.
11. Miscellaneous.

We also made some changes in the wording of the tariff. In that respect, we have naturally consulted the officials of the department—the appraisers and others, who have had opportunities of learning the possible difficulties that might arise under any vagueness of wording, and wherever these gentlemen have suggested that the wording of the tariff should be made clearer we have acted upon their advise, changing the wording here and there. Then, at the close we have two schedules, one dealing with question of drawbacks and the other with prohibited goods. A list of prohibited goods will remain. As to the matter of drawbacks, I shall have something to say about that presently.

Our present tariff arrangement, comprises, you may say, practically four tariffs—at all events, there are four distinct commercial arrangements. The first is the British preferential tariff, then the general tariff, then the surtax in certain cases, and then the French Treaty. We retain all these features, and there are not many changes as respects them. But we introduced a new feature which we call the Intermediate tariff. We propose to have three tariff columns—the general tariff, which will be, in large degree, the tariff of to-day. Not absolutely, of course ; it will be varied ; but, substantially speaking the tariff will not be much different from the tariff of to-day. There are a few items in which there is a higher rate than in the tariff to-day ; but, as a rule, the general tariff of to-day, and the general tariff of the new schedule will be nearly the same. Then there will be the Intermediate tariff. And lastly there will be the British preference. With regard to the Intermediate tariff, it is not intended, as I shall explain, to go into operation at once. I wish to speak first of the British preference. We adhere to the principle of the British preference, because, notwithstanding some criticisms which have been made, we believe it has been a good thing for Canada. We are satisfied that it has given Canada prominence in the eyes of the empire and all over the world. And we believe that it has brought us commercial advantages, advantages derived from sentiment, but advantages which are substantial. There was a short time during which it was claimed by our friends across the water that the preference was not much advantage to them. On one occasion a very distinguished statesman on the other side argued that way. But I am sure that all will acknowledge in view of the figures of recent years, that the British preferential tariff, has given decided advantage to the British manufacturer and to the British merchant in lines of goods which we desire to buy from them, an advantage not so much in comparison with the home producer as in comparison with the producer in a foreign country. In 1890 the imports into Canada from Great Britain, amounted to $43,000,000. In 1897 these imports had fallen to $29,200,000. At that time, the preferential tariff came in ; the tide was turned, and the British imports into Canada last year, amounted to $69,000,000. If we look at the dutiable goods only—and, of course, the preference only applies to the duty of the goods—we find that, in 1897 our imports from Great Britain amounted to $20,217,422, and in 1906 to $52,615,725. Therefore, there is no doubt that the British preference has increased our trade with Great Britain, so far as increasing the volume of British imports is concerned. We think that it has had also a most desirable effect in increasing the interest in Great Britain in Canadian products ; and, though it is difficult to establish it by particular evidence, our conviction is that the preferential tariff has been the means of encouraging the use and consumption of Canadian products in Great Britain. There is another view of the British preferential tariff. It gave a great reduction of taxation to the consumers of this country. It has been estimated, by a close calculation, that if this preference had not been established, if we had maintained, during the past ten years, the old rates of duty as we found them, and if the goods had continued to come into the country under those rates of duty—though, of course, they might not have done so—no less than $28,000,000 of taxation would have been collected from the people over and above what they have been called upon to pay under the British preferential tariff. Another point is that the rates under the British preferential tariff have governed to a very considerable extent, the prices of articles sold in Canada by foreign countries ; and, undoubtedly, a very considerable advantage is given to the people in the prices they have paid for articles of consumption by reason of the fact that the foreign exporter, if he wished to sell to our people, had to bring the prices of his goods to the standard of British prices under the British preferential rate.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, sometimes talk

of a mutual preference. That is an old story. Hon. gentlemen on both sides would be happy if the preference had been mutual ; if it had pleased the British people to give us a preference there would be no difference of opinion, but all would agree that it would be well for us to have it. The only difference of opinion would be in the value set upon it.

There are a few gentlemen in the House who perhaps do not value it as highly as some others, but we would be willing to say that if it suited the pleasure and convenience of the British people to grant that preference to the products of Canada, we should have been glad to have it, and many of us think it would have been of considerable advantage. But while we hold that opinion, we have felt that we would not be doing justice to Canada if we were to press the matter unduly upon the British people. We have never made any concealment of our views on the subject; but when it became apparent that the adoption of such a policy was obnoxious to the mass of the people of Great Britain for the time being, whatever their views may be in the future, when it became a party question in Great Britain, when one of the great political parties over there took strong ground against it, when it was declared to be a policy antagonistic to the wishes of the mass of the people, we thought the proper position for us to take was and is this: It is a question for you, the people of Great Britain. We adopted the British preference because we believed it was a good thing for Canada. When you people see fit to adopt it as a good thing for Great Britain, why, we shall be pleased; but if it don't suit you to adopt it from the standpoint of your own interests, we have no objection to make, you must go your own way.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought some of you did not want it.

Mr. FIELDING. That might refer to some other people. There are one or two hon. gentlemen on the other side who say they do not want a British preference at all ; I do not want to mention names, but they are looking straight at me now. Now I am not going to say what may happen in the future. 'Never,' as I once had occasion to say in this House while discussing the same question, is a very large word in public affairs. For the moment there is no prospect of that mutual preference being granted. But there is one point upon which I have always had a clear view, and I venture to repeat it to-day, that is, that if a mutual preference is desirable, if it is desirable for the British people to grant us that preference, then certainly we can never advance the cause by pressing it unduly upon the British people, by insisting upon their doing something for our advantage which they do not regard as consistent with their own good. We say, therefore, those of us who regard that mutual preference as a desirable thing, that while we may perhaps bring about that mutual preference by the policy we are now pursuing, we never could bring it about by the other policy of insisting and demanding that our British brethren should do something for us which they regard as inconsistent with their own interests.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the cattle embargo ? You take a different ground there.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I am afraid some of the British people are becoming a little protectionist. A great many men in this world are protectionists without being willing to acknowledge it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The woods are full of them.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not be surprised if some of those British statesmen have got a little protection in the back of their head on the question of that cattle embargo. However, they have a right to their own view of that question, and we must not quarrel with them.

With regard to the application of the British preference, the countries to which it has been applied have been extended from time to time, and probably it would be of interest to the House to know exactly what countries come under the operation of that tariff. First of course there is the United Kingdom, then the British colony of Bermuda, the British colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the Bahamas, Jamaica, Jurks and Caicos Islands the Leeward Islands, the Windward Islands, Barbadoes, Trinidad, Tobago, British Guiana, British India, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, New Zealand, Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Orange River, Transvaal and Southern Rhodesia. All these countries are to-day under the operation of the British preferential tariff, and we continue to them this privilege. Then we provide, as in the past, that any other British colony or possession may be given the benefit of the British preference in Canada, by order in council.

Now we are making some changes in the British preferential tariff, but they are not changes of great importance. For some years we had a flat rate of one-third off the general tariff. That was found to be embarrassing in some cases, and we had to introduce special legislation to provide for special items. We have thought it best now to depart from that method and to have a tariff column in which every item shall be set forth with the proper rate of duty opposite. In some cases it will be found that the rate of preference is a little less than it was before ; in some cases it

will be found that the preference to Great Britain is larger than it was before. On the whole I think it will be found, as a result of our revision, that the tariff is more favourable to Great Britain in the way of preference than it is at the present moment. We desire to turn trade to Great Britain wherever we can properly do so, because Great Britain is our best customer, and if, by any arrangement that we can properly make we can turn trade from people who will not buy from us towards people who do buy from us, then we think we ought to do so. We are desirous of doing this in the way of turning trade to Great Britain. We are taking special account of Great Britain as a producer of metals, and when hon. gentlemen come to examine carefully the tariff schedules they will find that in that particular class of goods we have increased the preference to Great Britain ; so that in that line of manufactures in which she has severe competition she will be in a better position to sell goods to Canada in comparison with foreign countries than she is under the present tariff. Then we are making another effort, a modest effort, to turn trade towards Great Britain. There are some cases in which we propose that goods which have been free to Great Britain, may have a small duty when coming from foreign countries, articles of course upon which there is competition, and in that way there will be a further advantage to Great Britain.

Now, there are fractional differences in the tariff, which are not very important, I admit. I will give one or two illustrations. For example, if we have a duty of 25 per cent in the general tariff with one-third off, we get a net rate of 16 two-thirds. We think it desirable in making a new tariff that we should avoid this fraction—shall I call it a vulgar fraction ?—and that we shall adopt units of two and a half per cent. For convenience of calculation—and convenience of calculation in the customs means the convenience of the business man who has to do business at the custom house—for convenience of calculation by the Customs Department we are endeavouring to adopt in the case of ad valorem duties, units of two and a half. Thus a duty will be 15, 17½, 20, 22½, 25 and so on, avoiding in collection any intermediate rate. So if you take a duty which, taking one-third off, would give you a fraction, we propose to bring it down to the one unit of duty or up to the other. If you have a duty of 16⅔ we make it either 17½ or 15 ; in some cases, perhaps in the majority of cases, we have made it 17½, because that cannot be said to be higher than a fair revenue tariff rate. If you have a duty of 35 per cent and one-third off, the net rate is 23⅓, which is an inconvenient rate ; so we make it 22½ or 25. In some cases we have made it 25, in other cases, I think in the majority of cases of that class, you find the same illustration. You have a rate of 20 per cent which, with one-third off, gives a result of 13 and a fraction. We make that rate on goods coming from Great Britain in some cases 12½, and in other cases 15. Hon. gentlemen will see, having regard to these fractional rates under the present system, that by endeavouring to adopt a system of units of two and a half, sometimes we increase the rate of goods from Great Britain and sometimes we reduce it. I think it will be found on the whole, however, that as a result of the revision we leave the preference to Great Britain quite as much, and probably larger than it is to-day, and that Great Britain will have a better chance to compete with foreign competitors under this tariff than she has had in the past.

Then in connection with the British preferential tariff there is the question of the amount of British labour which should enter into a foreign product to qualify it as a British article. Great Britain manufactures in a very large degree from materials which are imported from aboard and we have been constantly told that German goods are being sent into Canada under the British preferential tariff and that that is an evasion of the law. We have given that very careful attention and while it would not be right to say that in no case has it been done, it is possible it has been done, we think we are justified in saying that as a rule it has not been done. But there is one difficulty that arises with which we propose to deal. We have provided by regulation that in order that an article may be qualified for admission under the British preferential tariff it must have 25 per cent of British labour. Nothing less than that will stamp it as a British article. It has been held in some quarters that this expression 'British labour' includes merchants or manufacturer's profit. This we think a wrong interpretation and we propose to lay it down as a principle that profit shall not be deemed labour but that in order that any foreign article may receive the British stamp, may qualify itself to be admitted under the British preferential tariff, it must have upon it 25 per cent of bona fide British labour, without computing the profits as a portion of that labour. I think that will meet the criticism which has occasionally been offered as to the amount of British labour entering into those goods.

I have spoken, Sir, of the general character of the British preferential tariff and I wish now to say something concerning what we have called the intermediate tariff, there being, as I said before, three columns the British preference, the intermediate and the general. The column of the intermediate tariff will contain rates of duty which are somewhat below the rates of duty in the general tariff. On duties of 30 per cent or

less, roughly speaking, the reduction is about one-tenth; in some cases it may be a little more. The intermediate tariff then will have rates which are somewhat below the rates of the general tariff, but still leaving a material preference in the British column. We do not propose at the present time to apply the intermediate tariff to any country. There are reasons which being stated will commend themselves to the House at once on that point. We propose to adopt this intermediate tariff as an instrument by which we may conduct negotiations, from time to time, with any country which is willing to give Canada favourable conditions. We want to extend our markets abroad and we want to have some tariff condition which we can offer to other countries as an inducement to them to give us favourable terms in order that we may find new and larger markets for the products of Canada. Now there are various reasons why we do not think it well to put that tariff into operation at once. It would require negotiation, we wish to have it as an instrument of negotiation. Just how far we may be able to use an instrument of that character for negotiation is a very interesting question. The very discussion of this intermediate tariff to apply to foreign countries brings us into the field of what I might almost call Canada's foreign relations, if we be permitted to have such a thing as foreign relations. The wisdom of British statesmen has given to selfgoverning colonies like Canada practical fiscal independence, subject only to that imperial veto power which has to exist, which is a necessity and proper thing under our constitutional system, but which is rarely, practically never exercised. Subject to that as a necessary connecting link between the mother country and the colony, Canada is practically a free country, having her own Customs law. We are free to say on what terms we shall admit the products of any country. If we should adjust our tariff to satisfy any foreign country and if that country should adjust its tariff to satisfy us, then, by reciprocal legislation, by reciprocal executive action founded on legislation we might bring about an adjustment that would be satisfactory. The representative of a foreign nation approaching us might say: Here are certain things on which we will reduce our duties, and if you will reduce your duties on certain things which we want we will trade with one another. And we might say: Very well, that is all right, we will reduce the duties and you do likewise, and in that short and informal way there might be a mutual trade arrangement. We have the undoubted power to do anything of that kind, but of course any arrangement of that character which we might make would be temporary; it would be simply legislation from day to day and might be brought to an end at any moment by either party who was dissatisfied with the arrangement. If we desired at any time to make a more permanent arrangement, if we desired to make an arrangement for a period of years, we, of course, would have no power to do that whatever; that could only be done by the treaty-making power and while Canada has made enormous progress and has a large measure of self-government, we quite recognize that the treaty-making power belongs to the Sovereign and if we desired to give the benefits of this intermediate tariff to any country in return for compensating advantages and desired to have them fixed for a period of years, that could only be brought about through negotiation on the part of His Majesty's government, by the appointment of an official representing His Majesty's government in order that a proper treaty might be negotiated. There is, however, no likelihood of any trouble on that score, because we may feel quite sure that if at any time we have reason to believe that any foreign country is ready to make a favourable trade arrangement with Canada, His Majesty's government would be only too ready to co-operate with us and that a proper official would be appointed to negotiate such a treaty and that with him would be associated some Canadian minister in order that we might, through the proper channels, negotiate a treaty to bring about the desired end.

All we do then by adopting this intermediate tariff is to hold it up to countries abroad and say: This is something which you may obtain if you desire by entering into negotiations with Canada; you may obtain the whole tariff for equal compensation or you may obtain a part of that tariff for compensation. You may obtain it from day to day by reciprocal legislation or you may obtain it by a treaty brought about through the proper diplomatic channels. We do not therefore bring this middle tariff into operation at once but we put it before the world as a statement of the terms and conditions upon which we are willing to negotiate with other countries, and in order that we may induce them to give us better terms and take from us a larger share of the products of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does it include every article in the tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. Every article in the tariff is set forth but it does not follow that there is a difference in every article. There are a number of articles in the tariff which are the same all through. There are here and there articles on which for special resons we made no difference at all as between the general tariff and the preferential tariff; there are a number of such articles upon which there is no difference to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask my hon. friend two questions. First, do I under-

stand him to say that if the British preferential tariff on certain classes of goods is to-day 17½ per cent and if this intermediate tariff having reference to that article is agreed upon with any foreign country—say at 10 per cent reduction—does that come off from the British preference, and is then the British preference only 7 per cent instead of 17½ per cent as regards that foreign country? The other question I wish to ask is this : By whom is this temporary or transitory arrangement to be brought into force ; is it by the Governor in Council or by parliament?

Mr. FIELDING. We will ask parliament to give us the authorty—within the limits set down in that tariff—to bring it into operation by order in council only as respects the temporary arrangement from time to time. Of course my hon. friend is aware that on the treaty side of it we cannot do that at all. I may say that there is no case in which the reduction is equal to 10 per cent in value, but wherever there is a reduction, to that extent it would diminish the British preferential undoubtedly. Though in some cases the British preferential is reduced and in others it is increased, on the whole the British preferential will be as between itself and the general tariff, about as it is to-day or perhaps a little better for Great Britain. But between these two rates will be an intermediate tariff and if that intermediate tariff were brought into operation it would operate as a reduction of the tariff, and to the extent of a small percentage—just to extent of the difference between the two—it would diminish the British preference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to ask whether the intermediate tariff is entirely a matter of treaty ? Or, assuming that the Governor in Council should be invested by parliament with the power mentioned by the Minister of Finance would it follow that the Governor in Council could bring that intermediate tariff at once into force with regard to some country whose tariff towards us was of a moderate character ; could that be done by the Governor in Council without the intervention of any treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but it could only last from day to day. There would be no guarantee of permanency except through a treaty brought about through the intervention of the imperial authorities. Let me give as an illustration that which has actually happened. We are not supposed to have diplomatic relations with foreign countries, but as a matter of fact we have although it is not set out in official form. I suppose, if to-day a citizen of Germany were to get into any trouble in the city of Montreal and if he wanted to follow diplomatic channels and to do the absolutely correct thing according to the official Hoyle he would write or telegraph home to Germany, the German government would go to the British Ambassador to Germany, the British Ambassador would go to the foreign office in London, the foreign office in London would go to the Colonial office, the Colonial office would go to the Governor General and by and by the man in Montreal might find some action taken in Canada as to his particular difficulty. That is the old theory as to relations with foreign countries. But what a foreign government does to-day is that it establishes a Consul General in Montreal and the German citizen goes to that gentleman and that gentleman comes to Ottawa and probably within an hour the whole matter is adjusted. In that way we have in reality to-day diplomatic relations, in a sense, with a foreign country. We are not supposed to have diplomatic relations in a certain official sense, but as a matter of fact we have business relations with the representatives of foreign countries. I have in my mind an illustration of that. I remember that a gentleman closely connected with a certain foreign country said to us : If you reduce your tariff on certain things we will reduce our tariff on certain things and it would be to our mutual advantage. We could both do that. It would be our voluntary action to reduce the duty and it would be his voluntary action to reduce it on his side and thus bring about the desired end. But the next day his government could alter it and the next day our government could alter it, and therefore if it is to have permanency—and permanency is very desirable in such a thing—it would have to be a matter of negotiation through the imperial authorities and we should have to seek their good offices. They would undoubtedly appoint a representative, clothed with all the high powers of an ambassador, and they would in all probability associate themselves as they have done in the past in more than one instance, with some officer representing the government of Canada and so the result would be brought about.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has answered me as far as he can at this moment, but what I want to know is : Whether it is the policy of the government to only make the intermediate tariff applicable under conditions that are permanent such as he has mentioned ; or, whether it is also the intention of the government to make it applicable in cases where the conditions may be varied from day to day?

Mr. FIELDING. We certainly would not think of asking parliament to give us authority to make a treaty for any length of time without submitting it to parliament. We would only deal with it legislatively in that temporary way I speak of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Until you could come to parliament ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. If we propose to make any treaty of that nature that treaty would have no value or effect until we laid it before parliament and had it ratified and confirmed. We would not ask parliament to give us any authority to make a permanent treaty such as has been referred to. Now, there is one other aspect of the question which I should frankly say complicates it a little, and which I ought to put before the House. It is an additional reason why although we adopt this intermediate tariff we set it forth in our legislation as a proposal and as an offer; it is an additional reason why we should not attempt to put it into operation at once.

There are what are known as favoured nation treaties which have to be considered in any matter of this sort. When our government came into power in 1896 there were two classes of commercial treaties which affected Canada. There were first what is commonly called the favoured nation treaties. It is an expression which is very commonly used but perhaps some have not taken the trouble to study what it means. Where a country has made a treaty with Great Britain in which it is to receive certain advantages it is a common thing for a clause to be inserted to this effect: that if at any time any privileges of a commercial character shall be granted to any country, then they shall automatically apply to the country which has made this treaty. That principle is adopted very largely by the nations of the world. These treaties, called favoured nation treaties, had been in existence for a long time. They did not effect us very much.

But there was another class of treaty; there were the treaties known as the German and Belgian treaties. These were favoured nation treaties but they were a great deal more. Let me say here that in the olden time these treaties were made by Great Britain without taking the trouble of consulting the colonies, but there has been a vast difference of late years. Great Britain to-day gives her self-governing colonies a large measure of fiscal independence, and Great Britain would not to-day make a treaty affecting the interests of Canada, with any foreign nation, without submitting that treaty to the Canadian government and saying; Is it your wish to become a party to this treaty? But in the olden time it was otherwise and these treaties were made as I have said. I do not think many of the favoured nation treaties are of very great importance, but still they are treaties which are binding upon Canada. The Belgian and German treaties were not only favoured nation treaties but they were much more. The Belgian and German treaties required that if Canada was within the sphere of the treaty—and it was held that she should give to Germany and Belgium everything which she might grant in the way of preferential concessions to Great Britain herself. That was the vital difference between the two classes of treaties—the one only affected our relations with foreign countries, but the Belgian and German treaties interfered with our liberty to make arrangement with our mother country. It was against these treaties that the parliament and the government of Canada for many years protested. In the end these two treaties were denounced and the colonial empire received fiscal independence and liberty to make arrangements within itself. But the favoured nation treaties remained. Now, if we should bring in one foreign country under the privileges of this new tariff, although that country should give us concessioins which would repay us, the effect would be that we would be obliged to give the same advantages without any return from them to a number of countries which possess these favoured nation treaties. You can see at once that this raises a very serious complication and warns us that we must not attempt to put this tariff into operation at once. We must conduct our negotiations and try if we can to get several countries to make an arrangement with us, and then if we should bring them in about the same time it would not do us any harm if we had to bring in some half dozen other countries the trade of which is not very important. I think it fair to point out this very important aspect of the matter and it is a very important reason why, while we put this tariff on our statute-book and hold it up as a basis for negotiations, we should not attempt to put it into operation at once, but should only make it the subject for negotiation.

I have spoken of the schedule in relation to drawbacks. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the tariff are aware that there are items in the tariff which grant free admisison for certain articles when used for special purposes—chiefly for manufacturing purposes. It has sometimes been complained of that that is open to abuse; that the articles although designed for one particular purpose and made free for that particular purpose may be applied to some other purpose, and that the revenue may in that way be defrauded. After some consideration we have come to this conclusion. There are a few of these items which are easily administered—the articles can only be used for the specific purposes for which they are designed. In such cases we make no change. There are, however, a number of articles which could possibly be used for more than one purpose, and on these we say that hereafter the duty must be paid; but, so that the importer will not be placed in a worse position, we make a refund in the shape of a drawback to the extent of 95 per cent of the duty, upon proof that the article has been used for the purpose designed, and not for any other pur-

pose. I think that change will meet the views of a very large number of business men in the country who feel that the present system is capable of being misused.

There is one item of that class which we treat in a somewhat different way. It is not a free item; it is an item on which we have placed a special duty. Several years ago, hon. gentlemen may remember, I called the attention of the House to the peculiar position occupied by the manufacturers of neckties. It was represented to us that the chief material used in the manufacture of neckwear was German silk, which it was claimed was particularly well adapted to the business. That material was imported under the German surtax, and would have to pay a very high rate of duty. At the same time German silk could be imported into Great Britain free of duty, manufactured there into neckwear which had 25 per cent of British labour upon it, and then imported into Canada at 23½ per cent duty, while the Canadian manufacturers of neckwear had to pay nearly double that duty on the raw materials, out of which they had to make the article. That was one of the difficulties that might arise under our tariff system, and we had to meet it. The manner in which we met it was to fix a special rate of duty of 10 per cent on silk imported for the manufacture of ties, so that with the British preference of 33⅓ per cent the manufacturer of neckwear had a fair chance. This provision however has been very open to abuse. The man who makes neckwear is apt to engage in the making of other things, and if he imports silk at a special rate of duty for ties, and puts it into his factory, he may some day forget that it was to be used exclusively for ties, and may put it into other things. The dry goods trade have repeatedly made representations to us on that subject, claiming that the customs duty is being evaded. Without passing judgment on that question or reflecting on the manufacturers—because we have no evidence of it—but realizing that it is capable of abuse, we have decided to abolish the special duty and re-arrange the duties in a way that will give the manufacturer of neckwear a chance to carry on his business. This will involve some increases on silks, which may not be objectionable, regarding them as luxuries. We propose to re-arrange the rates of duty as follows. Silk fabrics will be 30 per cent under the general tariff, 27½ per cent under the intermediate, and 17½ per cent under the British preference; manufactures of silk, including ties, 37½ per cent under the general tariff, 35 per cent under the intermediate, and 30 per cent under the British preference. If the manufacturers of neckties still had to import their silk from Germany and pay the surtax they would be at a disadvantage; but other countries are now competing with Germany in the production of silks; Switzerland, for instance, is supplying silks of excellent quality; so that we think the effect will be that the manufacturers will purchase many of their silks from that country, and also to encourage the importation of British silks.

Another item to which I would call the attention of the House is the importation of goods for the government. From time immemorial, as long as I have been able to study tariffs, we have had in our tariff laws the provision that any department of the government might import goods for the government free of duty, and that has been so interpreted that a merchant who had received from the government an order for goods might import them free of duty. We think on the whole that is a rather objectionable system, and we have thought it well to change it. There are a few special cases in which we retain the system for special reasons, which will be explained when the item is reached. But subject to these exceptions, we propose to abolish the system. One disadvantage of the system is that it results in confusion in comparing prices of supplies. A merchant is asked to tender for the supply of goods to the government, and he tenders at a figure including the duty, forgetting this provision, while another tenders at a much lower figure on the expectation of getting the remission of the duty; so that there is no fair basis of comparison. This leads to misunderstandings and possibly evasions of the spirit and intention of the law. We therefore propose with a few exceptions—a very few, for special reasons which I am sure the House will appreciate—to abolish the system; so that if the Department of Railways and Canals or the Department of Marine or any other department of the government wants to import goods, that department must stand in the same position as a private importer, and if a merchant gets an order from any department of the government to supply goods, he will not be able to get them in free, but must pay the duty. It may be said that this is as broad as it is long, that in the one case the government does not pay the duty, while in another case the duty comes in through the Customs Department and is paid out again in the price of the goods. At all events, we remove a system which is capable of misunderstanding, and I think on the whole the change will commend itself to the House generally.

In the existing tariff there is what is known as the anti-combine clause. Hon. gentlemen may remember that when that clause was first submitted to parliament ten years ago, we proposed that it should make this provision, that whenever the Governor in Council should become satisfied that any combination existed for un-

duly enhancing the price of goods, and such enhancement of price was facilitated by the operation of the tariff, we might provide by order in council for the abolition or reduction of the duty. When the matter came to be considered, the suggestion was made to us, I think by one of our friends, that this was a dangerous power for the government to take to themselves, as they might at any moment, perhaps in the case of a manufacturer who was a political opponent, lower the rate of duty. We were impressed by that view, although we had great faith in this government to do the right thing, and we decided to introduce a change providing that when the Governor in Council exercised that power, the question whether or not there was such a combine should be the subject of judicial investigation, and only after the fact had been established by such investigation should we have the right to take the proposed action. In that shape the resolution passed the House, and is part of the tariff law to-day. While it imposed a check on the government, it had this disadvantage, that it provided a somewhat slow piece of machinery. Justice in the courts is somewhat slow; judges are busy, and men who thought there were combines were slow to take advantage of the provision. There was one case in which full advantage was taken of it, that was in the case of the paper combine. The gentlemen connected with the newspaper press organized and took proceedings and a very thorough investigation was had, the result of which was the proof of the existence of a combine. Then, in accordance with the intention of the Act, the government reduced the duty on paper to 15 per cent. That was a case in which the Act served its purpose entirely; and I am inclined to think that although the Act was only put into complete operation in that one case, the very fact that a trial took place was of great value because it warned all manufacturers that the power existed, and, although seldom used, could be made use of by those who took the trouble to do it. We propose to maintain that clause in the tariff because its existence there, we think, has a wholesome effect.

We propose to put in another clause. Almost the same words are found in the Criminal Code. In the Criminal Code there is a provision that proceedings may be taken against any persons who are engaged in conspiracy or combine to enhance prices, and we know that such proceedings have been taken. We propose that if in any case, not by our own judicial investigation, but in the ordinary process of justice, proceedings take place in any court under the Crimnal Code, and it is there established that a combine exists, that shall be sufficient evidence on which the government may act. We still adhere to the special judicial investigation, but we in addition take the power to act on the results of that investigation if it be brought about in the usual way under the Criminal Code, just as if it were brought by a special commissioner chosen by ourselves.

We introduced a couple of years ago a rather novel piece of legislation known as the dumping clause. There was some friction at the time, as there always will be in the introduction of any new feature of tariff legislation, but the friction has pretty well passed away, and it will be generally admitted that this clause has on the whole served its purpose very well. We propose to continue the dumping clause and enlarge it in this respect. Hitherto it has applied ouly to dutiable goods. We propose to strike out the restriction and make it apply to imports whether dutiable or free. The special duty, or the dumping duty as it is familiarly termed—and by the way the word has now been sufficiently naturalized for us to import it into the tariff and we are going to honour it by placing it there—was the difference in value between the true value and what for convenience I may call the false value of the goods—at all events the cut value, but subject to this limitation, that the difference should not exceed one half of the ordinary duties. We propose to change that slightly so that hereafter it will read that the dumping or special duty shall be the difference in value as before, provided it does not in any case exceed 15 per cent. Thus in the case of an article on the free list, if the dumping principle be applied, the duty to be charged would be the difference in value—the improper difference as we deem it—not however to exceed 15 per cent.

A question which attracted very much notice last year in the United States and Canada is that of denatured alcohol—the use of spirits for the purpose of fuel and light and power. There are several erroneous impressions existing in this country on that subject. The first is that the United States have made all such alcohol free for the purposes of power and so forth. That is a mistake. All that the United States government have done is to declare that alcohol for that purpose shall, after the 1st January, be made free so far as the excise duty is concerned. They have not touched the custom duty at all. Another mistaken impression is that the United States are leading us in that matter. Well, it may be a surprise to some to be told that where the United States will be on the 1st January next by their new legislation, Canada has been for some years. Denatured alcohol has been in Canada for some years free of excise duty. The only difference between the condition in Canada to-day and the condition of the United States after the 1st January next is this, that whereas by their legislation they propose to allow the manufacturer of this denatured al-

cohol to be carried on by certain individuals at certain distilleries, we have it treated in Canada as a government monopoly. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, is one of these monopolistic manufacturers we hear so much about. He is making denatured alcohol which he calls methylated spirits. It has been considered advisable in the interests of the revenue, not to allow that to be made outside but only by the government, and we have been making and selling it at something like cost price. We buy the alcohol at Canadian distilleries; in denaturing we use wood alcohol; the process is carried on by the government, and the product is sold at or about cost price. We do not aim at making a profit, but when it is seen we are making a profit we reduce the price. So that we have now and have enjoyed a long time the advantage of denatured alcohol free of excise duty, the very advantage the United States will enjoy in January next.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you manufacture it only in one locality ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, only at Ottawa.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. How much a day ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is not good for drinking, my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. What distilleries do you buy the alcohol from ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is purchased from the various distilleries in Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. At a profit ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly. They never sell anything without a profit and would be very foolish if they did. Unfortunately however we have not been able to produce denatured alcohol or methylated spirits at a low rate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is the point.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been sold at a low rate but not sufficiently low to bring it within the reach of popular demand.

Mr. FOSTER. What rate ?

Mr. FIELDING. The rate has been lately reduced to eighty cents. It used to be $1.10. Denatured alcohol at eighty cents is not going to respond to the cry of the country for cheap fuel. We must get it away below that if we are to reach the results which the people are looking for. It is expected in the United States that alcohol can be made from refuse at a very low rate. There are new processes engaging attention. There is reason to believe that something may be done in the way of cheapening the article, and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) may be able to supply it, at no distant date, below the rate now offered. But even then, I am afraid it will fail to come down to a point which will meet public expectation.

Mr. FOSTER. In purchasing from the distiller, you purchase subject to the excise ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that is what I mean in saying that to-day we are supplying alcohol denatured to the public without any duty. But I am afraid that my hon. colleague, with his improvements, may not be able to fully realize the expectations of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. He only manufactures in one place.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. It may be found by experience that our distillers will not want to bother producing this alcohol. We shall try to get it from our distillers, if they will supply it at a rate which will enable us to produce denatured alcohol at about the rate at which it is produced in the United States and in that case the system will be all right. But if we cannot, we propose to give the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) power to import it from abroad. He has under the general clause, the power of buying goods for the government, and this is one of the cases in which we reserve the power while abolishing it generally. We therefore say that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) shall have the power, if he wishes, to import alcohol from abroad for the purpose of denaturing it, but he will naturally only do that if he fails to get it in at a low price in Canada.

Even then, we may find that under his system of manufacture he has failed to realize all his expectations, for the reason that my hon. friend has suggested—that he makes it only in one place. In view of that possibility, it may be expedient for the government to license people in different parts of the country to manufacture this alcohol. And if it be found necessary to give the people cheap denatured alcohol for the industries and the arts and for power and heating, then the Minister of Inland Revenue will be given the right to import it free of duty and sell it free of duty. Or, he may license people in different parts of Canada to import the alcohol or buy it and apply the denaturing agent and thus produce the cheap denatured alcohol. At present the government has a contract with the people who supply the wood alcohol, which is the denaturing agent, and which is mixed with grain alcohol to produce the result. At present, we shall have to live up to that contract. But, if it be found that the Minister of Inland Revenue cannot get the cheap alcohol in Canada, arrangements must be made for importation; and if it be found that the manufacture carried on in Ottawa alone is insufficient to meet the demands of the country, then we pro-

pose that the government should license a number of parties in different sections of the country to carry on the business of making the denatured alcohol. But, in that case, the persons so licensed shall have power to import foreign alcohol free of duty for this purpose and for no other.

Mr. HAGGART. Will these parties manufacture the two kinds of alcohol—wood and grain alcohol ?

Mr. FIELDING. As the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) reminds me, if these licenses are granted, they will be granted to responsible people, and the work will be carried on under the supervision of the Inland Revenue Department, as at present in the case of distilleries.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is the denaturing agent which is used in the United States, wood alcohol ?

Mr. FIELDING. I believe it is wood alcohol chiefly. The United States government has recently sent a commission—I do not know whether it is composed of more than one commissioner—to the old country to specially study the various processes of denaturing alcohol, and we hope to learn something from their experience. Of course, if other denaturing agents are found, we can use them. At present wood alcohol is the chief. Benzine also is used to a limited extent. It may be said that we could gain the desired result in a different way by simply letting the denatured alcohol come in free. But there is an objection to that course also. Denatured alcohol is alcohol which has been made non-potable—or let me coin a word and say non-drinkable. It contains certain articles which are supposed to make it so disagreeable and offensive that even the hardened toper will not touch it. But everything depends upon your having the necessary admixture of the disagreeable ingredient, and it might be that if a sufficient quantity had not been used the spirit would be used as a beverage. We have to guard against that abuse. If the denatured alcohol were brought in free of duty every package containing it would have to be chemically tested to prove that it contained the necessary quantity of the denaturing agent. This of course, would take a great deal of time and be expensive. Therefore, we think it better not to allow the denatured alcohol to be brought in. But it may be wise to allow the grain alcohol to come in free of duty, to be treated in the establishments under the supervision of the Minister of Inland Revenue. In that way only, we believe, can abuse be avoided.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is wood alcohol admitted free ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is made in Canada, and the making of it is a very considerable industry. There is a duty of $2.40 a gallon on it, the same as on other alcohol. But, of coures, if it is to be used as a denaturing agent for grain alcohol, it cannot pay a duty of $2.40 a gallon. You cannot make cheap alcohol for fuel if the agent which is used has to pay so high a duty. We propose to put a duty of 20 cents a gallon on wood alcohol to be used for the purpose of denaturing and for that purpose only, and then allow it to be imported, if not by the department alone, then only by the persons whom the department may license for that purpose. And, in case it may be found that the effect of this duty is to prevent our obtaining the desired end of securing cheap alcohol for fuel and similar purposes, we take power to abolish the duty by order in council. I am advised that under the present system only ten per cent of wood alcohol is used in denaturing ethyl alcohol. With a duty of 20 cents a gallon on the denaturing agent, the denatured alcohol would be subject to a duty of about 2 cents a gallon. The subject is one of very deep interest to people throughout the whole country. There have been erroneous impressions as to the action of the United States on the question and as to the present position of Canada with relation to it. We have, rightly or wrongly, taken a monopoly of it. We are willing that the Minister of Inland Revenue should carry on his experiments to bring it to a lower figure. If he does not succeed he will have to license people to manufacture the denatured alcohol, and for that purpose they will be allowed to bring in foreign alcohol—and for that purpose only—free of duty.

I am reminded by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) of a point which may require some further explanation. I have referred to the German surtax, but perhaps I should make a further statement as to how we stand on that question. I have pointed out that we do not propose to extend the benefit of the intermediate tariff to any country at the present time. Germany will stand exactly as she stands now in her relations with Canada. At present, her products are subject to the duties of the general tariff. They will continue to be subject to the duties of the general tariff. But, as no other country will receive the benefit of the new intermediate tariff at present, Germany will not be at any disadvantage in that respect. But then German products are subject to the duties of the surtax and they will continue to be subject to those duties under this legislation. I fancy, for the reasons that I have already explained, that we can hardly hope to have the opportunity, at an early day, to extend to Germany the benefit of the intermediate tariff. These things take time. But there is no reason why we should not come to a better understanding with regard to the surtax. I have had conversations

with certain gentlemen connected with German trade, which lead me to hope for a settlement in that respect. The discrimination against Canada and the resulting surtax imposed by Canada were the result, I hope, of a misunderstanding. I am inclined to think that our German friends did not understand the spirit of Canada's action, and when they took the step they did, we had to reply, and so the misunderstanding continued. As I say, I am encouraged to believe that we may come to an understanding whereby the surtax may be removed. If arrangements can be entered upon with a view to the removal of the surtax and the removal of the burdens under which Canada's trade with Germany lies, we shall approach the matter in the best spirit and with the hope that the desired result may be obtained.

Now, I desire to say a word with regard to the iron and steel bounties. In 1897, we regarded it as important, and we regard it as important now, that the cost of iron and steel to the consumer in Canada should not be too high, because iron and steel at moderate cost are the foundation of an immense variety of industrial enterprises. Therefore, in 1897, we thought it our duty to cut down the customs duties on iron and steel, and, if necessary, that we should aid the industry by a system of bounties. In 1897 the bounties established were as follows: On iron from native ore, $3 per ton; upon foreign ore, $2 per ton; upon steel, $3 per ton. These bounties were fixed on a sliding scale and gradually diminished. Last year they were 55 per cent of the original amount. This year since the 1st of July, they stand at 35 per cent of the original amount. We are inclined to think, from the best information we have, that it will be necessary for us to encourage this industry for a short period further by a system of bounties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—When will they expire?

Mr. FIELDING—On July 1 next, under existing legislation. We propose to begin with the first day of January, 1907, and go back a step, and revert to the rate of last year. We do not go back to the original bounties of $2 and $3, but we go back one step on the sliding scale. Whereas last year it was 55 per cent and this year 35, we take as our starting point now 55 per cent of the original amount. Beginning on January 1, we propose to take the bounties of a year ago as a starting point, and so to arrange them that they will run out at the end of four years from January 1 next. As we have six months to run yet, that means an extension period of three years and a half, four years from January 1, but one-half year is provided under the existing law. We adopt to some extent a sliding scale, but we do not change the rate every year. We apply the following rates: On pig iron manufactured from foreign ore, for the year 1907—this means the calendar year—$1.10 per ton; for 1908, $1.10; for 1909, 70 cents; for 1910, 40 cents. It will be observed that we take two years at $1.10, the rate last year; we reduce it next year to 70 cents and the following year to 40—this is on iron manufactured from foreign ore. On steel ingots, we propose, in 1907, $1.65; in 1908, $1.65; in 1909, $1.05; in 1910, 60 cents. Puddled iron bars are treated in the same way as steel ingots, but as they are not made in any considerable quantity they are not of any practical importance.

Now I have not made any mention yet of iron from native ore. I have reserved that for special reference for this reason: Bounties were originally established at $3 on iron from native ore, and $2, on iron from foreign ore. There was a clear advantage of $1 in favour of native ore. That was a considerable advantage, and if continued would probably have been useful in the development of our Canadian ores. Hon. gentlemen will see that as the sliding scale came into operation that difference in favour of the native ore was diminished. To-day the bounty on iron from Canadian ore is 35 per cent of $3, that is equal to $1.05 per ton. The bounty on iron from foreign ore is 35 per cent of $2, which is 70 cents per ton. The difference to-day is 35 cents per ton. This difference is not sufficient to encourage native industry. Those interested have represented that if we could keep up that difference of $1 there would be some inducement, some larger prospect of the development of native ores. We are impressed with this argument because, while we wish to encourage the iron industry generally, we particularly want to encourage iron made from native ore in order to encourage the development of the ores of Canada. We, therefore, make a special scale of rates for iron from native ore, the object of which is to show a more decided difference in favour of native ore than would be shown by adopting the old sliding scale. We propose that the rates of bounty during these four year periods should be as follows: For the year 1907 the bounty on iron from native ore will be $2.10, and on foreign ore, $1.10—the full dollar of difference occurs there. For the next year we keep the figures the same, $2.10 for native ore and $1.10 for foreign ore—the difference of a dollar still maintained. For the third year the bounty on iron from native ore will be $1.70, whereas on iron from foreign ore it is reduced to 70 cents; there is a reduction, but we still keep the difference of $1. Then for the fourth year we reduce the bounty on the native ore to 90 cents and the bounty on the foreign ore to 40 cents; making a difference of 50 cents be-

tween the two. It will be seen that under this scale there are three years during which native ore will have the advantage of the full dollar, and then in the fourth year the difference will be 50 cents, which will be more than it is to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Beginning in each case with January 1 next ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Existing bounties remain as they are until then. They are very small, 35 per cent of the original figures. We put these figures in for the purpose of giving more encouragement than at present to the Canadian ore. It has been suggested in some cases that we should put the bounty upon ore instead of upon the product of the smelter. There are, however, some difficulties in doing that, and unless the ore is produced by a smelter and used, it will be no good to the miner. But we think this will help the miner and work out the same end.

We propose that these bounties should not apply to articles exported. There are rumours,—hon. gentlemen may have seen them from time to time—that the great steel trust of the United States may come into Canada to do business. If it comes into Canada to do business in the ordinary way, well and good ; but if it comes here to make up iron and steel for export, it might add largely to our burden. We think it is well to have it understood that we are giving these bounties for the encouragement of iron and steel for consumption in Canada, and if any parties undertook to export these articles they should not be entitled to the bounty upon it. Then there are bounties at present on angles, plates and wire rods. With respect to angles and plates, there is a bounty of $3 and a duty of 10 per cent. We have decided to abolish the bounty and allow these articles to fall, as a rule, into their class at $7 per ton, subject to the preferential reduction. The bounty is at present $3 and the duty 10 per cent ; we strike out the bounty, and put them in with the usual tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the result of the change ?

Mr. FIELDING. The result of the change is to give them about the same degree of protection, but to get rid of the bounties. The articles are now made in Canada to a considerable extent. We would be glad to do the same thing, if we could find it convenient, in relation to the bounty on wire rods. The difficulty there, however, is that wire rods are not finished articles. They are used by manufacturers of other lines of goods, and if we impose a considerable duty on wire rods we will have to change the duties on the articles which are made from iron rods. We do not wish at present to disturb that class of duties, so we continue the bounties we have at present. The other bounties are for fixed periods.

The bounty on wire rods was not for any fixed period, and it is like a tariff item which may be changed from time to time.

This bounty question is one of widespread interest. In some quarters strong objections have been taken to bounties. Criticisms are of a varied character. Some gentlemen object to bounties because they are a protection, others because they think bounties are something which impose tremendous burdens upon the country for which the country receives no advantage. I think that is too strong a statement of the case. I think those who condemn bounties generally do not stop to consider what would happen if we did not adopt this system. If we did not adopt the bounty system, then unquestionably we should be obliged largely to increase the duties on iron, or to allow industries of a considerable character probably to close up, and we do not think that is desirable. These industries are of great importance to the country. and we do not think hon. gentlemen on either side of the house have any desire to close them up. Those who think that these bounties could be dispensed with have not perhaps given the matter as careful a consideration as they might. These bounties have not been fruitless of good. They have accomplished a great deal in the development of the interests of the country. They have built up great establishments, they have given employment to thousands of men.

Very much has been done in that way. Then there is another view which is perhaps lost sight of. If you turn to the Customs returns of ports connected with the iron industry, take Sault Ste. Marie, Midland, New Glasgow, Sydney, North Sydney, take all the various points where the Customs department comes in touch with these iron industries and you will discover that during the period of these iron bounties there has been an enormous development of trade at these ports, the greater part of which, it is not too much to say, is directly due to the development of these industries, and if you make a comparison between the Customs revenues of these ports a few years ago and the Customs revenues as they have been under the influence of this bounty, I think I shall be justified in saying that you will find that the increased collection of revenue at these ports is fully equal to every dollar that the government have paid by way of bounties, and so any impression that may exist in the minds of any hon. gentlemen that the bounties are not in any way returning anything to the country is certainly a mistake. I know the question is one about which there may be very much difference of opinion but it is only fair that I should present that view.

It would be a mistake if I should detain the House very much longer. I have felt, however, that I ought to give some information as to the details of this tariff. It will

be utterly impossible for me to go through the whole tariff. I remember that in introducing the tariff of 1897, I undertook to read all the items; my cruel friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) insisted that I must do it. If it were difficult to do it then it would be trebly difficult now because I have three columns instead of one and so it would be a physical impossibility and I am sure you would not wish me to impose on you by any attempt to go though to any extent the details of the tariff, but I think you would desire to have some illustration of the way in which the question has been treated and therefore I propose to give you some of the items, if by so doing I shall not weary you too much.

Mr. BERGERON. Will it all appear in 'Hansard'?

Mr. FIELDING. Only what I read will appear in 'Hansard.' The whole statement is too full. In the class of metals, the rates on lead manufactures, including lead pipe, lead shot and lead bullets have been reduced as follows:—

New tariff rates British preference, 20 per cent; intermediate, 27½ per cent; general, 30 per cent.

Old tariff rates, British preference, 23⅓ per cent; general, 35 per cent.

The preferential rate on lead in bars and sheets has been reduced from 16⅔ per cent to 15 per cent.

In item 384 of the new tariff, formerly item 234 of the old tariff, an effort is made to divert trade to Great Britain and at the same time to cheapen the cost to the consumer. This item reads:

Rolled iron or steel sheets number fourteen gauge and thinner, n.o.p.; Canada plates; Russia iron; flat galvanized iron or steel sheets; terne plate and rolled sheets of iron or steel, coated with zinc, spelter or other metal, of all widths or thicknesses, n.o.p.; and rolled iron or steel hoop, band scroll or strip, No. 14 gauge, and thinner, galvanized or coated with other metal or not, n.o.p.

That is a large item, quite a number of items grouped together.

The rates were formerly: general, 5 per cent; preferential, 3⅓ per cent.

The new rates are: British preferential, free; intermediate, 5 per cent; general, 7½ per cent.

The articles are made free from Great Britain, and dutiable from other countries.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does that include tin plate?

Mr. FIELDING. No, tin plate is free under all tariffs, free everywhere. In the interest of manufacturers and consumers, the item has been enlarged by increasing the gauge of iron and steel sheets from 17 to 14 gauge, and the gauge of hoop, band, scroll and strip from 18 to 14 gauge.

The preferential rate on japanned ware, tinware and all manufactures of tin; also on manufactures of zinc and manufactures of aluminum is reduced from 16⅔ per cent to 15 per cent. The general tariff rate of 25 per cent on these articles is continued.

I come now to the item of brass. Here is a case where there is an increase. Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than 6 feet in length and brass in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished, or coated nickel, nickel silver and German silver, in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than 6 feet in length, and also in strips, sheets or plates.

These were formerly free, but they are now made in Canada in substantial quantities and we propose to put on duties as follows:

British preference, 5 per cent; intermediate, 7½ per cent; general, 10 per cent

Brass and copper wire, which were formerly rated at different rates, as follows:

Brass: British preferential, 6⅔ per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Copper: British preference, 10 per cent; general, 15 per cent; are made dutiable at the following uniform rates: British preference, 7½ per cent intermediate, 10 per cent; general, 12½ per cent.

Aluminum tubing, in lengths of not less than 6 feet, not polished, bent, or otherwise manufactured, is added to the free list. On Britannia metal, nickel silver, Nevada and German silver, manufactures of, not plated, n.o.p. The general tariff is increased from 25 per cent to 30 per cent and the preferential tariff from 16⅔ per cent to 17½ per cent. That is a case where the duty is in the shape of an increase but it will be observed that the ratio of preference to Great Britain is greater than it was before.

Sterling or other silverware, nickel-plated ware or electro-plated ware, and manufactures of gold and silver are increased, under the general tariff, from 30 per cent to 35 per cent, and under preference, from 20 per cent to 22½ per cent.

These are articles more or less of luxury and we thought they could properly bear a higher rate.

On pig iron the preferential rate is reduced from $1.66⅔ to $1.50, and the general tariff remains at $2.50; intermediate rate, $2.25.

Here is another iron item:

Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, girders and other rolled shapes or sections, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.o.p.

The new tariff rates on these items will be: British preferential, $4.25 per ton; intermediate, $6 per ton; general, $7 per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the old rates?

Mr. FIELDING. They were $7 per ton general, and $4.66⅔ per ton preferential when weighing less than 35 pounds per lineal yard.

It will be observed that this makes a difference in favour of Great Britain.

A special item No. 379, at low rates : British preferential, 5 per cent ; intermediate, 10 per cent ; general, 10 per cent, has been provided, covering beams, channels, and angle bars, weighing not less than 40 pounds per lineal yard, for the manufacture of bridges. Formerly such beams, channels and and angle bars were dutiable as follows :

If less than 35 lbs., $7 per ton. If over 35 lbs., 10 per cent.

It will be observed that the preference in favour of Great Britain is made greater than one-third.

Bar iron or steel, rolled, whether in coils, rods, bars or bundles, comprising rounds, ovals and squares, and flats ; steel billets, n.o.p.; and rolled iron or steel hoop, band scroll or strip, twelve inches or less in width, number 13 gauge and thicker :

New tariff, British preferential, $4.25 a ton ; intermediate, $6 a ton; general, $7 a ton.

Old tariff, item 229, British preferential, $4.66⅔ a ton ; general, $7 a ton.

It will be observed that here again the ratio of preference is increased by reducing the British rate.

Under the old tariff, item 230, universal mill plates, without qualification as to size, were rated at 10 per cent for manufacturers of bridges. It is now specified that the size shall be over 12 inches wide. The general rate is maintained and the preferential rate is reduced from 6⅔ per cent to 5 per cent.

Rolled iron or steel, bars, bands, hoop, scroll or strip, sheet or plate, of any size, thickness or width, galvanized or coated with any material or not, and cast steel, when of greater value than three and a half cents per pound, n.o.p.:

New tariff rates, British preference, free ; intermediate, 5 per cent ; general, 5 per cent. Old tariff, item 236, British preference, 3⅓ per cent ; general, 5 per cent.

That is one case where we impose a small duty on the foreign article and make it free if it comes from Great Britain.

Boiler tubes were formerly dutiable at 5 per cent general and 3⅓ per cent preference. They are made free from Great Britain and 5 per cent general tariff rate as against foreign countries is continued.

Galvanized iron or steel wire, 9, 12 and 13 gauge, formerly on free list is now made a dutiable at 5 per cent under the general and intermediate tariffs and free from Great Britain. This is an item of very considerable importance, as over a million dollars' worth was imported last year, mostly from the United States.

The rates on stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids, not for advertising purposes, are reduced from ¼ of a cent per square inch to one-eighth of a cent per square inch, and matrices and copper shells, not for advertising, are treated in the same way—Such matrices and copper shells now made dutiable at one-eighth of a cent per square inch were formerly dutiable at 1½ cents per square inch.

Type casting and type setting machines, adapted for use in printing offices ; and typewriters, will be dutiable as follows : general tariff 20 per cent ; intermediate tariff 17½ per cent. British preference 12½ per cent. This is a new item intended to cover linotype machines which are now made in Canada in sufficient quantities to meet the demand. They were formerly dutiable at 10 per cent as 'printing machines' or type making accessories under the old tariff. Typewriters were dutiable under the old tariff at 25 per cent and we are now reducing them to 20 per cent.

Mowing machines, harvesters, selfbinding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, the old tariff rate on those was 20 per cent and 13⅓ per cent under the preference. Of course we have to put the preferential rates opposite all these items but there are very many of these goods that cannot come from Great Britain at all. We quite realize that, but we have to fill in the rates in order to make the tariff symmetrical. The old tariff on these articles as I say was 20 per cent and we propose to reduce it to 17½ per cent. We give the manufacturer some compensation in the way of a drawback on some portions of the iron and steel which he will use. The manufacturers are compensated by a drawback of 95 per cent of duty they may pay on pig iron, rolled iron, and rolled steel entering into such machines sold for home consumption in Canada.

Windmills—this is an important item to the House of Commons—windmills have been reduced from 25 to 20 per cent.

Threshing machine outfit, when consisting of traction or portable engine and separator ; under the old tariff these articles were dutiable at 25 per cent and we propose to make them 20 per cent. In the case of threshing machines the difficulty has not been so much the duty as the valuation. There has been a difficulty in establishing a proper valuation for that article because it is not sold to the wholesale trade ; it passes from the manufacturer through the hands of agents to the consumer. The department has been allowing 40 per cent reduction on the cost price but the department is rearranging that and increasing the valuation, so that unless there was a reduction in the duty the cost of the article would be increased. That was not desirable because it is a very important item in the Northwest so that the change in the valuation will not operate to the disadvantage of the buyer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are ploughs included with mowers ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not in this item ; I have not come to the ploughs yet. Axes,

scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes ; rakes, n.o.p., and pronged forks; these are all farming implements; the old duty was 25 per cent and we propose a reduction to 22½ per cent. Under the old tariff if they were imported from Great Britain the duty was 16⅔ per cent but the new preferential rate will be 15 per cent.

The old general tariff of 25 per cent is continued on the following agricultural implements : hayloaders, potato-diggers, horsepowers, separators, n.o.p., windstackers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, farming mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths and other agricultural implements n.o.p.

Shovels and spades, iron or steel n.o.p.; shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut shape for the same and lawn mowers ; on these the old rate of duty was 35 per cent and in the new general tariff we propose to reduce it to 32½ per cent. The old rate from Great Britain was 23⅓ per cent and we propose to reduce it to 20 per cent.

Telephone and telegraph instruments, electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors, dynamos, generators, sockets, insulators of all kinds; electric apparatus, n.o.p.; boilers, n.o.p.; and all machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, n.o.p.; and integral parts of all machinery specified in this item ; in the case of these articles there is an increase in the general rate and a reduction in the preference. The old general rate was 25 per cent and the new general rate is 27½ per cent. The old preferential rate was 16⅔ per cent and the new preferential rate is 15 per cent. The clause 'all machinery n.o.p.' practically covers all machinery except agricultural and except certain special machinery provided for on the free list or at lower rates. It will be observed that the ratio of preference here has been substantially increased.

Mr. GALLIHER. Does that include mining machinery ?

Mr. FIELDING. Changes have been made in the mining machinery items in the free list. There are a number of articles which are now made in Canada and which are transferred from the free list. The following articles under the head of mining machinery are dropped from the free list and will become dutiable as 'machinery' or as 'manufactures of iron or steel' as the case may be : Coal washing machinery ; coke-making machinery, charcoal making machinery, ore drying machinery, ore-roasting machinery, ball and rock emery grinding machinery, jigs, classifiers, separators, blast furnace water jackets, monitors and giants. All of these articles are now being made in Canada and we drop them from the free list.

These following have been added to the free list and free of duty : Parts of miner's safety lamps and accessories for cleaning, filling and testing such lamps ; blast furnaces for the smelting of copper and nickel ; integral parts of all machinery specified in the item ; the diameter of the tubing covered by the item has been increased from 2½ to 4 inches.

Now, here is one of the few cases where we make an exception as to the importation of articles for the use of the government or of other governments.

The following articles and materials when imported by manufacturers of automatic gas beacons and automatic gas buoys, for use in the manufacture of such buoys and beacons for the government of Canada or for export, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, namely : Iron or steel tubes over 16 inches in diameter ; flanged and dished steel heads made from boiler plate, over five feet in diameter ; hardened steel balls not less than three inches in diameter ; acetylene gas lanterns and parts thereof ; these things are made free of duty for this purpose. They could now be imported free by the government but we are abolishing the general item while we preserve this for two reasons. It is not only for our government but for export. These are articles which are made for governments and for governments only. They are made by an extensive establishment in Ottawa, an establishment which we have reason to believe will grow very largely. It may be said that they do not need these articles free, that if it is for the export trade they could get a drawback. But this is a business which would have to be carried on on a very large scale and it is represented to us that if they had to pay their duties they would have such a vast amount of material in stock at the one time that they would have to deposit with the government several hundred thousand dollars and keep it there all the time, the articles being very costly and taking a long time to produce and the operations of the company being on a very large scale. If there were any danger of difficulties arising from this we would not make these articles free, but if these articles are to be made for our government or for foreign governments and if there is proper supervision we see no reason why they should not be allowed to import the articles free rather than have them pay the duties and then get a refund. There is every indication that this is going to be a very large industry indeed and one that the whole country is interested in. It is claimed that on existing contracts the company will spend no less than $800,000 for labour in Canada in the next two years.

Blast furnace slag trucks, of a class or kind not made in Canada are placed on the free list.

Surgical operating tables, for use in hospitals are made free.

Machinery for the manufacture of twine, cordage, rope, linen, or for the preparation of flax fibre is made free.

A special rate of 10 per cent in all three tariffs is provided for machinery of a class or kind not made in Canada specially adapted for carding, spinning, weaving or knitting purposes.

Well-drilling machinery for boring and drilling for water is made free, whether made in Canada or not. It was formerly free but the free admission was confined to such machinery as was not made in Canada. We think that boring for water is a matter of much importance to the country and so we make the machinery free altogether.

Steel balls, which were formerly rated at 30 per cent and which are used on bearings of machinery and vehicles, are now rated :—

British preference, free ; intermediate, 7½ per cent ; general, 10 per cent.

The duties on glucose and syrups are reduced thus :

New tariff. British preference 35c. per 100 lbs.; intermediate, 45c. per 100 lbs.; general, 50c. per 100 lbs.

In the old tariff the rates were : British preference, 50c. per 100 lbs.; general tariff, 75c. per 100 lbs.

The specific rate of ½c. a lb. on 'confectionery' is dropped, and the ad valorem rate of 35 general is continued. The ad valorem rate under the preference is reduced from 23⅓ per cent to 22½ per cent.

The rates on cotton fabrics have not been changed to any appreciable extent. They are :—

	B. Pref. p.c.	Inter. p.c.	Gen. p.c.
Gray cotton, unbleached, n.o.p..	15	22½	25
White cotton, bleached, n.o.p..	17½	22½	25
Printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p..	25	30	32½

This is a reduction of 1⅔ per cent (from 16⅔ per cent to 15 per cent) under the preferential tariff on gray cottons, unbleached; an increase from 16⅔ per cent to 17½ per cent under the preference on white fabrics; a decrease of 2½ per cent under the general and an increase of 1⅔ per cent under the preferential on printed, dyed or coloured fabrics, n.o.p.

These rates are also made applicable to similar fabrics of linen. For departmental reasons it is considered advisable to have common rates on cotton and linen fabrics as these articles are so interwoven that it is impossible to distinguish between them or to state which is the component part of chief value. All such linen fabrics were formerly dutiable at 25 per cent under the general tariff and 16⅔ per cent under the preferential tariff.

White cotton embroideries, which were rated at 25 per cent, and valenciennes, torchon and white cotton lace, which were dutiable at 35 per cent, are grouped in one item and the following low rates imposed thereon : British preference, 12½ per cent ; intermediate, 17½ per cent ; general, 20 per cent. This is in the interest of the white-wear manufacturers.

I can imagine some one saying that these laces are articles of luxury which should be taxed heavily, but on second thoughts hon. gentlemen will see that these laces and embroideries are largely used in making up white-wear goods. The work of the seamstress is a very large industry in Canada, and the effect of giving this reduction will be to have a greater proportion of these fabrics made in Canada and to give work to seamstresses.

Mr. BERGERON. They are not made in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. Practically not at all. Under the old tariff all articles entering into the cost of binder twine were entitled to free entry, but as cordage and binder twine can be, and are, made in the same factories, there is a possibility that the item may be abused. It has, therefore, been provided that the right to free entry of such articles at the time of importation is confined to manufacturers who manufacture binder twine alone. The manufacturers who make cordage as well as binder twine will get a drawback of the duty paid on articles entering into the cost of bindery twine, such drawback to be paid upon due proof that the articles have entered into the cost of making binder twine only.

Mr. FOSTER. A full drawback ?

Mr. FIELDING. The drawback is 95 per cent in all of these cases.

The following changes have been made as respects the duties on woollen goods :—

A new item has been created for flannels, plain not fancy, Italian linings of wool, Cobourgs, lustres and mohair and alpaca fabrics, the rates for which are fixed at : British preference, 22½ per cent ; intermediate, 30 per cent ; general, 35 per cent.

The preferential rate on such flannels was formerly 23⅓ per cent. There is no change in the general tariff rate.

Flannels, other than those specified, will be dutiable as follows :

British preference, 30 per cent ; intermediate, 35 per cent ; general, 35 per cent.

The other articles, except flannels, mentioned in this item—which are of a class not made in Canada—were rated at 30 per cent preferential, and they are now reduced to 22½ per cent. This is in the interest of tailors and manufacturers of clothing and, of course, consumers also.

Blankets, if of pure wool, will hereafter pay the following rates : British preference, 22½ per cent ; intermediate, 30 per cent ; general, 35 per cent.

Under the old tariff all blankets were 35 per cent under the general tariff and 23⅓ per cent under the preferential tariff. In future, blankets, other than pure wool, will pay 30 per cent preferential and 35 per cent general. The old rates, general 35 per cent, and preferential 30 per cent, are continued on all other fabrics of wool and on clothing.

On knitted goods, of any material, the preferential rate is reduced from 23⅓ per cent to 22½ per cent. No change is made in the general rate. The intermediate rate is 30 per cent.

The preferential rate on all carpets is increased from 23⅓ per cent to 25 per cent. No change is made in the general rate.

A very important change has been made in connection with the item of books. Under the old tariff free entry was allowed of books not printed or reprinted in Canada, which were included and used as text books in the curriculum of any university, incorporated college or normal school in Canada.

The new item is extended so as to provide that books not printed or reprinted in Canada shall be allowed free entry if they are included and used as text books in any university, college or school in Canada. This means that books that are not produced in Canada for ordinary schools, which were formerly dutiable, are made entirely free.

The general tariff rate on paper sacks or bags, printed or not, has been increased from 25 per cent to 27½ per cent. The preferential rate, which was formerly 16⅔ per cent, has been reduced to 15 per cent. It will be observed that the ratio of preference in favour of Great Britain has been substantially increased.

In the interest of boot and shoe manufacturers the duty on boot and shoe patterns manufactured of paper, which was 25 per cent under the general tariff and 23⅓ per cent under the preferential tariff, has been reduced as follows: British preference, 10 per cent; intermediate, 12½ per cent; general, 15 per cent.

Under the old tariff tubes and cones of paper, to be used in winding yarns in cotton mills, were free of duty. They are continued free, but the item is extended so as to allow free entry of such tubes and cones for woollen mills and other textile industries that may use them.

Matrix paper adapted for use in printing, which was formerly dutiable at 25 per cent, is made entirely free.

The general tariff on perfumery has been increased from 30 to 35 per cent and the British preference from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. The intermediate rate is fixed at 32½ per cent. That is an article of luxury which we thought should be charged a higher tariff.

Celluloid, xylonite or xyolite, in the rough, which were formerly free, have been made dutiable at 5 per cent under the general and intermediate tariff, and continued free when from Great Britain. That is one of the cases in which we put a duty on the foreign article and kept the article free from Great Britain.

Linseed oil, we have changed the duty from ad valorem to specific. It was explained, not merely by makers of the oil but by importers, that it is an article which varies very much in price, and it is almost impossible to do the business successfully under an ad valorem duty. The specific duty amounts probably to about the same. The general rate per hundred pounds is $1.20, the intermediate rate is $1.10, and the British preference rate 80 cents.

Gasoline or naphtha, which was dutiable at 2½ cents per gallon, is made free of duty. This will be of great benefit to fishermen and farmers who use gasoline as motive power.

On marble and granite, dressed, and manufactures thereof, the preferential tariff has been increased from 23⅓ per cent to 30 per cent. The general tariff rate is continued at 35 per cent.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the difference?

Mr. FIELDING. The difference is not so large as it was. The rates on common and colourless window glass were made very low by the change several years ago and they remain practically the same. They are continued at 7½ per cent under the preferential tariff and 15 per cent under the general tariff. The intermediate rate is fixed at 12½ per cent.

With regard to the agricultural schedule, there is sometimes a difference of opinion among farmers as to the value of these duties on farm products and animals and their products. The farmer, as a rule, is a low tariff man; but if you ask him whether he wants the duties on agricultural products abolished, he is apt to be a little careful. Some will say yes and others no. Others will say: Take the duties off agricultural products if you take them off every thing else. Well, whenever we have made changes in the schedule of agricultural duties, as a rule they are in the direction of a little increase. We do not want the farmer to say that the changes made are to the disadvantage of the things he himself produces. In fact some farmers are strong advocates of high duties although the general tendency is the other way. Therefore we have not made many changes, and any we have made are in the way of an increase to some extent.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about the articles on which there is also an excise duty? Are there any changes there?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not proposing to deal to-day with the excise law at all but I am confining myself to the custom tariff. One matter to which attention has been

drawn in connection with the excise duty is the duty on tobacco, and that has not to do so much with the increase or decrease of the duty as with the method of collection. We have been asked to consider that question but have not been able to give it our attention so far. We intend however dealing with it later in the session. It is merely a question of a readjustment of the method of collection.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. On spirits, where there is a customs duty, is there any change ?

Mr. FIELDING. None whatever. We make a change in the duties on rice, which is a substantial reduction. The old tariff rates were for cleaned rice $1.25 per hundred pounds. We have reduced that to 75 cents per hundred pounds, and the intermediate rate is 65 cents. The British preference rate, which under the old tariff was 83⅓ cents per hundred pounds, we have reduced to 50 cents, and we make the paddy or uncleaned rice free. The reduction on the cleaned rice is very material. The duty collected last year was about $170,000. The reduction on that item will be very considerable.

Mr. FOSTER. How does that affect the protection ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is about the same. We take the duty off the raw material and make a proportionate reduction on the finished article.

Another article we propose to make free is oranges, lemons and limes. That may seem an article of slight consequence, but hon. gentlemen will be surprised when I tell them that the reduction in duty I estimate at $190,000. The duty on rice will probably effect a reduction in the revenue, which I estimate at $145,000. So that these two items alone represent a reduction in duties of about $330,000.

The general changes made—a few of which I have given my hon. friend—will not I think affect the revenue much one way or another. Here a little increase ; there a little reduction. On the whole I do not think there will be a material difference in by reason of the changes in the tariff. But there are a few large items which will make a difference.

Mr. BERGERON. Any change in tobacco ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are dealing entirely with the customs to-day. We have had our attention directed, not to the question of an increase or decrease in the duty on tobacco, but to a change in the method of collection which will bring about more satisfactory results without disadvantage to the consumer. But that question we can discuss at a later day.

I have shown that in the case of the two large items of oranges and lemons and rice, we will suffer a reduction of revenue to the extent of $300,000 ot $340,000. While we do not want to increase taxation materially, we are not in such a position that we are anxious to lose revenue. The public business of the country is growing, public demands are growing and large obligations are falling due. We have to keep up our revenue. We are glad to find that the taxation in the past has not been burdensome while at the same time it has yielded a large revenue. There has been practically little outcry against it. We do not want to increase it but we do not want to decrease the revenue. Consequently if we make changes which cause considerable loss to the revenue, we must try and make up the difference in some other direction. I would call attention to the slight change proposed in the sugar duty—not in the duties on refined sugar. The change in that would affect the consumer because the refined sugar is the article which the consumer uses.

There was a time when the coarse sugar from the West Indies was used by the consumer here. But that day has passed and gone, and, in the house of the poorest man in Canada, the sugar used, as a rule, is the refined sugar. We make no change in the duty on the refined sugar. But we propose a slight change in the duty on the raw sugar, and I desire to explain briefly the reason for that change. We think that the schedule of sugar duties we adopted a few years ago was eminently fair. In 1896 the duty on refined sugar was $1.14, and on the raw, 50 cents per 100 pounds, a difference of 64 cents per hundred in favour of the refiners. We reduced the duty on refined to $1, and left the duty on the raw 50 cents, so that the difference in favour of the refiner became 50 cents. It has been our idea, all through, to give the refiner about that much advantage. Of course, he has to take into account the loss in manufacture and the cost of manufacture. Later we changed the system of sugar duties, but in a way, as we believed, not to affect the rate of taxation. We adopted the polariscopic test, fixing a certain duty for a certain degree of saccharine strength, and increasing it with every degree of added strength. In doing so, as I have said, we tried to avoid any change, in the relative duties, trying to keep the proportion between the refined and the raw sugar at about the rate we had originally fixed, and we think that we succeeded. As the rates varied from degree to degree, there may not have been mathematical accuracy in every case, but we think that the change made was rather a matter of departmental convenience than of the relative rates of duty. Then came the preferential tariff, under which one-third was taken off the raw sugar brought in from the West Indies. There has been a great

change in our importations of sugar. We no longer get our sugar from Germany, or from Java, or other countries outside the empire; our sugar comes almost wholly from the West Indies. The refiner is given the full benefit of the preference on the raw material. If he had suffered a corresponding disadvantage by way of competition in the refined sugar, of course, he would have been no better off by the change. But there are conditions attaching to the sugar refining business which practically prevent the Canadian refiner from suffering this competition. We do not say that all refined sugar made in Great Britain shall come in under the preferential tariff. What we say is that we are giving the benefit of the preference to refined sugar made from British grown raw sugar. It happens that the refiners in England have not equipped themselves to meet that condition. They draw their raw material from all sources. If the raw material comes from other than a British country, the refined sugar made from it is not entitled to the benefit of the preference on entering Canada. The consequence is that, in practice, a very small quantity of British refined sugar comes in under the preference. Therefore, the Canadian refiner gets the benefit of the reduction on the raw material, but he suffers very little from the competition of the refined sugar from Great Britain. There has been a very considerable outcry against the sugar duties. In the course of the investigation by the tariff commission, we had strong representations made to us that the refiner was receiving an enormous protection. I frankly say that I could not follow the argument to that conclusion. But I think that, under the preference, the Canadian refiner gets more advantage than we intended to give him. One point that is made is that the raw sugar manufactured in Great Britain must be taken to England from, say, the West Indies, paying freight, and then has to be brought to Canada, paying freight again. This double freight of itself, is a considerable protection. As it works out, the refiner gets the full benefit of the preference and he suffers little competition from the British refined sugar. So, as I have said, we think that the operation of the preferential tariff, is to give him, perhaps, more than we intended, and a little more than he needs. And, in consideration of this, and in deference to the feeling that the sugar duties should be reconsidered, we propose to add a little to the duty on the raw material. We make an increase of 7⅛ cents per hundred pounds on raw sugar when imported from a British country, which means 12 cents under the general tariff. We need consider only the 7⅛ cents under the British preference, because the refiner gets practically all his raw sugar from the West Indies.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The British refiner ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the refiner in Canada.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Does the British refiner get his raw material from the West Indies particularly ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I said he got his raw material from all sources. Canada is largely the market for West India sugar now. By giving the West Indies the preference in that respect, we have made this the market for their raw sugar, which, in turn, encourages our West India trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not follow the argument as to the British refiner bringing his raw sugar from the West Indies and then having to reconvey it to Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The argument advanced by those who think that the refiner has been getting too much advantage is that the British refiner had to bring his raw material from the West Indies or some other country, paying freight upon it, and then must pay freight upon the refined sugar to Canada. This was regarded as a considerable protection in itself to the Canadian refiner. The result is that, while an enormous quantity of raw sugar comes in under the preference, very little refined sugar comes in. While it is our desire to encourage the sugar refining industry, and while we wish to promote the importation of raw sugar from the West Indies, at the same time, we do not wish to give the Canadian refiner an undue advantage. And, as, under the preferential tariff, the Canadian refiner has been gaining rather more advantage than we intended to give, we make a slight change in the duty. This does not affect the consumer, because it does not touch the question of refined sugar. The increase is very slight, but, as sugar is an article of enormous consumption in Canada, we shall receive about $300,000 of additional revenue from this source, which will be almost enough to balance the losses to which I have called attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House any longer. I desired merely to give these few illustrations, because I know that though the tariff schedules will be laid upon the table it will be impossible for any hon. gentleman to apprehend at once the effect of them, and I thought it would be convenient for hon. gentlemen to have these instances explained.

I do not suppose that we shall have succeeded in pleasing everybody. I am sure that we shall find, here and there, some particular interest which will think that it has not been treated as it should have been. It is only natural for each man to think that his interest is the one of great importance. But I can say that we have

approached the question with a sincere desire to be fair to all. Here and there, where an industry seemed to have too great advantage under the tariff, we have made a decrease. Here and there, where an industry seemed not to have been fairly considered we tried to give it a better chance, keeping always in view the idea that we should have a moderate and not an excessive tariff. I hope that we have accomplished these results. As I have said we approached the question with the single desire to do that which was best in the interest of the whole country. We want the manufacturer to prosper as well as others, but we must keep always in view the interest of the great mass of the people of Canada. Our hope is that the tariff which we now propose will be an instrument for the advancement and prosperity of the whole Dominion. We are confident that it will be found a good tariff for the manufacturers, while, at the same time, it is one that we may fairly ask the consumers to accept and one under which the country will go on and prosper even more than it has prospered during the last ten years. I will place on the table the resolutions and the tariff schedules. I may add that I am having prepared an index which will connect the present tariff with the tariff as it was last revised so that any hon. gentleman may compare any item as it is revised to-day with the corresponding item in the existing tariff. The whole thing has been revised and shaken up. When an hon. gentleman looks at the present tariff and desires to compare it with the old tariff, he will have an index which will enable him to trace the item in the existing tariff. I beg to move :

1. Resolved,—That it is expedient to revise and consolidate the Acts and parts of Acts now in force respecting the duties of customs, and that for this purpose it is expedient to repeal the following Acts or parts thereof not heretofore repealed, viz.:

The Customs Tariff, 1897, being chapter sixteen of the statutes of 1897; chapter thirty-seven of the statutes of 1898, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897 ; chapter fifteen of the statutes of 1900, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897 ; chapter twenty-two of the statutes of 1901, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter thirty-three of the statutes of 1902, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter fifteen of the statutes of 1903, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter eleven of the statutes of 1904, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter eleven of the statutes of 1905, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; and chapter nine of the statutes of 1906, intituled an Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

And to provide otherwise by enacting that the following be substituted in lieu thereof :

1. That unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) The initials 'M. ft.' represent and have the meaning of the words 'one thousand feet board measure';

(b) The initials 'n.o.p.' represent and have the meaning of the words 'not otherwise provided for';

(c) The expression 'gallon' means an imperial gallon ;

(d) The expression 'ton' means two thousand pounds avoirdupois;

(e) The expressions 'proof,' 'proof spirit' or 'proof spirits,' when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, mean spirits of a strength equal to that of pure ethyl alcohol compounded with distilled water in such proportions that the resultant mixture shall at a temperature of sixty-two degrees Fahrenheit have a specific gravity of 0·9187 as compared with that of distilled water at the same temperature ;

(f) The expression 'gauge' when applied to metal sheets or plates or to wire, means the thickness as determined by the imperial standard gauge ;

(g) The expression 'in diameter,' when applied to tubing, means the actual inside diameter;

(h) The expression 'sheet,' when applied to metals, means a sheet or plate not exceeding three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness ;

(i) The expression 'plate,' when applied to metals, means a plate or sheet more than three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness ;

(j) The initials 'p.c.' in any one of the tariff columns in schedule A to these resolutions represent and have the meaning of the words 'per centum, ad valorem';

(k) The word 'free' in any one of the tariff columns in said schedule A means that the goods opposite which the word appears, and to which the tariff in said column applies, may be imported and taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada, without duty ;

(l) The expression 'iron' includes 'steel';

(m) The expression 'rolled iron' or 'rolled steel' means iron or steel hot rolled only.

2. That the expressions mentioned in section 2 of the Customs Act, as amended by section two of the Customs Amendment Act, 1888, whenever they occur herein or in any Act relating to the customs, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning assigned to them respectively by the said section two ; and any power conferred upon the Governor in Council by the Customs Act to transfer dutiable goods to the list of goods which may be imported free of duty or to reduce the rates of duty on dutiable goods is not hereby abrogated or impaired.

3. That subject to the provisions of these resolutions and of the Customs Act, there shall be levied, collected and paid upon all goods enumerated, or referred to as not enumerated in schedule A to these resolutions, the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set forth and described in the said schedule and set opposite to each item respectively or charged thereon as not enumerated, in the column of the tariff applicable to the goods, when such goods are imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, under the following conditions, viz.:—

(1) That the rates of customs duties, if any, set forth in column 1 'British Preferential Tariff' shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of the following British countries when imported direct from any British country—

(a) The United Kingdom ;

(b) The British colony of Bermuda ;

(c) The British colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the following :—

The Bahamas ;

Jamaica ;
Turks and Caicos Islands ;
The Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands);
The Windward Islands (Gretna, St. Vincent and St. Lucia);
Barbados ;
Trinidad and Tobago ;
(d) British Guiana ;
(e) British India ;
(f) Ceylon ;
(g) Straits Settlements ;
(h) New Zealand ;
(i) Cape of Good Hope ;
(j) Natal ;
(k) Orange River ;
(l) Transvaal ;
(m) Southern Rhodesia ;
(n) Any other British colony or possession admitted to the benefit of the British Preferential Tariff in Canada, in the manner hereinafter provided.

(2) That the rates of custom duties, if any, set forth in column 2 'Intermediate Tariff' shall apply :—

(a) To goods the produce or manufacture of any British or foreign country to which the benefits of such intermediate tariff shall have been extended in the manner hereinafter provided, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country.

(3) That the rates of customs duties, if any, set forth in column 3 'General Tariff' shall apply to all goods not entitled to admission under the Intermediate Tariff or under the British Preferential Tariff aforesaid.

(4) That proof of origin, as prescribed by the Minister of Customs, shall be furnished with the bill of entry at the custom house for goods admitted to entry under any of the tariffs in schedule A ; and that the decision of the Minister of Customs shall be final as to the tariff or surtax applicable in any case to imported goods by reason of their origin :

Provided, that goods for which entry is claimed under the intermediate tariff shall be bona fide the produce or manufacture of a country which has been admitted to the benefits of such intermediate tariff;

Provided further that every manufactured article to be admitted under the British preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufacture of a British country entitled to the benefits of such British preferential tariff, and that a substantial portion of the value of the manufactured article has been produced by labour in one or more of such countries.

(5) That the Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of the several tariffs herein mentioned.

4. That the Governor in Council may by order in council—

(a) extend the benefit of the British preferential tariff to any British country not named in subsection 1 of section 3 of the foregoing resolutions, and from and after the publication of such order in council in the 'Canada Gazette' the British preferential tariff shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions ;

(b) withdraw the benefit of the British preferential tariff from any British country (other than the United Kingdom) which has received the same, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the General Tariff or the Intermediate Tariff, as mentioned in the said order, shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions ;

(c) from time to time, in consideration of benefits satisfactory to the Governor in Council, extend the benefit of the Intermediate Tariff, in whole or in part, to any British or foreign country the produce or manufactures of which have previously been subject to the rates of customs duties set forth in the general tariff, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the rates of duty set forth in the Intermediate Tariff, so far as they are mentioned in the said order, shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British or foreign country, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country—subject to the provision of these resolutions ; and

(d) withdraw the benefit of the Intermediate Tariff from any country to which it has been extended, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the rates of customs duties set forth in the general tariff shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions.

5. That in the case of articles exported to Canada of a class or kind made in Canada, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Canada be less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Canada at the time of its exportation to Canada, there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected and paid on such article, on its importation into Canada, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption :

Provided, that the said special duty shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem in any case ;

Provided also, that the following goods shall be exempt from such special duty, viz.:—

(a) Goods whereon the duties otherwise established are equal to fifty per cent ad valorem ;

(b) Goods of a class subject to excise duty in Canada ;

(c) Sugar refined in the United Kingdom;

Provided further that excise duties shall be disregarded in estimating the market value of goods for the purposes of special duty when the goods are entitled to entry under the British Preferential Tariff.

(2) That the expression 'export price' or 'selling price' in this section shall be held to mean and include the exporter's price for the goods, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment from the place whence exported directly to Canada.

(3) That if at any time it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, on a report from the Minister of Customs, that the payment of the special duty by this section provided for is being evaded by the shipment of goods on consignment without sale prior to such shipment, the Governor in Council may in any case or class of cases authorize such action as is deemed necessary to collect on such goods or any of them the same special duty as if the goods had been sold to an importer in Canada prior to their shipment to Canada.

(4) That if the full amount of any special duty of customs is not paid on goods imported, the customs entry thereof shall be amended and

the deficiency paid upon the demand of the collector of customs.

(5) That the Minister of Customs may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this section and for the enforcement thereof.

(6) That such regulations may provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that such articles are not made or sold in Canada in substantial quantities and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

(7) That such regulations may also provide for the exemption from special duty of any article when the difference between the fair market value and the selling price thereof to the importer as aforesaid amounts only to a small percentage of its fair market value.

6. That articles which are the produce or manufacture of any foreign country which treats imports from Canada less favourably than those from other countries may be subject to a surtax over and above the duties specified in the said schedule A, such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty specified in the general tariff in the said schedule A :

That any question arising as to any foreign country or goods coming under the operations of the provisions in regard to the surtax shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final :

Provided, that the Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purposes of this resolution in regard to such surtax, and may, by order in council, from time to time suspend the surtax from application to the goods of any country.

7. That notwithstanding anything in these resolutions, fish and other products of the fisheries of Newfoundland may be imported into Canada free of customs duty until otherwise determined by the Governor in Council, by order published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

8. That fish caught by fishermen in Canadian fishing vessels and the products thereof carried from the fisheries in such vessels, shall be admitted into Canada free of duty under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

9. That on the materials set forth in schedule B to these resolutions, there may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the several rates of drawback of customs duties set opposite to each item respectively in such schedule, when used for consumption in Canada for the purpose specified in the schedule, under regulations by the Governor in Council.

10. That the importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in schedule C hereto is prohibited; and that any such goods imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and shall be destroyed or otherwise dealt with as the Minister of Customs directs ; and that any person importing any such prohibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

11. That whenever from or as a result of proceedings in any court of justice, it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement of any kind among manufacturers of such articles or dealers therein to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

(2) That whenever the Governor in Council deems it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among manufacturers or dealers in any article of commerce to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in such article at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court, or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such conspiracy, combinataion, agreement or arrangement exists.

(3) That the judge may compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them under oath and require the production of books and papers, and shall have such other necessary powers as are conferred upon him by the Governor in Council for the purpose of such inquiry.

(4) That if the judge reports that such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists in respect of such article, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

2. Resolved,—That it is expedient to repeal all orders in council placing articles on the free list or reducing rates of duties, and all other orders in council and departmental regulations inconsistent with any of the provisions of these resolutions.

3. Resolved,—That it is expedient to provide that nothing contained in the foregoing provisions shall affect the French Treaty Act, 1894, or chapter three of fifty-eight-fifty-nine Victoria, being 'An Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.

4. Resolved —That it is expedient to provide that the provisions of the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 30th day of November, 1906.

SCHEDULE 'A.'

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS.

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 1.			
	Animals, Agricultural Products, Fish and Provisions.			
1	Horses, cattle, sheep, goats, asses, swine and dogs, for the improvement of stock, under regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council.	Free.	Free.	Free.
2	Domestic fowls, pure-bred, for the improvement of stock, homing or messenger pigeons and pheasants and quails.	Free.	Free.	Free.
3	Bees	Free.	Free.	Free.
4	Horses over one year old, valued at $50 or less per head each.	$10	$12.50	$12.50
5	Animals, living, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
6	Live hogs, per pound.	1 cent.	1¼ cents.	1⅓ cents.
7	Meats, fresh, n.o.p. "	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
8	Canned meats, canned poultry and game; extracts of meats and fluid beef not medicated, and soups of all kinds.	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
9	Poultry and game, n.o.p.	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
10	Meats, n.o.p. per pound. Provided that the weight of a barrel of pork for duty purposes shall not be less than two hundred pounds.	1½ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.
11	Rennet, raw and prepared.	Free.	Free.	Free.
12	Sausage skins or casings, not cleaned.	Free.	Free.	Free.
13	Lard, lard compound and similar substances; cottolene and animal stearine of all kinds, n.o.p. per pound.	1½ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.
14	Tallow	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
15	Beeswax	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
16	Eggs, per dozen.	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
17	Cheese, per pound.	2 cents.	3 cents.	3 cents.
18	Butter. "	3 cents.	4 cents.	4 cents.
19	Cocoa shells and nibs	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
20	Cocoa paste or 'liquor' and chocolate paste or 'liquor,' not sweetened, in blocks or cakes, and cocoa butter. per pound.	2½ cents.	3 cents.	3 cents.
21	Cocoa paste or 'liquor' and chocolate paste or 'liquor,' sweetened, in blocks or cakes not less than two pounds in weight. per pound.	2¾ cents.	3½ cents.	3½ cents.
22	Preparations of cocoa or chocolate, in powder form	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
23	Preparations of cocoa or chocolate, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
24	Chicory, raw or green, per pound	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
25	Chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground; extract of coffee, n.o.p., or substitutes therefor of all kinds, per pound	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
26	Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof and substitutes therefor, including acorn nuts, n.o.p., per pound.	1½ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.
27	Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, per pound. and	1½ cents. 10 p.c.	1¾ cents. 10 p.c.	2 cents. 10 p.c.
28	Tea and green coffee imported direct from the country of growth and production, and tea and green coffee purchased in bond in the United Kingdom.	Free.	Free.	Free.
29	Tea and green coffee, n.o.p.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
30	Ginger and spices, unground, n.o.p.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	12½ p.c.
31	Ginger and spices, ground, n.o.p. per pound and	3 cents. 7½ p.c.	3 cents. 10 p.c.	3 cents. 10 p.c.
32	Nutmegs and mace, whole or unground	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
33	Nutmegs and mace, ground	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
34	Mustard, ground	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
35	Hops, per pound.	4 cents.	6 cents.	7 cents.
36	Compressed yeast, in bulk or mass of not less than fifty pounds, per pound.	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
37	Compressed yeast, in packages weighing less than fifty pounds, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty. per pound.	4 cents.	5 cents.	6 cents.
38	Yeast cakes, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, per pound.	4 cents.	5 cents.	6 cents.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 1—*Continued.*			
39	Starch, including corn starch, potato starch, potato flour, rice flour, sago flour, tapioca flour and all preparations having the qualities of starch, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per pound.	1 cent.	1½ cents.	1½ cents.
40	Salt for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
41	Salt. n.o.p., in bags, barrels and other coverings .....per one hundred pounds.	Free.	6½ cents.	7½ cents.
	Bags, barrels and other coverings, used in the importation of the salt specified in this item.....	Free.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
42	Salt, in bulk, n.o.p. .....per one hundred pounds.	Free.	4 cents.	5 cents.
43	Condensed milk, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty. .....per pound	2 cents.	3 cents	3½ cents.
44	Condensed coffee with milk.....	20 p.c.	27½ p. c.	30 p. c.
45	Milk foods, n.o.p., prepared cereal foods, in packages not exceeding twenty-five pounds weight each.....	17½ p.c.	22½ p. c.	25 p. c.
46	Prepared cereal foods, n.o.p.....	15 p.c.	17½ p. c.	20 p. c.
47	Beans, n.o.p.....per bushel	15 cents.	22½ cents.	25 cents.
48	Pease, n.o.p.....per bushel	10 cents.	12½ cents.	15 cents.
49	Buckwheat, ...per bushel	10 cents.	12½ cents.	15 cents.
50	Buckwheat meal or flour..... per one hundred pounds	35 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
51	Pot, pearl, rolled roasted or ground barley.....	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
52	Barley, n.o.p..... per bushel	10 cents.	12½ cents.	15 cents.
53	Cornmeal.....per barrel	20 cents.	22½ cents.	25 cents.
54	Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council per bushel	7½ cents.	7½ cents.	7½ cents.
55	Indian corn, not for purposes of distillation and under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
56	Oats.....per bushel	7 cents.	9 cents.	10 cents.
57	Oatmeal and rolled oats..... per one hundred pounds	40 cents.	50 cents.	60 cents.
58	Rye .....per bushel	7 cents.	9 cents.	10 cents.
59	Rye flour.....per barrel	33 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents
60	Wheat.....per bushel	8 cents.	10 cents.	12 cents.
61	Wheat flour .....per barrel	40 cents.	50 cents.	60 cents.
62	Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
63	Rice, cleaned.....per one hundred pounds	50 cents.	65 cents.	75 cents.
64	Sago and tapioca	17½ p. c.	25 p. c.	27½ p. c.
65	Biscuits, not sweetened.....	15 p.c.	22½ p. c.	25 p. c.
66	Biscuits, sweetened.....	17½ p.c.	25 p. c.	27½ p. c.
67	Macaroni and vermicelli.....per one hundred pounds	75 cents.	$1	$1.25
68	Linseed oil cake and linseed oil cake meal, cotton seed cake and cotton seed cake meal, and palm nut cake and palm nut cake meal.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
69	Hay and straw..... per ton	$1.65	$1.75	$2
70	Flax seed.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
71	Seeds of timothy and clover.....	5 p.c.	10 p. c.	10 p. c.
72	Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing over one pound each. ...	5 p.c.	10 p. c.	10 p. c.
73	Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing one pound each or less.....	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p. c.
74	Seeds, viz. :—annato, beet, carrot, turnip, mangold, mustard, sowing rape seed and mushroom spawn.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
75	Aromatic seeds which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by grinding or refining or by any other process of manufacture, viz.:—anise, anise star, caraway, cardamom, coriander, cumin, fennel and fenugreek.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
76	Seed pease and seed beans, from the United Kingdom.....	Free.		
77	Beans, viz. :—Tonquin and vanilla, crude only; locust beans; cocoa beans, not roasted, crushed or ground; locust bean meal.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
78	Florist stock, viz. :—palms, ferns, rubber plants (Ficus), gladiolus, cannas, dahlias and paeonias.....	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 1—*Continued.*			
79	Florist stock, viz. :—azaleas, rhododendrons, pot grown lilacs, araucarias, bulbs, corms, tubers, rhizomes and dormant roots, n.o.p. ; seedling stock for grafting, viz.: —plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees	Free.	Free.	Free.
80	Trees, n.o.p., and teasels	Free.	Free.	Free.
81	Trees, viz. :—Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds ..... each	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
82	Grape vines ; gooseberry, raspberry, currant and rose bushes ; fruit plants, n.o.p. ; trees, plants and shrubs, commonly known as nursery stock, n.o.p	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
83	Potatoes, n.o.p. ..... per bushel	10 cents.	12½ cents.	15 cents
84	Sweet potatoes and yams ..... per bushel	7 cents.	9 cents.	10 cents.
85	Tomatoes, fresh ..... per one hundred pounds.	50 cents.	65 cents.	75 cents.
86	Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, n.o.p., the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty ..... per pound	1 cent.	1¼ cent.	1½ cent.
87	Vegetables, n.o.p.	15 p-c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
88	Pickles, sauces and catsups, including soy	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
89	Olives in brine	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
90	Fruits, viz. :—Bananas, plantains, pine-apples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes, wild blueberries, wild strawberries and wild raspberries	Free.	Free.	Free.
91	Citron, lemon and orange rinds in brine	Free.	Free.	Free.
92	Apples ..... per barrel	25 cents.	35 cents.	40 cents.
93	Apples, dried, desiccated or evaporated, and other dried, desiccated or evaporated fruits, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
94	Dates and figs ..... per hundred pounds	50 cents.	70 cents.	80 cents.
95	Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty ..... per pound	1½ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.
96	Cranberries and fruits, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
97	Pears, quinces, apricots and nectarines, n.o.p. ..... per one hundred pounds	35 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
97a	Plums ..... per bushel	20 cents.	20 cents.	30 cents.
98	Melons ..... each	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
99	Prunes and dried plums, unpitted ; raisins and dried currants ..... per pound	½ cent.	⅝ cent.	1 cent.
100	Grapes ..... per pound	1½ cents.	1⅞ cents.	2 cents.
101	Oranges, shaddocks or grape fruit, lemons and limes	Free.	Free.	Free.
102	Peaches, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty ..... per one hundred pounds	67 cents.	90 cents.	$1.
103	Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, and containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirit in the liquid contents thereof	50 p.c.	50 p.c.	50 p.c.
104	Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, and containing more than forty per cent of proof spirit in the liquid contents thereof ..... per gallon and	$2.40 30 p.c.	$2.40 30 p.c.	$2.40 30 p.c.
105	Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty ..... per pound	1½ cents.	2 cents.	2¼ cents.
106	Jellies, jams, preserves, n.o.p., and condensed mince meats per pound	2¼ cents.	3 cents.	3½ cents.
107	Preserved ginger	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
108	Honey, in the comb or otherwise, and imitations thereof ... per pound	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
109	Almonds, walnuts, Brazil nuts, pecans and shelled peanuts, n.o.p. ..... per pound	1¾ cents.	2 cents.	3 cents.
110	Cocoanuts, n.o.p. ..... per one hundred pounds	65 cents.	90 cents.	$1.
111	Coccanuts, when imported from the place of growth, by ship, direct to a Canadian port..per one hundred pounds	30 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
112	Nuts of all kinds, n.o.p. ..... per pound	1¾ cents.	2 cents.	3 cents.
113	Cocoanut, desiccated, sweetened or not ..... per pound.	3 cents.	4 cents.	5 cents.
114	Nuts, shelled, n.o.p. ..... "	3 cents.	3½ cents.	4 cents.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 1—*Continued.*			
115	Mackerel.....per pound.	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.
116	Herrings, pickled or salted.....per one hundred pounds.	35 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
117	Salmon, fresh, pickled or salted.....per pound.	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.
118	All other fish, fresh, pickled or salted..... "	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.
119	Fish, smoked or boneless..... "	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.
120	Anchovies, sardines, sprats, and other fish packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes, the weight of the tin box to be included in the weight for duty:—			
	(a) When weighing over twenty ounces and not over thirty-six ounces each.....per box.	3½ cents.	5 cents.	6 cents.
	(b) When weighing over twelve ounces and not over twenty ounces each.....per box.	2½ cents.	4 cents.	4½ cents.
	(c) When weighing over eight ounces and not over twelve ounces each.....per box.	2 cents.	3 cents.	3½ cents.
	(d) When weighing eight ounces each or less..... "	1¼ cents.	2 cents.	2½ cents.
121	Fish preserved in oil, n.o.p.....	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
122	Dried fish.....per pound.	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.
123	Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, including oysters, n.o.p.....	17½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
124	Oysters, shelled, in bulk.....per gallon.	7 cents.	9 cents.	10 cents.
125	Oysters, shelled, in cans not over one pint, including the duty on the cans.....per can.	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
126	Oysters, shelled, in cans over one pint and not over one quart, including the duty on the cans.....per can.	3 cents.	4½ cents.	5 cents.
127	Oysters, shelled, in cans exceeding one quart in capacity, including the duty on the cans.....per quart. Provided that a fraction over a quart shall be computed as a quart for duty purposes under this item.	3 cents.	4½ cents.	5 cents.
128	Oysters in the shell.....	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
129	Oysters, seed and breeding, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
130	Turtles.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
131	Leeches.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
132	Live fish and fish eggs, for propagating purposes.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
133	All other articles the produce of the fisheries, n.o.p.....	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	25 p.c.
	GROUP 2. *Sugar, Molasses and manufactures thereof.*			
134	All sugar above number sixteen, Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, testing not more than eighty-eight degrees by the polariscope.....per one hundred pounds.	72 cents.	98 cents.	$1.08
	And for each additional degree over eighty-eight degrees...per one hundred pounds.	1 cent.	1⅓ cents.	1½ cents.
	Provided that fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less shall not be subject to duty, and that fractions of more than five-tenths shall be dutiable as a degree.			
	Provided that refined sugar shall be entitled to entry under the British Preferential Tariff upon evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies and possessions, and not otherwise.			
135	Sugar, n.o.p., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms, sugar concrete, and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not more than seventy-five degrees by the polariscope...per one hundred pounds.	34 cents.	45 cents.	52 cents.
	And for each additional degree over seventy-five degrees...per one hundred pounds.	1 cent.	1⅓ cents.	1½ cents.
	Provided that fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less shall not be subject to duty, and that fractions of more than five-tenths shall be dutiable as a degree.			

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 2—*Continued.*			
	Provided that all raw sugar, including sugar specified in this item, the produce of any British colony or possession, shall be entitled to entry under the British Preferential Tariff, when imported direct into Canada from any British colony or possession.			
136	Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the cane without any admixture with any other ingredient, when imported direct from the place of production or its shipping port, in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing, testing by the polariscope not less than thirty degrees nor more than fifty-six degrees, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.....per gallon.	.....	2½ cents.	3 cents.
137	Molasses, testing not more than fifty-six degrees by the polariscope, the produce of any British country entitled to the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff when produced from sugar-cane and imported direct by ship from the country of production, or from any British country, in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production, and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing.	Free.		
	Provided, however, that the said molasses may be transferred in bond under excise regulations for purposes of distillation.			
138	Maple sugar and maple syrup.....	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
139	Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing an admixture thereof.....per hundred pounds.	35 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
140	Syrups and molasses of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane or beet, n.o.p., and all imitations thereof or substitutes therefor .....per one hundred pounds.	35 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
141	Sugar candy and confectionery of all kinds, including sweetened gums, candied peel, candied pop-corn, candied fruits, candied nuts, flavouring powders, custard powders, jelly powders, sweetmeats, sweetened breads, cakes, pies, puddings and all other confections containing sugar.....	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
	GROUP 3.			
	Tobacco, and manufactures thereof.			
142	Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes under conditions of the Inland Revenue Act.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
143	Cigars and cigarettes, the weight of cigars to include bands and ribbons, and the weight of cigarettes to include the paper covering.....per pound	$3.00	$3.00	$3.00
	and.....	25 p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
144	Cut tobacco.....per pound.	55 cents.	55 cents.	55 cents.
145	Manufactured tobacco, n.o.p., and snuff.....per pound.	50 cents.	50 cents.	50 cents.
	GROUP 4.			
	Spirits, Wines and other Beverages.			
146	Ale, beer, porter and stout, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottle.....per gallon.	16 cents.	16 cents.	16 cents.
147	Ale, beer, porter and stout, when imported in bottles...per gallon.	24 cents.	24 cents.	24 cents.
	Provided that six quart bottles or twelve pint bottles, shall be held to contain one gallon.			
148	Cider, not clarified or refined.....per gallon.	5 cents.	5 cents.	5 cents.
149	Cider, clarified or refined.....per gallon.	10 cents.	10 cents.	10 cents.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Perferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 4—*Continued.*			
150	Lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits..... per gallon.	60 cents.	60 cents.	60 cents.
151	Lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits..... per gallon.	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	and..	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
152	Lime juice and other fruit syrups and fruit juices, n.o.p....	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
153	Lime juice, crude only.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
154	Mineral waters, natural, not in bottle, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
155	Ice..	Free.	Free.	Free.
156	Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine, n.o.p.; gin of all kinds, n.o.p.; rum, whisky and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p.; amyl alcohol or fusel oil, or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy, n.o.p.; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.o.p.; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, shiedam and other schnapps; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages; and wines, n.o.p., containing more than forty per cent of proof spirit.....per gallon of the strength of proof..	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	Provided, as to all the goods specified in this item when of less strength then the strength of proof, that no reduction or allowance shall be made in the measurement thereof for duty purposes, below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof.			
	Provided also, that when the goods specified in this item are of greater strength than the strength of proof, the measurement thereof and the amount of duty payable thereon shall be increased in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof.			
	Provided further, that bottles and flasks and packages of gin, rum, whisky and brandy of all kinds, and imitations thereof, shall be held to contain the following quantities (subject to the provisions for addition or deduction in respect of the degree of strength); viz,			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing not more than three-fourths of a gallon per dozen, as three-fourths of a gallon per dozen;			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than three-fourths of a gallon but not more than one gallon per dozen, as one gallon per dozen;			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than one gallon but not more than one and one-half gallon per dozen, as one and one-half gallon per dozen;			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than one and one-half gallon but not more than two gallons per dozen, as two gallons per dozen;			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than two gallons but not more than two and four-fifths gallons per dozen, as two and four-fifths gallons per dozen;			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than two and four-fifths gallons but not more than three gallons per dozen, as three gallons per dozen.			
	Bottles, flasks and packages, containing more than three gallons but not more than three and one-fifth gallons per dozen, as three and one-fifth gallons per dozen.			
	Provided further, that bottles or phials of liquors for special purposes, such as samples not for sale to the trade, may be entered for duty according to actual measurement, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.			

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 4—*Continued.*			
157	Ethyl alcohol, when imported by the Department of Inland Revenue or by a person licensed by the Minister of Inland Revenue, to be denatured for use in the arts and industries, and for fuel, light and power, to be entered at ports prescribed by regulation of the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue, subject to the Inland Revenue Act and to the regulations of the Department of Inland Revenue	Free.	Free.	Free.
158	Methyl alcohol, when imported by the Department of Inland Revenue or by a person licensed by the Minister of Inland Revenue, to be used in denaturing alcohol for use in the arts and industries, and for fuel, light and power, to be entered at ports prescribed by regulation of the Ministers of Customs and Inland Revenue, subject to the Inland Revenue Act and to the regulations of the Department of Inland Revenue..per proof gallon	20 cents.	20 cents.	20 cents.
	Provided that the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, reduce or abolish the duty specified in this item.			
159	Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, or ethereal and spirituous fruit essences, n.o.p.....per gallon.	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	and....	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
160	Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind:—			
	(*a*) When in bottles or flasks containing not more than four ounces each	50 p.c.	50 p.c.	50 p.c.
	(*b*) When in bottles, flasks or other packages, containing more than four ounces each.....per gallon.	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	and....	40 p.c.	40 p.c.	40 p.c.
161	Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia.....per gallon.	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	and....	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
162	Medicinal or medicated wines, including vermouth and ginger wine, containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirits	50 p.c.	50 p.c.	50 p.c.
163	Wines of all kinds, n.o.p., including orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant wines, containing twenty-six per cent or less of proof spirit, whether imported in wood or in bottles.....per gallon.	25 cents.	25 cents.	25 cents.
	and ...	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
	And in addition thereto, for each degree of strength in excess of twenty-six per cent of proof spirit until the strength reaches forty per cent of proof spirit.....	3 cents.	3 cents.	3 cents.
	Provided that six quart bottles, or twelve pint bottles, shall be held to contain a gallon for duty purposes under this item.			
164	Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirit, whether imported in wood or in bottles (six quart bottles or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain a gallon) when the produce or manufacture of any British Colony or territory in the South African Customs Union Convention per gallon.	25 cents.	25 cents.	25 cents.
165	Champagne and all other sparkling wines—			
	(*a*) in bottles containing each not more than a quart but more than a pint (old wine measure).....per dozen bottles.	$3.30	$3.30	$3.30
	and...	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
	(*b*) In bottles containing not more than a pint each, but more than one-half pint (old wine measure)...per dozen bottles.	$1.65	$1.65	$1.65
	and....	30 p.c.	30 p.c	30 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 4—*Continued.*			
	(*c*) In bottles containing one-half pint each or less.....per dozen bottles	82 cents.	82 cents.	82 cents.
	..and	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
	(*d*) In bottles containing over one quart each (old wine measure).....per gallon	$1.50	$1.50	$1.50
	and	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
166	Acetone and amyl acetate.....	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
167	Malt and malt flour, upon entry for warehouse subject to excise regulations.....per one hundred pounds	40 cents.	40 cents.	40 cents.
168	Extract of malt, fluid or not.....per pound	4 cents.	4 cents.	4 cents.
	GROUP 5.			
	Pulp, Paper and Books.			
169	Books, viz.:—Novels or works of fiction, or literature of a similar character, unbound or paper bound or in sheets, but not to include Christmas Annuals, or publications commonly known as juvenile and toy books.....	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
170	Freight rates for railways, and telegraph rates, bound in book or pamphlet form.....	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
171	Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, or parts thereof, n.o.p.,—not to include blank account books, copy books, or books to be written or drawn upon.....	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
172	Books, viz.:—Books on the application of science to industries of all kinds, including books on agriculture, horticulture, forestry, fish and fishing, mining, metallurgy, architecture, electric and other engineering, carpentry, ship-building, mechanism, dyeing, bleaching, tanning weaving and other mechanic arts, and similar industrial books; also including books printed in any language other than the English and French languages, or in any two languages not being English or French, or in any three or more languages; and bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, religious tracts, and Sunday school lesson pictures.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
173	Books, embossed, and grooved cards for the blind; and books for the instruction of the deaf and dumb and blind; maps and charts for the use of schools for the blind.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
174	Books printed by any government or by any association for the promotion of science or letters, and official annual reports of religious or benevolent associations, and issued in the course of proceedings of the said associations, to their members, and not for the purpose of sale or trade.	Free.	Free.	Free.
175	Books not printed or reprinted in Canada, which are included and used as text books in the curriculum of any university, college or school in Canada; books specially imported for the *bona fide* use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, libraries of universities, colleges and schools, or for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific or art association or society, and being the property of the organized authorities of such library, and not in any case the property of individuals,—the whole under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs,—provided that importers of books who have sold the same for the purpose mentioned in this item shall, upon proof of sale and delivery for such purpose, be entitled to a refund of any duty paid thereon.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
176	Books, bound or unbound, which have been printed and manufactured more than twelve years.....	Free.	Free.	Free.
177	Admiralty charts, manuscripts and insurance maps, and album insides of paper; pictorial illustrations of insects or similar studies, when imported for the use of colleges, schools and scientific and literary societies..	Free.	Free.	Free.

Mr. FIELDING.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 5—*Continued.*			
178	Advertising and printed matter, viz.:—Advertising pamphlets, advertising show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals; price books, catalogues and price lists; advertising almanacs and calendars; patent medicine or other advertising circulars, fly sheets or pamphlets; advertising chromos, chromotypes, oleographs or like work produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, and having any advertisement or adve tising matter printed, lithographed or stamped thereon, or attached thereto, including advertising bills, folders and posters, or other similar artistic work, lithographed, printed or stamped on paper or cardboard for business or advertisement purposes, n.o.p. per pound	10 cents.	15 cents.	15 cents.
179	Labels for cigar boxes, fruits, vegetables, meats, fish, confectionery or other goods or wares; shipping, price or other tags, tickets or labels, and railroad or other tickets, whether lithographed or printed, or partly printed, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
180	Photographs, chromos, chomotypes, artotypes, oleographs, paintings, drawings, pictures, decalcomania transfers of all kinds, engravings or prints or proofs therefrom, and similar works of art, n.o.p.; blue prints, building plans, maps and charts, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
181	Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts and all similar work, unsigned, and cards or other commercial blank forms printed or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
182	Printed music, bound or in sheets	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
183	Newspapers, or supplemental, editions or parts thereof, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
184	Newspapers, and quarterly, monthly and semi-monthly magazines, and weekly literary papers, unbound; and tailors', milliners', and mantle-makers' fashion plates	Free.	Free.	Free.
185	Adhesive felt adapted for sheeting vessels	Free.	Free.	Free.
186	Hemp paper, made on four cylinder machines and calendered to between ·006 and ·008-inch thickness adapted for the manufacture of shot shells; primers adapted for the manufacture of shot shells and cartridges; and felt board sized and hydraulic pressed, and covered with paper or uncovered, adapted for the manufacture of gun wads	Free.	Free.	Free.
187	Albumenized and other papers and films chemically prepared for photographers' use	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	30 p.c.
188	Plain basic photographic paper, baryta coated, adapted for use exclusively in manufacturing albumenized or sensitized photographic paper	Free.	Free.	Free.
189	Tubes and cones of all sizes, made of paper, adapted for winding yarns thereon	Free.	Free.	Free.
190	Union collar cloth paper, in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
191	Union collar cloth paper, in rolls or sheets, glossed or finished	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
192	Strawboard, millboard and cardboard; tarred paper, felt board, sandpaper, glass or flint paper and emery paper, or emery cloth	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
193	Paper sacks or bags of all kinds, printed or not	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
194	Playing cards per pack	5 cents.	7 cents.	8 cents.
195	Paper hanging or wall papers, borders or bordering, and window blinds of paper of all kinds	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
196	News printing paper and all printing paper, in sheets and rolls, valued at not more than two and one-quarter cents per pound	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
197	Paper of all kinds, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 5—*Continued.*			
198	Ruled and border and coated papers, boxed papers, pads not printed, papier-mache ware, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
199	Papeteries, envelopes, and all manufactures of paper, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
200	Pulp of wood or of straw	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
201	Matrix paper adapted for use in printing	Free.	Free.	Free.
202	Boot and shoe patterns manufactured of paper	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
	GROUP 6.			
	Chemicals, Drugs, Oils and Paints.			
203	Non-edible seeds, beans, nuts, berries, plants, weeds, barks, and woods, in a crude state or chipped or ground, and extracts and preparations thereof, and chemical compounds adapted for dyeing or tanning; turmeric, nutgalls and extracts thereof; indigo, indigo paste and extracts of; aniline and coal tar dyes, soluble in water, in bulk or packages of not less than one pound weight; aniline oil, crude, alizarin and artificial alizarin; annato, liquid or solid; iron liquor, being solution of acetate or nitrate of iron adapted for dyeing and calico printing; red liquor, being a crude acetate of aluminum prepared from pyroligneous acid and adapted for dyeing and calico printing	Free.	Free.	Free.
204	Drugs, such as barks, flowers, roots, beans, berries, balsams, bulbs, fruits, insects, grains, gums and gum resins, herbs, leaves, nuts, fruit and stem seeds—which are not edible and which are in a crude state and not advanced in value by refining or grinding, or any other process of manufacture, n.o.p.	Free.	Free.	Free.
205	Roots, medicinal, viz.:—alkanet, crude, crushed or ground; aconite, calumba, folia digitalis, gentian, ginseng, jalap, ipecacuanha, iris, orris root, liquorice, sarsaparilla, squills, taraxacum, rhubarb and valerian, unground	Free.	Free.	Free.
206	Dragon's blood; fuller's earth, in bulk only, not prepared for toilet or other purposes; litmus and all lichens, prepared or not prepared; musk, in pods or in grain; vaccine and ivory vaccine points; quassia juice, bacteriological products or serum for subcutaneous injection; saffron, saffron cake, safflower, and extracts of; quinine, salts of; cochineal; ferment cultures to be used in butter making	Free.	Free.	Free.
207	Blood albumen, egg albumen and egg yolk	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
208	Boracic acid and borax in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight; hydro-fluo-silicic acid; oxalic acid; tannic acid; ammonia, sulphate of; sal ammoniac, and nitrate of ammonia; cyanide of potassium, cyanide of sodium and cyanogen bromide, for reducing metals in mining operations; antimony salts, viz.:—tartar emetic, chlorine and lactate (antimonine); arsenous oxide; oxide of cobalt; oxide of tin; bichloride of tin; tin crystals; oxide of copper; precipitate of copper, crude; sulphate of copper (blue vitriol); verdigris or subacetate of copper, dry; sulphate of iron (copperas) sulphate of zinc; chloride of zinc; sulphur and brimstone, crude or in roll or flour; cream of tartar, in crystals or argols; tartaric acid crystals; chloride of lime and hypochlorite of lime, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds in weight; iodine, crude; bromine, phosphorous	Free.	Free.	Free.
209	Potash, chlorate of, not further prepared than ground; potash, muriate, sulphate and bichromate of, crude; saltpetre or nitrate of potash; red and yellow prussiate of potash	Free.	Free.	Free.
209*a*	Pot ash, pearl ash and caustic potash:—			
	1. When in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight each	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 6—*Continued.*			
	2. When in packages of less than twenty-five pounds weight each	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
210	Peroxide of soda; soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake; barilla soda ash; silicate of soda in crystals or in solution; bichromate of soda; nitrate of soda or cubic nitre; sal soda; sulphide of sodium; nitrite of soda; arseniate, binarseniate, chlorate, bisulphite and stannate of soda; prussiate of soda and sulphite of soda	Free.	Free.	Free
210*a*	Caustic soda:—			
	1. When in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight each	Free.	Free.	Free.
	2. When in packages of less than twenty five pounds weight each	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
211	Alumina and chloride of aluminum, or chloralum	Free.	Free.	Free.
212	Sulphate of alumina or alum cake; and alum in bulk, ground or unground but not calcined	Free.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
213	Acid, acetic and pyroligneous, n.o.p., and vinegar:—per gallon of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof	10 cents.	12½ cents.	15 cents.
	—and in addition thereto, for each degree of strength in excess of the strength of proof	2 cents.	2 cents.	2 cents.
	Provided that the strength of proof shall be held to be equal to six per cent of absolute acid, and shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the Governor in Council.			
214	Acid, acetic, crude, and pyroligneous crude, of any strength not exceeding thirty per cent	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
215	Stearic acid	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
216	Nitric acid and all mixed or other acids, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
217	Sulphuric and muriatic acid.....per one hundred pounds.	17½ cents.	22½ cents.	25 cents.
218	Acid phosphate, n.o.p.	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
219	Sulphuric ether, chloroform and solutions of peroxides of hydrogen	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
220	All medicinal, chemical and pharmaceutical preparations, compounded of more than one substance, including patent and proprietary preparations, tinctures, pills, powders, troches, lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences and oils, n.o.p.:—			
	(*a*) When dry	20½ p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
	(*b*) All others	50 p.c.	50 p.c.	50 p.c.
	Provided that drugs, pill-mass and preparations, not including pills or medicinal plasters, recognized by the British or the United States pharmacopœia, or the French Codex as officinal, shall not be held to be covered by this item;			
	Provided, also, that any article in this item containing more than forty per cent of proof spirit shall be rated for duty at.....per gallon	$2.40	$2.40	$2.40
	and	30 p.c.	30 p.c.	30 p.c.
221	Opium, crude, the outward ball or covering to be free of duty.....per pound	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00
222	Opium, powdered.....per pound.	$1.35	$1.35	$1.35
223	Opium, prepared for smoking.....per pound.	$5.00	$5.00	$5.00
224	Paraffine wax and sealing wax	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
225	Wax, vegetable and mineral, n.o.p	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
226	Candles	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
227	Whale oil soap	Free.	Free.	Free.
228	Soap powders, powdered soap, mineral soap, and soap, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
229	Soap, common or laundry.....per one hundred pounds.	65 cents.	90 cents.	$1.00
230	Castile soap.....per pound.	1 cent.	1 cent.	2 cents.
231	Baking powder, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per pound.	4 cents.	5 cents.	6 cents.
232	Glue, liquid, powdered or sheet, and mucilage, gelatine, casein, adhesive paste and isinglass	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 6—*Continued.*			
233	Pomades, French or flower odours, preserved in fat or oil for the purpose of conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, when imported in tins of not less than ten pounds each	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
234	Perfumery, including toilet preparations, non-alcoholic, viz.:—Hair oil, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes and all other perfumed preparations, n.o.p., used for the hair, mouth or skin	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
235	Liquorice paste and liquorice in rolls and sticks, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
236	Antiseptic surgical dressing, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings, plain or medicated; surgical trusses, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
237	Celluloid, moulded into sizes for handles of knives and forks, not bored nor otherwise manufactured; moulded celluloid balls and cylinders, coated with tinfoil or not, but not finished or further manufactured; and celluloid lamp shade blanks	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
238	Celluloid, xylonite, xyolite, in sheets, lumps, blocks or balls, in the rough	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
239	Lamp black, carbon black, ivory black and bone black	Free.	Free.	Free.
240	Ultramarine blue, dry or in pulp; whiting or whitening; Paris white and gilders' whiting; blanc fixe; satin white	Free.	Free.	Free.
241	Litharge	Free.	Free.	Free.
242	Dry red lead, orange mineral and zinc white	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
243	Dry white lead	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
244	White lead ground in oil	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
245	Ochres, ochrey earths, siennas and umbers	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
246	Oxides, fireproofs, rough stuff, fillers, laundry blueing, and colours, dry, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
247	Liquid fillers, anti-corrosive and anti-fouling paints, and ground and liquid paints, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
248	Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers ..... per gallon.	$1.00	$1.00	$1.00
249	Varnishes, lacquers, japans, japan driers, liquid driers, and oil finish, n.o.p. ..... per gallon.	15 cents. and 15 p.c.	15 cents. 20 p.c.	15 cents. 22½ p.c.
250	Paris green, dry	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
251	Gold liquid paint	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
252	Shoe blacking; shoemakers' ink; shoe, harness and leather dressing, and knife or other polish or composition, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
253	Putty, of all kinds	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
254	Gums, viz.:—Amber, Arabic, Australian, copal, damar, elemi, kaurie, mastic, sandarac, Senegal, tragacanth, gedda and barberry; gum chicle or sappato gum, crude; lac, crude, seed, button, stick and shell; ambergris; Pontianac	Free.	Free.	Free.
255	British gum, and dextrine, dry; sizing cream and enamel sizing	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
256	Printing ink	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
257	Writing ink	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
258	Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, per 100 pounds	80 cents.	$1.10	$1.20
259	Lard oil, neat's-foot oil, and sesame seed oil	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
260	Turpentine, raw or crude	Free.	Free.	Free.
261	Turpentine, spirits of	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
262	Olive oil, n.o.p	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
263	Peppermint oil	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
264	Essential oils, n.o.p.	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
265	Oils, spermaceti, whale and other fish oils, including cod liver oil	12½ p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
266	Resin oil, and China wood oil	Free.	Free.	Free.
267	Crude petroleum, fuel and gas oils, ·8235 specific gravity or heavier, at 60 degrees temperature	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 6—*Continued.*			
268	Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of the products of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
269	Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, costing less than 25 cents per gallon.... per gallon.	1½ cents.	2¼ cents.	2½ cents.
270	Crude petroleum, gas oils, other than naphtha, benzine and gasoline, lighter than ·8235 but not less than ·775 specific gravity, at 60 degrees temperature..per gallon.	1 cent.	1¼ cents	2½ cents.
271	Oils, coal and kerosene, distilled, purified or refined petroleum, and products of petroleum, n.o.p.....per gallon.	1½ cents.	2¼ cents.	2½ cents.
272	Gasoline or naphtha, under ·775 specific gravity, at 60 degrees temperature	Free.	Free.	Free.
273	Lubricating oils, n.o.p., and axle grease	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
274	Vaseline and all similar preparations of petroleum, for toilet, medicinal or other purposes	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
275	Oil (petroleum) when imported by miners or mining companies or concerns, to be used in the concentration of ores of metal in their own concentrating establishments, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
276	Refined cotton seed oils, edible, for canning fish	Free.	Free.	Free.
277	Bleached palm oil and shea butter	Free.	Free.	Free.
278	Oils, viz. : Cocoanut, palm and palm kernel, not edible, for manufacturing soap ; carbolic or heavy oil ; olive oil for manufacturing soap or tobacco, or for canning fish	Free.	Free.	Free.
279	Degras and grease for stuffing or dressing leather and which are fit only for such use	Free.	Free.	Free.
280	Foots, being the refuse of cotton seed or olives after the oil has been pressed out ; and grease, rough, the refuse of animal fat, for the manufacture of soap and oils only...	Free.	Free.	Free.
	GROUP 7. *Earth, Earthenware and Stoneware.*			
281	Fire brick	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
282	Building brick, paving brick, and manufactures of clay or cement, n.o.p	12½ p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
283	Drain tiles, not glazed	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
284	Drain pipes, sewer pipes and earthenware fittings therefor, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed ; earthenware tiles, n.o.p...	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
285	Tiles or blocks of earthenware or of stone prepared for mosaic flooring	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
286	Earthenware and stoneware, viz. : Demijohns, churns or crocks	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
287	Tableware of china, porcelain, white granite or ironstone..	15 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
288	Earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured and Rockingham ware ; "C.C." or cream-coloured ware, decorated, printed or sponged ; and all earthenware, n.o.p. :	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
289	Closets, urinals, basins, lavatories, baths, bath tubs, sinks and laundry tubs of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material, n.o.p	20 p.c.	30 p.c,	35 p.c.
290	Cement, Portland and hydraulic or water lime, in barrels, bags, or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per one hundred pounds.	8 cents.	11 cents.	12½ cents.
291	Bags in which cement or lime mentioned in the next preceding item is imported	15 p.c.	20 pc..	20 p.c.
292	Gypsum, crude (sulphate of lime)	Free.	Free.	Free.
293	Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, calcined, and prepared wall plaster, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty .....per one hundred pounds.	8 cents.	11 cents.	12½ cents.
294	Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, ground, not calcined	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 7—*Continued.*			
295	Clays, including China clay, fire clay and pipe clay not further manufactured than ground; ganister and sand; gravels; earths, crude only	Free.	Free.	Free.
296	Flint, ground flint stones; felspar, fluorspar, magnesite; cliff, chalk, China, or Cornwall stone, ground or unground; refuse stone, not sawn, hammered or chiselled nor fit for flagstone, building stone or paving	Free.	Free.	Free.
297	Silex or crystallized quartz, ground or unground	Free.	Free.	Free.
298	Pumice, calcareous tufa, pumice stone and lava, not further manufactured than ground	Free.	Free.	Free.
299	Burr-stones, in blocks, rough or manufactured, not bound up or prepared for binding into mill-stones	Free.	Free.	Free.
300	Crucibles, clay or plumbago	Free.	Free.	Free.
301	Curling stones, and handles therefor	Free.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
302	Lithographic stones, not engraved	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
303	Grindstones, mounted, and not less than thirty-six inches in diameter	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
304	Grindstones, mounted or not, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
305	Flagstone, sandstone and all building stone, not hammered, sawn or chiselled, and marble and granite, rough, not hammered or chiselled	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
306	Marble, sawn or sand rubbed, not polished; granite, sawn; flagstone and all other building stone, sawn or dressed; and paving blocks of stone	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
307	Marble and granite, n.o.p., and all manufactures of marble or granite, n.o.p.	30 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
308	Manufactures of stone, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
309	Roofing slate	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
310	Slate mantels and other manufactures of slate, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
311	Slate pencils and school writing slates	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
312	Asbestos in any form other than crude, and all manufactures thereof	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
313	Plumbago, not ground or otherwise manufactured	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
314	Plumbago, ground, and manufactures of, n.o.p., and foundry facings of all kinds	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
315	Carbons over six inches in circumference	Free.	Free.	Free.
316	Electric light carbons and carbon points, of all kinds, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	33½ p.c.	35 p.c.
317	Glass cut to size adapted for use in the manufacture of dry plates for photographic purposes, when imported by the manufacturers of such dry plates for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
318	Common and colourless window glass	7½ p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
319	Glass, in sheets, and bent plate glass, n.o.p	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
320	Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes not exceeding seven square feet each, n.o.p	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
321	Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five square feet each, n.o.p	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
322	Plate glass, n.o.p	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
323	Silvered glass, bevelled or not and framed or not	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
324	German looking-glass plate (thin plate), unsilvered or for silvering	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
325	Stained or ornamental glass windows	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
326	Glass demijohns or carboys, bottles, decanters, flasks, phials, glass jars and glass balls, lamp chimneys, glass shades or globes; cut, pressed or moulded or crystal glass tableware, decorated or not; blown glass tableware and manufactures of glass, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	.c.	32½ p.c.
327	Spectacles, eyeglasses, and ground or finished spectacle or eyeglass lenses	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
328	Spectacle and eyeglass frames, and metal parts thereof	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8.			
	Metals, and manufactures thereof.			
329	Ores of metals of all kinds	Free.	Free.	Free.
330	Antimony, or regulus of, not ground, pulverized or otherwise manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
331	Bismuth, metallic, in its natural state	Free.	Free.	Free.
332	Ore of cobalt	Free.	Free.	Free.
333	Cinnabar; quicksilver; radium	Free.	Free.	Free.
334	Kryolite or cryolite (ore)	Free.	Free.	Free.
335	Manganese, oxide of	Free.	Free.	Free.
336	Tea lead	Free.	Free.	Free.
337	Lead, old, scrap, pig and block	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	15 p.c.
338	Lead, in bars and in sheets	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
339	Lead, manufactures of, n.o.p	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
340	Type for printing, including chases, quoins and slugs, of all kinds	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
341	Babbit metal and type metal, in blocks, bars, plates and sheets	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	15 p.c.
342	Phosphor tin and phosphor bronze in blocks, bars, plates, sheets and wire	5 p.c.	7½ p.c,	10 p.c.
343	Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars, plates or sheets; tin strip waste, and tin foil	Free.	Free.	Free.
344	Japanned ware, tinware, and all manufactures of tin, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
345	Zinc dust, zinc spelter and zinc in blocks, pigs, bars, rods, sheets and plates; and seamless drawn tubing of zinc	Free.	Free.	Free.
346	Zinc, manufacturers of, n.o.p	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
347	Yellow metal, in bolts, bars and sheets, adapted for use in the construction or repairs of vessels	Free.	Free.	Free.
348	Brass and copper, old and scrap, or in blocks, ingots or pigs; copper and bronze in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, unmanufactured; copper in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated; brass or copper tubing, in lengths of not less than six feet, and not polished, bent or otherwise manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
349	Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, and brass in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
350	Brass wire, plain	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.
351	Copper wire, plain, tinned or plated	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.
352	Brass and copper nails, tacks, rivets and burrs or washers; bells and gongs, n.o.p.; and manufactures of brass or copper, n.o.p	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
353	Aluminum ingots, blocks, bars, rods, strips, sheets or plates; aluminum tubing, in lengths of not less than six feet, not polished, bent or otherwise manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
354	Manufactures of aluminum, n.o.p	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
355	Britannia metal in pigs, blocks or bars; nickel, nickel silver, and German silver, in ingots, blocks or bars, n.o.p.	Free.	Free.	Free.
356	Nickel, nickel silver and German silver, in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, and also in strips, sheets or plates	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
357	Britannia metal, nickel silver, Nevada and German silver, manufactures of, not plated, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
358	Anodes of nickel, zinc, copper, silver or gold	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
359	Gold and silver, in ingots, blocks, bars, drops, sheets or plates, unmanufactured; gold and silver sweepings; and bullion fringe or gold fringe	Free.	Free.	Free.
360	Gold and silver coins, except foreign silver coin	Free.	Free.	Free.
361	Gold, silver and aluminum leaf; Dutch or schlag metal leaf; brocade and bronze powders	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
362	Articles, consisting wholly or in part of sterling or other silver ware, nickel-plated ware, gilt or electro-plated ware, n.o.p.; manufactures of gold and silver, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
363	Platinum wire and platinum in bars, strips, sheets or plates	Free.	Free.	Free.
364	Diamond dust or bort and black, for borers	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
365	Composition metal and plated metal, in bars, ingots or cores, for the manufacture of watch cases, jewellery, and of filled gold and silver seamless wire..	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
366	Watch actions and movements, uncased	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
367	Watch cases, and parts thereof finished or unfinished, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
368	Clocks, watches, time records, watch glasses, clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
369	Chronometers and compasses for ships	Free.	Free.	Free.
370	Rollers, copper, adapted for use in calico printing	Free.	Free.	Free.
371	Spurs and stilts, adapted for use in the manufacture of earthenware	Free.	Free.	Free.
372	Blast furnace slag	Free.	Free.	Free.
373	Scrap iron and scrap steel, old and fit only to be remanufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.
374	Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use.. per ton.	70 cents.	90 cents.	$1.00
	But nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured in rolling mills or furnaces; provided that articles of iron or steel, damaged in transit, broken up under customs supervision and rendered unsaleable except as scrap, may be entered for duty as scrap.			
375	Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, and cast scrap iron; ferro-silicon ferro-manganese, and spiegeleisen per ton.	$1.50	$2.25	$2.50
376	Iron or steel billets, weighing not less than sixty pounds per lineal yard; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, slabs, puddled bars; and loops or other forms, n.o.p., less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings per ton.	$1.75	$2.50	$2.75
377	Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, girders and other rolled shapes or sections, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.o.p per ton.	$4.25	$6.00	$7.00
378	Bar iron or steel, rolled, whether in coils, rods, bars or bundles, comprising rounds, ovals and squares, and flats; steel billets, n.o.p.; and rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, twelve inches or less in width, number thirteen gauge and thicker, n.o.p. per ton.	$4.25	$6.00	$7.00
379	Rolled iron or steel beams, channels and angle-bars, weighing not less than forty pounds per lineal yard, and universal mill or rolled edge plates of steel, over twelve inches wide, for use in the manufacture of bridges, when imported by manufacturers of bridges.	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
380	Rolled iron or steel plates, not less than thirty inches in width, and not less than one-quarter of an inch in thickness, when imported by manufacturers of boilers for use in the manufacture of boilers	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
381	Rolled iron or steel plates, not less than forty-eight inches in width, and exceeding one-half inch in thickness, n.o.p.	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
382	Rolled iron or steel sheets or plates, sheared or unsheared, and skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, n.o.p.	$4.25	$6.00	$7.00
383	Skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, when imported by manufacturers of wrought iron or steel pipe for use only in the manufacture of wrought iron or steel pipe in their own factories	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
384	Rolled iron or steel sheets number fourteen gauge and thinner, n.o.p.; Canada plates; Russia iron; flat galvanized iron or steel sheets; terne plates and rolled sheets of iron or steel, coated with zinc, spelter or other metal, of all widths or thicknesses, n.o.p.; and rolled			

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
	iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, number fourteen gauge and thinner, galvanized, or coated with other metal, or not, n.o.p	Free.	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.
385	Chrome steel	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
386	Rolled iron or steel bars, bands, hoop, scroll or strip, sheet or plate, of any size, thickness or width, galvanized or coated with any material or not, and cast steel, when of greater value than three and a half cents per pound, n.o.p	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
387	Swedish rolled iron and Swedish rolled steel nail rods, under half an inch in diameter, for the manufacture of horseshoe nails	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
388	Iron and steel railway bars or rails of any form, punched or not, n.o.p., for railways, which term for the purposes of this item shall include all kinds of railways, street railways and tramways, even although they are used for private purposes only, and even although they are not used or intended to be used in connection with the business of common carrying of goods or passengers...per ton	$4.50	$6.00	$7.00
388*a*	Iron or steel railway bars or rails, which have been in use in the tracks of railways in Canada, and which have been exported from Canada and returned thereto after having been re-rolled, and weighing not less than fifty-six pounds per lineal yard when re-rolled, and which are to be used by the railway company importing them on their own tracks, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs. Provided that the value for duty of such re-rolled rails shall be the cost of re-rolling the same. Provided also that whenever the Governor in Council is satisfied that a mill adapted and equipped for re-rolling such rails in substantial quantities has been established in Canada, the Governor in Council may by Order in Council to be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' abolish the duty specified in this item, and thereupon all such rails when imported shall be subject to such duty as otherwise provided in the Customs Tariff.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
389	Railway fish-plates and tie-plates ....per ton.	$5.00	$7.00	$8.00
390	Switches, frogs, crossings and intersections for railways	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	32½ p.c.
391	Iron or steel bridges, or parts thereof; iron or steel structural work, columns, shapes or sections, drilled, punched or in any further stage of manufacture than as rolled or cast, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
392	Springs, axles, axle bars, n.o.p., and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, for railway, tramway, or other vehicles	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
393	Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size or in whatever stage of manufacture, n.o.p.; and steel shafting, turned, compressed, or polished; and hammered, drawn or cold rolled iron or steel bars or shapes, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
394	Cast iron pipe of every description....per ton.	$6.00	$7.00	$8.00
395	Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubes for boilers, n.o.p., under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs; flues and corrugated tubes for marine boilers	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
396	Seamless steel tubing, valued at not less than three and one-half cents per pound; rolled or drawn square tubing of iron or steel; adapted for use in the manufacture of agricultu al implements	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
397	Tubes of rolled iron or steel, not joined or welded, not more than one and one-half inches in diameter, n.o.p.	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
398	Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, over 4 inches in diameter	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
399	Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, four inches or less in diameter, n.o.p	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
400	Iron or steel pipe or tubing, plain or galvanized, riveted, corrugated or otherwise specially manufactured, including lock joint pipe, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
401	Wire bound wooden pipe	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
402	Iron or steel fittings for iron or steel pipe, of every description	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
403	Wire, crucible cast steel, valued at not less than six cents per pound	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
404	Galvanized iron or steel wire numbers nine, twelve and thirteen gauge	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
405	Buckthorn strip fencing, woven wire fencing and wire fencing of iron or steel, n.o.p., not to include woven wire or netting made from wire smaller than number fourteen gauge nor to include fencing of wire larger than number nine gauge	0 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
406	Wire of all metals and kinds, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
407	Wire, single or several, covered with cotton, linen, silk, rubber or other material, including cable so covered, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
408	Wire rope, stranded or twisted wire, clothes lines, picture or other twisted wire and wire cable, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
409	Wire cloth or wove wire, and wire netting, of iron or steel.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
410	Coil chain, coil chain links, and chain shackles, of iron or steel, five-sixteenths of an inch in diameter and over	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
411	Malleable sprocket or link-belting chain.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
412	Iron or steel nuts, washers, rivets, and bolts, with or without threads; nut, bolt and hinge blanks; and T and strap hinges of all kinds, n.o.p. per one hundred pounds and	75 cents. 10 p.c.	75 cents. 20 p.c.	75 cents. 25 p.c.
413	Screws, commonly called "wood screws," of iron or steel, brass or other metal, including lag or coach screws, plated or not, and machine or other screws, n.o.p	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
414	Iron or steel cut nails and spikes (ordinary builders'); and railroad spikes per one hundred pounds.	30 cents.	45 cents.	50 cents.
415	Composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
416	Wire nails of all kinds, n.o.p. per one hundred pounds.	40 cents.	55 cents.	60 cents.
417	Nails, brads, spikes and tacks of all kinds, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
418	Wire cloth, or woven wire of brass or copper.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
419	Needles, of any material or kind, and pins manufactured from wire of any metal, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
420	Buckles of iron, steel, brass or copper, of all kinds, n.o.p. (not being jewellery)	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
421	Bird, squirrel and rat cages, of wire and metal parts thereof	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
422	Trawls, trawling spoons, fly hooks, sinkers, swivels, sportsmen's fishing bait and fishing hooks, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 pc.
423	Skates of all kinds, roller or other, and parts thereof.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
424	Guns, rifles, including air guns and air rifles not being toys; muskets, cannons, pistols, revolvers, or other firearms; cartridge cases, cartridges, primers, percussion caps, wads, or other ammunition, n.o.p.; bayonets, swords, fencing foils and masks; gun or pistol covers or cases, game bags, loading tools and cartridge belts of any material	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
425	Knife blades or blanks and table forks of iron or steel in the rough, not handled, filed, ground or otherwise manufactured	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
426	Knives and forks and all other cutlery, of steel, plated, or not, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
427	Agate, granite or enamelled iron or steel ware.	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
428	Iron or steel hollow-ware, plain plack, tinned or coated, n.o.p.; and nickel and aluminum kitchen or household hollow-ware, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
429	Machine card clothing.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
430	Patterns of brass, iron, steel or other metal not being models	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
431	Plates engraved on wood, steel, or other metal and transfers taken from the same; engravers' plates of steel, or other metal, polished, for engraving thereon	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
432	Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids, for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspapers or other advertisements, n.o.p., and matrices or copper shells for such stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids. per square inch.	1 cent.	1¼ cents.	1½ cents.
433	Stereotypes, electrotypes, celluloids and bases for the same, composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid, n.o.p., and matrices or copper shells for such stereotypes, electrotypes, and celluloids per square inch.	⅛ cent.	⅛ cent.	⅛ cent.
434	Lamp springs	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
435	Lamps, side-lights and head-lights, lanterns, chandeliers; gas, coal oil, or other lighting fixtures, including electric light fixtures, or metal parts thereof; lava or other tips, burners, collars, galleries, shades and shade holders	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
436	Gas meters, and finished parts thereof	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
437	Safes, doors for safes and vaults; scales, balances, weighing beams, and strength testing machines of all kinds	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
438	Locomotives and motor cars, for railways and tramways, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
439	Fire engines and fire-extinguishing machines, including sprinklers for fire protection	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
440	Sewing-machines, and parts thereof	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
441	Typecasting and typesetting machines, adapted for use in printing offices; and typewriters	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
442	Printing presses, lithographic presses and type-making accessories therefor, also printers' and book-binders' folding machines, book-binders book-binding, ruling, embossing and paper-cutting machines, and iron or steel parts thereof, n.o.p.	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
443	Newspaper printing presses, of not less value by retail than fifteen hundred dollars each, of a class or kind not made in Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.
444	Mould boards or shares, or plough plates, land sides, and other plates for agricultural implements, when cut to shape from rolled plates of steel, but not moulded, punched, polished or otherwise manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
445	Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	17½ p.c.
446	Cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, seed-drills, manure spreaders, weeders and windmills	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
447	Threshing machine outfit, when consisting of traction or portable engine and separator	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
448	Hay loaders, potato diggers, horse powers, separators, n.o.p, windstackers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths and other agricultural instruments, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
449	Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, n.o.p., and pronged forks	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.
450	Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.o.p.; shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for the same; and lawn mowers	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	32½ p.c.
451	Stoves of all kinds, for coal, wood, oil, spirits or gas	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
452	Belt pulleys of all kinds for power transmission	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
453	Telephone and telegraph instruments, electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors, dynamos, generators, sockets, insulators of all kinds; electric apparatus, n.o.p.; boilers, n.o.p.; and all machinery composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, n.o.p.; and integral parts of all machinery specified in this item	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
454	Manufactures, articles or wares of iron or steel or of which iron and steel (or either) are the component materials of chief value, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tarif Items.		British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
455	Anchors for vessels	Free.	Free.	Free.
456	Ingot moulds; glass moulds of metal	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
457	Iron sand or globules or iron shot, and dry putty, adapted for polishing glass or granite, or for sawing stone	Free.	Free.	Free.
458	Locomotive and car wheel tires of steel, in the rough	Free.	Free.	Free.
459	Steel bowls for cream separators, and cream separators	Free.	Free.	Free.
460	Sundry articles of metal as follows, when for use exclusively in mining or metallurgical operations, viz.:—Diamond drills, not including the motive power; coal cutting machines, except percussion coal cutters; coal heading machines; coal augers; rotary coal drills; core drills; miners' safety lamps and parts thereof, also accessories for cleaning, filling and testing such lamps; electric or magnetic machines for separating or concentrating iron ores; blast furnaces for the smelting of copper and nickel; converting apparatus for metallurgical processes in iron or copper; copper plates, plated or not; machinery for extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes; amalgam safes; automatic ore samplers; automatic feeders: retorts; mercury pumps; pyrometers: bullion furnaces; amalgam cleaners; blast furnace blowing engines; wrought iron tubing, butt or lap welded, threaded or coupled or not, over four inches in diameter; and integral parts of all machinery mentioned in this item	Free.	Free.	Free.
461	Machinery and appliances of iron or steel, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and elevators and machinery of floating dredges, when for use exclusively in alluvial gold mining	Free.	Free.	Free.
462	Blast furnace slag trucks, of a class or kind not made in Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.
462*a*	Briquette-making machines	Free.	Free.	Free.
463	Machinery of every kind and structural iron and steel, when imported under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, for use in the construction and equipment of factories for the manufacture of sugar from beet root	Free.	Free.	Free.
464	The following articles and materials, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, viz.:— (*a*) All tools and machinery not manufactured in Canada up to the required standard, necessary for any factory to be established in Canada for the manufacture of rifles for the Government of Canada	Free.	Free.	Free
	(*b*) All materials or parts in the rough, unfinished, and screws, nuts, bands and springs, to be used in rifles to be manufactured at any such factory for the Government of Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.
465	The following articles and materials when imported by manufacturers of automatic gas buoys and automatic gas beacons, for use in the manufacture of such buoys and beacons for the Government of Canada or for export, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, viz.:—iron or steel tubes over sixteen inches in diameter; flanged and dished steel heads made from boiler plate, over five feet in diameter; hardened steel balls, not less than three inches in diameter; acetylene gas lanterns and parts thereof	Free.	Free.	Free.
466	Surgical and dental instruments of metal; surgical needles; X Ray apparatus and parts thereof; surgical operating tables for use in hospitals	Free.	Free.	Free.
467	Machinery, of a class or kind not made in Canada, for the manufacture of twine, cordage or linen, or for the preparation of flax fibre	Free.	Free.	Free.
468	Machinery of a class or kind not made in Canada, specially adapted for carding, spinning, weaving or knitting purposes, when imported by manufacturers for such purposes	10 p.c.	10 p.c,	10 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Continued.*			
469	Well-drilling machinery and apparatus for boring and drilling for water	Free.	Free.	Free
470	Iron or steel masts, or parts thereof, and iron or steel beams angles, sheets, plates, knees and cable chain, for wooden, iron, steel or composite ships and vessels; and iron, steel or brass manufactures which at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction or equipment of ships or vessels, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
471	Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in making wire in the coil, in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
472	Materials which enter into the construction and form part of cream separators, when imported by manufacturers of cream separators to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of cream separators	Free.	Free.	Free.
473	Rolled steel for saws and for straw cutters, not tempered or ground nor further manufactured than cut to shape, without indented edges	Free.	Free.	Free.
474	Steel springs for the manufacture of surgical trusses, when imported by manufacturers of surgical trusses for use exclusively in the manufacture thereof in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
475	Crucible sheet steel, eleven to sixteen gauge, two and one-half to eighteen inches wide for the manufacture of mower and reaper knives, when imported by the manufacturers thereof for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
476	Steel of number twenty gauge and thinner, but not thinner than number thirty gauge, for the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
477	Steel of number twelve gauge and thinner, but not thinner than number thirty gauge, for the manufacture of buckle clasps, bed fasts, furniture casters, and ice creepers, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
478	Steel of numbers twenty-four and seventeen gauge, in sheets sixty-three inches long, and from eighteen inches to thirty-two inches wide, when imported by the manufacturers of tubular bow sockets for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
479	Flat steel wire, of number sixteen gauge or thinner, when imported by the manufacturers of crinoline or corset wire and dress stays, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
480	Steel strips and flat steel wire when imported into Canada by manufacturers of buckthorn and plain strip fencing, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories; and barbed fencing wire of iron or steel	Free.	Free.	Free.
481	Steel wire, Bessemer soft drawn spring, of numbers ten, twelve and thirteen gauge, respectively, and homo steel spring wire of numbers eleven and twelve gauge, respectively, when imported by manufacturers of wire mattresses, to be used exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
482	Wire, of brass, zinc, iron or steel, screwed or twisted, or flattened or corrugated, for use in connection with nailing machines for the manufacture of boots and shoes, when imported by manufacturers of boots and shoes, to be used exclusively for such purposes in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 8—*Concluded.*			
483	Sterotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns in any language other than French and English, and of books, and bases and matrices and copper shells for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid	Free.	Free.	Free.
484	Cups, brass, being rough blanks, for the manufacture of paper shells or cartridges, when imported by manufacturers of brass and paper shells and cartridges, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
485	Brass caps, adapted for use in the manufacture of electric batteries	Free.	Free.	Free.
486	Iron tubing, lacquered or brass covered, not over two inches in diameter, and brass trimmings, when imported by manufacturers of iron or brass bedsteads for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
487	Tagging metal, plain, japanned or coated, in coils, not over one and a half inch in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoe and corset laces for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.	Free.	Free.	Free.
488	Nitrate and acetate of lead, not ground; platinum and black oxide of copper, for use in the manufacture of chlorates	Free.	Free.	Free.
489	Platinum crucibles	Free.	Free.	Free.
480	Platinum retorts, pans, condensers, tubing and pipe, and preparations of platinum, when imported by manufacturers of sulphuric acid for use exclusively in the manufacture or concentration of sulphuric acid in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
491	Steel balls, adapted for use on bearings of machinery and vehicles	Free.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
492	Steel wool	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
	GROUP 9. *Wood and manufactures thereof.*			
493	Corkwood, or cork bark, unmanufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
494	Manufactures of corkwood or cork bark, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
495	Corks, manufactured from corkwood, over three-fourths of an inch in diameter measured at the larger end . . . per pound	4 cents.	5 cents.	5 cents.
496	Corks, manufactured from corkwood, three-fourths of an inch and less in diameter measured at the larger end per pound	6 cents.	8 cents.	8 cents.
497	Cane and rattans, not manufactured; osiers or willows, and bamboos, unmanufactured, and bamboo reeds, not further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for walking sticks or canes, or for sticks for umbrellas, parasols or sunshades	Free.	Free.	Free.
498	Cane, reed or rattan, not further manufactured than split, n.o.p.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
499	Sawdust of wood, of all kinds	Free.	Free.	Free.
500	Logs and round unmanufactured timber, handle, heading, stave and shingle bolts; firewood, hop poles, fence posts and railway ties	Free.	Free.	Free.
501	D shovel handles, wholly of wood	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
502	Mexican saddle trees and stirrups of wood, treenails; hub, last, wagon, car and gun blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn, or sawn only, felloes of hickory or oak, not further manufactured than rough sawn or bent to shape; barrel staves of wood, sawn, split or cut, not further manufactured than listed or jointed; shingles of wood; spokes of hickory or oak, not further manufactured than rough turned, and not tenoned, mitred or sized	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 9—*Concluded.*			
503	Planks, boards, clapboards, laths, plain pickets and other timber or lumber of wood, not further manufactured than sawn or split, whether creosoted, vulcanized, or treated by any other preserving process, or not	Free.	Free.	Free.
504	Planks, boards and other lumber of wood, sawn, split or cut and dressed on one side only, but not further manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
505	Sawn boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are joined or tongued and grooved	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
506	Manufactures of wood; n.o.p	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
507	Veneers of wood, not over three thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
508	Mouldings of wood, plain, gilded or otherwise further manufactured	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
509	Vulcanized fibre, kartavert, indurated fibre, and like material, and manufactures of, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
510	Churns, n.o.p., brooms, whisks, washboards, pounders and rolling pins	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
511	Fishing rods, walking sticks and walking canes, of all kinds, n.o.p	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
512	Picture frames and photograph frames, of any material	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
513	Umbrella, parasol and sunshade sticks or handles, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
514	Coffins and caskets, and metal parts thereof	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
515	Show-cases, of all kinds, and metal parts thereof	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
516	Blinds of wood, metal or other material, not textile or paper	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
517	Window shade or blind rollers	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
518	Billiard tables, with or without pockets, and bagatelle and other game tables or boards, cues, balls, cue-racks, and cue-tips	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
519	House, office, cabinet or store furniture of wood, iron or, other material, in parts or finished; wire screens, wire doors and wire windows; cash registers; window cornices and cornice poles of all kinds; hair, spring and other mattresses; curtain stretchers, furniture springs and carpet sweepers	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
	GROUP 10.			
	Cotton, Flax, Hemp, Jute, and other Fibres, and Silk, Wool, and Manufactures thereof.			
520	Batts, batting and sheet wadding of wool, cotton or other fibre, cotton warps and cotton yarns, dyed or not, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
521	Gray cotton fabrics and fabrics of flax, unbleached, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
522	White cotton fabrics, and fabrics of flax, bleached, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
523	Fabrics of cotton or flax, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	30 p.c.	32½ p.c.
524	Cotton duck, gray or white, weighing over eight ounces per square yard	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
525	Stair linen, diaper, doylies, tray cloths, sheets, quilts, counterpanes, towels and pillow cases, of cotton or linen; uncoloured damask of linen or cotton in the piece, including uncoloured table cloths or napkins of linen or cotton	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
526	White cotton embroideries; valenciennes, torchons and white cotton lace	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
527	Jeans, sateens and coutils, when imported by manufacturers of corsets and dress stays, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
528	Webbing, non-elastic, when imported by manufacturers of suspenders for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	12½ p.c	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
529	Prunella cloth of wool	Free.	Free.	Free.
530	Bolting cloth, not made up	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 10—*Continued.*			
531	Cloth such as is used for covering the ontside of books, when imported by bookbinders for use exclusively in binding books in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
532	Coir and coir yarn; raw cotton or cotton wool not dyed; cotton yarns, single, number forty and finer	Free.	Free.	Free.
533	Waste or shoddy from cotton, woollen or other fabrics or from yarn or thread, machined, garnetted or prepared for use	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.
534	Cotton yarn, polished or glazed, when imported by manufacturers of shoe laces for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
535	Cotton sewing thread in hanks, three and six cord	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
536	Cotton or linen thread, n.o.p.; crochet and knitting cotton.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
537	Manufactures of cotton, hemp or flax, or of which cotton, hemp or flax in the component material of chief value, n.o.p	25 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
538	Manufactures of jute, n.o.p	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
539	Fibre, Mexican, natural, and tampico or istle and vegetable fibres; fibrilla, flax fibre and flax tow; grass, manilla, Esparto or Spanish, and other grasses, and pulp of, including fancy grasses, dried but not coloured or otherwise manufactured; moss, Iceland, and other mosses, seagrass and seaweed, crude or in their natural state, or cleaned only; and kelp	Free.	Free.	Free.
540	Hemp, dressed or undressed	Free.	Free.	Free.
541	Oakum of jute or hemp	Free.	Free.	Free.
542	Jute or hemp yarn, plain, dyed or coloured; jute canvas, not pressed or calendered	Free.	Free.	Free.
543	Linen yarn for the manufacture of towels and damask, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
544	Binder twine or twine for harvest binders	Free.	Free.	Free.
544a	Articles which enter into the cost of the manufacture of binder twine or twine for harvest binders, when imported for such use exclusively by manufacturers who manufacture such twine only	Free.	Free.	Free.
545	Jute and jute butts; jute cloth, as taken from the loom, not coloured, cropped, mangled, pressed, calendered nor finished in any way	Free.	Free.	Free.
546	Jute cloth, uncoloured, not further finished than cropped, bleached, mangled or calendered	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	10 p.c.
547	Sail twine and canvas, of hemp or flax, when to be used for boats' and ships' sails	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
548	Twine and cordage of all kinds, n.o.p	20 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
549	Hammocks, lawn tennis nets, sportsmen's fish nets, and other articles manufactured of twine, n.o.p	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
550	Sails for boats and ships	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
551	Horse clothing, shaped or otherwise manufactured	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
552	Bags or sacks of hemp, linen or jute, and cotton seamless bags	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
553	Lamp wicks	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
554	Wool and the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat, and other like animals, not further prepared than washed, n.o.p.; noils, being the short wool which falls from the combs in worsted factories; and worsted tops, n.o.p	Free.	Free.	Free.
555	Wool, viz.:—Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools, such as are grown in Canada ..... per pound.	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.
556	Worsted tops made from such wools as are mentioned in the next preceding item	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
557	Yarns, woollen and worsted, n.o.p	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
558	Yarns, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat or like animal, n.o.p., costing 30 cents per pound or over, when imported on the cop or tube or in the hank	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 10—*Continued.*			
559	Wool or worsted yarns, when genapped, dyed or finished and imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels, buttons and fringes, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
560	Yarns spun from the hair of the alpaca, and mohair yarn	Free.	Free.	Free.
561	Lastings, mohair cloth, or other manufactures of cloth, woven or made in patterns of such size, shape or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit only for covering buttons, when imported by manufacturers of buttons for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
562	Oiled silk and oiled cloth, and tape or other textile, india-rubbered, flocked or coated, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
563	Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, alpacas, orleans, cashmeres, henriettas, serges, buntings, nun's cloth, bengalines, whip cords, twills, plains or jacquards of similar fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat, or like animal, not exceeding in weight six ounces to the square yard, when imported in the gray or unfinished state for the purpose of being dyed or finished in Canada, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
564	Felt, pressed, of all kinds, not filled or covered by or with any woven fabric	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
565	Blankets, composed wholly of pure wool	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
566	Flannels, plain not fancy; Italian linings of wool; Cobourgs, lustres and mohair and alpaca fabrics	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
567	Fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel and readymade clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animal, n.o.p.; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings and felt cloth, n.o.p.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.	35 p.c.
568	Socks and stockings of all kinds; knitted goods, n.o.p., undershirts and drawers, and hosiery of all kinds, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
569	Stockinettes for the manufacture of rubber boots and shoes, when imported by manufacturers of rubber boots and shoes, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
570	Mats, door or carriage, other than metal, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
571	Carpeting, rugs, mats and matting of cocoa, straw, hemp or jute; carpet linings and stair pads	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
572	Turkish or imitation Turkish or other rugs or carpets; and carpets, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
573	Enamelled carriage, floor, shelf, and table oilcloth, linoleum, and cork matting or carpets	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
573a	Church vestments of any material	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
574	Shirts of any material, and ladies' or misses' blouses and shirt waists	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
575	Embroideries, n.o.p.; lace, n.o.p.; braids, n.o.p.; fringes, n.o.p.; cords: elastic, round or flat; garter elastic; tassels; handkerchiefs of all kinds; lace collars and all manufactures of lace; nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk or other material, n.o.p.; shams and curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed; corsets of all kinds; linen, silk or cotton clothing, n.o.p.	25 p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
576	Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture in any way; silk cocoons and silk waste	Free.	Free.	Free.
577	Silk in the gum or spun, when imported by manufacturers of silk underwear or of woven labels, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.	Free.	Free.	Free.
578	Spun silk not coloured, n.o.p.; silk in the gum not more advanced than singles; tram or thrown organzine, not coloured	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	——	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 10—*Concluded.*			
579	Sewing and embroidery silk; silk twist, and silk floss	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
580	Black mourning crapes	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
581	Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics	17½ p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
582	Ribbons of all kinds and materials	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
583	Manufactures of silk or of which silk is the component part of chief value, n.o.p.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.	37½ p.c.
	GROUP 11.			
	Miscellaneous.			
584	Asphalt or asphaltum, solid; bone pitch, crude only; and resin or rosin in packages of not less than one hundred pounds	Free.	Free.	Free.
585	Coal and pine pitch, burgundy pitch; and coal and pine tar, crude, in packages of not less than fifteen gallons	Free.	Free.	Free.
586	Coal, anthracite; anthracite coal dust; coke	Free.	Free.	Free.
587	Bituminous slack coal, such as will pass through a three-quarter inch screen, subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.....per ton.	10 cents.	12 cents.	14 cents.
588	Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, and coal, n.o.p.. per ton.	35 cents.	45 cents.	53 cents.
589	Ships and other vessels built in any foreign country, if British registered since September 1st, 1902, on application for license to engage in the Canadian coasting trade: on the fair market value of the hull, rigging machinery, boilers, furniture and appurtenances thereof (as provided in an Act respecting the Coasting Trade of Canada)	.....	25	25 p.c.
590	Vessels, dredges, scows, yachts, boats and other water-borne craft built outside of Canada, of any material, destined for use or service in Canadian waters (not including registered vessels entitled to engage in the coasting trade, nor vessels in transit between Canada and any place outside thereof), n.o.p.:—on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery, boilers, furniture and appurtenances thereof, on arrival in Canada	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
	Provided that regulations may be prescribed by the Minister of Customs for exemption from further duty after the duty specified in this item is once paid.			
591	Freight wagons, farm wagons, drays and sleighs	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
592	Buggies, carriages, pleasure carts and vehicles, n.o.p. including automobiles and motor vehicles of all kinds; tires of rubber for vehicles of all kinds, fitted or not; cutters, children's carriages and sleds, and finished parts of all articles in this item, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
	Provided that for duty purposes the minimum value of an open buggy shall be forty dollars, and the minimum value of a covered buggy shall be fifty dollars.			
593	Railway cars or other cars, wheelbarrows, trucks, road or railway scrapers and hand carts	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
594	Bicycles and tricycles, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
595	Locomotives and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, being the property of railway companies in the United States, running along any line or road crossing the frontier, so long as Canadian locomotives and cars are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	.....	Free.	Free.
596	Materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Continued.*			
597	Pianofortes, organs and musical instruments of all kinds, n.o.p.; phonographs, graphophones, gramaphones and finished parts thereof, including cylinders and records therefor; and mechanical piano and organ players	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
598	Brass band instruments; parts of pianofortes and parts of organs; and bagpipes	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
599	Hides and skins, raw, whether dry, salted or pickled; and raw pelts	Free.	Free.	Free.
600	For tails, in the raw state	Free.	Free.	Free.
601	For skins of all kinds, not dressed in any manner	Free.	Free.	Free.
602	Astrakan or Russian hare skins, China goat plates or rugs, and China goat skins, wholly or partially dressed, but not dyed	Free.	Free.	Free.
603	Fur skins, wholly or partially dressed, n.o.p	10 p.c.	15 p.c.	15 p.c.
604	Dongola, cordovan, calf, sheep, lamb, kid or goat, kangaroo, alligator, and all leather, dressed, waxed, glazed or further finished than tanned, n.o.p.; harness leather, and chamois skin	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.
605	Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; sole leather, in whole sides; belting leather, of all kinds; tanners' scrap leather; leather not further finished than tanned, and skins, n.o.p.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
606	Sole leather, n.o.p.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.
607	Glove leathers, tanned or dressed, coloured or uncoloured, when imported by glove manufacturers for use exclusively in their own factories in the manufacture of gloves	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.
608	Japanned, patent or enamelled leather; morocco leather and leathers in imitation of morocco leather	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
609	Belting, of leather	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
610	Belting, n.o.p.	20p .c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
611	Boots and shoes, slippers and insoles, of any material, n.o.p.	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
612	Harness and saddlery, including horse boots	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
613	Manufactures of raw hide, and all manufactures of leather, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
614	Leather-board, leatheroid, and manufactures thereof, n.o.p.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
615	Whips of all kinds, including thongs and lashes	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
616	Rubber and gutta percha, crude caoutchouc or india-rubber, unmanufactured; powdered rubber and rubber or gutta percha waste or junk; hard rubber in sheets but not further manufactured, and recovered rubber and rubber substitute	Free.	Free.	Free.
617	India-rubber boots and shoes	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
618	Rubber cement and all manufactures of india-rubber and gutta percha, n.o.p	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
619	India-rubber clothing and clothing made waterproof with india-rubber; rubber or gutta percha hose, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber; rubber mats or matting and rubber packing	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
620	Webbing, elactic, over one and one-quarter inches wide	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
621	Window shade cloth in the piece; window shades, cut to size or hemmed or mounted on rollors, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
622	Trunks, valises, hat boxes, carpet bags, tool bags, and baskets of all kinds, n.o.p., and parts thereof, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
623	Musical instrument cases and fancy cases or boxes of all kinds, portfolios and fancy writing desks, satchels, reticules, card cases, purses, pocket-books, fly books and parts thereof, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
624	Bead ornaments, and ornaments of alabaster, spar, amber, terra cotta or composition; fans, dolls and toys of all kinds; statues and statuettes of any material	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
625	Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, n.o.p.	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Continued.*			
626	Hats, caps, hoods and bonnets, n.o.p.; hat and bonnet crowns and hat, cap and bonnet shapes	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
627	Gloves and mitts, of all kinds	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
628	Braces or suspenders, and finished parts thereof	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
629	Umbrellas, parasols and sunshades of all kinds and materials	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
630	Boot, shoe, shirt and stay laces of any material	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
631	Collars and cuffs, of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite or celluloid	25 p.c.	35 p.c.	37½ p.c.
632	Quills in their natural state or unplumed	Free.	Free.	Free.
633	Feathers, in their natural state	10 p.c.	12½ p.c.	15 p.c.
634	Feathers and manufactures of feathers, n.o.p.; artificial feathers, fruits, grains, leaves, flowers and fancy braids, suitable for ornamenting hats	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
635	Whalebone, unmanufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
636	Featherbone, plain or covered, in coils	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
637	Corset clasps, busks, blanks and steels, and covered corset wires, cut to lengths, tipped or untipped; reed, rattan and horn, covered	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
638	Buckram, adapted for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes	Free.	Free.	Free.
639	Unfinished hoods, composed of "Leghorn," "Manilla," palm leaf, grass, willow or chip, not bleached or blocked.	Free.	Free.	Free.
640	Palm leaf, unmanufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
641	Braids or plaits, of chip, palm leaf, manilla, willow, osier, rattan, straw, Tuscan or grass, suitable for making or ornamenting hats	Free.	Free,	Free.
642	Hatter's furs, not on the skin	Free.	Free.	Free.
643	Hair, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled, dyed or otherwise manufactured; and horse-hair not further manufactured than simply cleaned and dipped or dyed	Free.	Free.	Free.
644	Hair, curled or dyed, n.o.p	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
645	Hair cloth of all kinds	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
646	Manufactures of hair, n.o.p. regalia, badges and belts of all kinds, n.o.p.	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
647	Jewellery of any material, for the adornment of the person, n.o.p	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
648	Diamonds, unset, precious stones in the rough or polished, but not set, pierced or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, n.o.p.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.
649	Shoe buttons, n.o.p	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
650	Metal parts adapted for the manufacture of covered buttons	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
651	Buttons of all kinds covered or not, n.o.p., including recognition buttons, and cuff or collar buttons	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
652	Combs for dress and toilet, including mane combs, of all kinds	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
653	Brushes of all kinds	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
654	Bristles, broom corn, and hair brush pads	Free.	Free.	Free.
655	Lead pencils, pens, penholders and rulers of all kinds	15 p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.
656	Tobacco pipes of all kinds, pipe mounts, cigar and cigarette cases, cigar and cigarette holders, and cases for the same, smokers' sets and cases therefor, and tobacco pouches	22½ p.c.	32½ p.c.	35 p.c.
657	Magic lanterns and slides therefor, philosophical, photographic, mathematical and optical instruments, n.o.p., cyclometers and pedometers, and tape lines of any material	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
658	Frames not more than ten inches in width, clasps and fasteners, adapted for use in the manufacture of purses and chatelaine bags or reticules	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.
659	Photographic dry plates	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.
660	Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof	22½ p.c.	30 p.c.	35 p.c.
661	Signs of any material other than paper, framed or not; letters and numerals of any material other than paper	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Continued.*			
662	Fertilizers, unmanufactured, including phosphate rock, kainite or German potash salts and German mineral potash; bone-dust, bone-black or charred bone and bone ash; fish offal or refuse and animal or vegetable manures	Free.	Free.	Free.
663	Fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, n.o.p	5 p.c.	7½ p.c.	10 p.c.
664	Glycerine, when imported by manufacturers of explosives, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
665	Torpedoes, firecrackers and fireworks of all kinds	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
666	Nitro-glycerine, giant powder, nitro and other explosives, n.o.p.....per pound.	1¾cents.	2¼ cents.	2½ cents.
667	Blasting and mining powder.....per pound.	1⅛ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.
668	Cannon, musket, rifle, gun and sporting powder and canister powder.....per pound.	2 cents.	2¾ cents.	3 cents.
669	Emery, in bulk, crushed or ground	Free.	Free.	Free.
670	Emery wheels, carborundum wheels and manufactures of emery or of carborundum	17½ p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
671	Metal glove fasteners, papier mache shoe buttons, shoe eyelets, corset eyelets, shoe eyelet hooks, shoe lace wire fasteners and sewing machine attachments	Free.	Free.	Free.
672	Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rings, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough, or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
673	Reeds, square or round, and raw-hide centres, textile leather or rubber heads, thumbs and tips, and steel, iron or nickel caps for whip ends, when imported by whip manufacturers, for use exclusively in the manufacture of whips in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
674	Ivory and ivory nuts, piano key ivories and veneers of ivory unmanufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
675	Key pins, damper springs, jack springs, rail springs, regulating screws, spoons, bridle wires, damper wires, back check wires, dowel wires, German centre pins, brass pins, rail hooks, brass brackets, plates, damper rod nuts, damper sockets and screws, shell, brass capstan screws, brass flange plates and screws, hammer wires, fly felt, butt felt, damper felt, hammer rail cloth, back check felt, catch felt, thin damper felt, whip cloth, bushing cloth, hammer felt, back hammer felt, bridle leather and buckskin, when imported by manufacturers of piano keys, actions, hammers, base dampers and organ keys, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
676	Metallic tubes, glass, caps, shells, containers and capillary tubes, rubber bulbs, boxes and corks, when imported by manufacturers of vaccine points for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
677	Buddles, vanners and slime tables, adapted for use in gold mining	Free.	Free.	Free.
678	Meerschaum, crude or raw	Free.	Free.	Free.
679	Hoofs, horn strips, horn and horn tips, in the rough, not polished or otherwise manufactured than cleaned; bones, crude	Free.	Free.	Free.
680	Fossils, shells, tortoise and mother-of-pearl, and other shells manufactured	Free.	Free.	Free.
681	Junk, old; rags of cotton, linen, jute, hemp and wool; paper waste clippings, and waste of all kinds, n.o.p., except metallic; broken glass or glass cullet	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Continued.*			
682	Fish hooks, for deep-sea or lake fishing, not smaller in size than number 2.0; bank, cod, pollack and mackerel fish lines; and mackerel, herring, salmon, seal, seine, mullet, net and trawl twine in hanks or coil, barked or not,—in variety of sizes and threads,—including gilling thread in balls, and head ropes for fishing nets; manilla rope for holding traps in the lobster fishery; barked marline, and net morsels of cotton, hemp or flax; and deep-sea fishing nets or seines, when used exclusively for the fisheries, not to include hooks, lines or nets commonly used for sportsmen's purposes	Free.	Free.	Free.
683	Fillets of cotton and rubber not exceeding seven inches wide, when imported by manufacturers of card clothing for use exclusively in the manufacture of card clothing in their own factories	Free.	Free.	Free.
684	Rubber thread, not covered	Free.	Free.	Free.
685	Blanketing and lapping, and discs or mills for engraving copper rollers, when imported by cotton manufacturers, calico printers, and wall paper manufacturers, for use in their own factories only	Free.	Free.	Free.
686	Goldbeaters' moulds and goldbeaters' skins	Free.	Free.	Free.
687	Cat-gut or worm gut, unmanufactured, adapted for the manufacture of whip or other cord, or ligatures	Free.	Free.	Free.
688	Artificial limbs, and parts thereof; artificial teeth, not mounted	Free.	Free.	Free.
689	Life-boats and life saving apparatus specially imported by societies to encourage the saving of human life	Free.	Free.	Free.
690	Clothing and books, donations of, for charitable purposes and photographs, not exceeding three, sent by friend, and not for purpose of sale	Free.	Free.	Free.
691	Communion sets of metal, glass or wood	Free.	Free.	Free.
692	Coins, cabinets of; collections of medals and collections of postage stamps; medals of gold, silver or copper, and other metallic articles actually bestowed as trophies or prizes and received and accepted as honorary distinctions, and cups or other metallic prizes (not usual merchantable commodities), won in bona fide competitions	Free.	Free.	Free.
693	Collections of antiquities, when imported by or for public museums, public libraries, universities, colleges or schools, and which are to be placed in such institutions.	Free.	Free.	Free.
694	Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts,—but no article shall be deemed a model which can be fitted for use	Free.	Free.	Free.
695	Paintings in oil or water colours and pastels. Provided that the duty on any painting or pastel shall not exceed fifty dollars.	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.
696	Philosophical and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and preparations, including boxes and bottles containing the same; maps, photographic reproductions, casts as models, etchings, lithographic prints or charts, when specially imported in good faith for the use and by order of any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy, school or seminary of learning in Canada, and not for sale, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
697	Globes, geographical, typographical and astronomical	Free.	Free.	Free.
698	Typewriters, type, tablets with movable fixtures, and musical instruments, when imported by and for the use of schools for the blind, and being and remaining the sole property of the governing bodies of the said schools and not of private individuals	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Continued.*			
699	Botanical and entomological specimens; mineralogical specimens; skins of birds, and skins of animals not natives of Canada, for taxidermic purposes, not further manufactured than prepared for preservation; fish skins; anatomical preparations and skeletons or parts thereof; and specimens, models and wall diagrams for illustration of natural history for universities, schools and public museums	Free.	Free.	Free.
700	Animals and articles brought into Canada temporarily and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or of competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association	Free.	Free.	Free.
	Provided a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals or articles would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not re-exported within the time specified in such bond.			
701	Menageries, horses, cattle, carriages and harness of, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
702	Carriages for travellers, and carriages laden with merchandise, not to include circus troupes or hawkers, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
703	Travellers' baggage, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
704	Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada; books, pictures, family plate or furniture, personal effects and heirlooms left by bequest.	Free.	Free.	Free.
705	Settlers' effects, viz:—Wearing apparel, books, usual and reasonable household furniture and other household effects; instruments and tools of trade, occupation or employment, guns, musical instruments, domestic sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, carts, wagons and other highway vehicles, agricultural implements and live stock for the farm, not to include live stock or articles for sale, or for use as a contractor's outfit, nor vehicles nor implements moved by mechanical power, nor machinery for use in any manufacturing establishment; all the foregoing if actually owned abroad by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs	Free.	Free.	Free.
	Provided that any dutiable article entered as settlers' effects may not be so entered unless brought by the settler on his first arrival, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty until after twelve month's actual use in Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.
706	Articles for the personal or official use of Consuls General who are natives or citizens of the country they represent and who are not engaged in any other business or profession	Free.	Free.	Free.
707	Articles for the use of the Governor General	Free.	Free.	Free.
708	Arms, military stores, munitions of war, and other articles the property of the Imperial government, and to remain the property of such government; articles consigned direct to officers and men of His Majesty's Imperial navy, for their own personal use or consumption, on board their own ships	Free.	Free.	Free.
709	Articles and other goods, the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, returned to the exporter thereof after having been exported without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means; also quicksilver flasks, and other metallic receptacles for holding liquids, and oyster pails, after having been once exported from Canada	Free.	Free.	Free.

IMPORT DUTIES OF CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

Tariff Items.	—	British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
	GROUP 11—*Concluded.*			
	Provided that the said articles and goods are returned within five years from time of exportation, subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs ;			
	Provided also that any article or goods described in this paragraph, upon which an allowance of drawback has been made shall not be admitted to entry except upon payment of duties equal to the drawback allowed ;			
	Provided further that any of such goods or articles manufactured in bond or under Excise Regulations in Canada and exported shall not be admitted to entry except upon payment of the Customs or Excise duties to which they would have been liable had they not been exported from Canada.			
710	Coverings, inside and outside, used in covering or holding goods imported therewith, shall be subject to the following provisions, viz. :—			
	(a) Usual coverings, containing free goods only ; usual coverings, except receptacles capable of holding liquids, containing goods subject to a specific duty only, n.o.p.	Free.	Free.	Free.
	(b) Usual coverings containing goods subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain	15 p.c.	20 p.c.	20 p.c.
	(c) Provided, that usual coverings containing goods subject to any ad valorem duty, if included in the invoice value of the goods they contain, and not charged separately on the invoice, shall be subject to the same rate of duty ad valorem as the goods they contain, and may be combined with the goods for valuation and duty on the Customs entry ;			
	(*d*) Provided further, that receptacles capable of holding liquids, when containing goods subject to a specific duty shall be charged with the rate of duty to which the same would be subject if imported separately, except when the coverings and the goods contained therein are rated together in the Tariff item ;			
	(*e*) Provided further, that usual coverings designed for use other than in the *bona fide* transportation of the goods they contain, shall be charged with the rate of duty to which the same would be subject if imported separately.			
	(*f*) Provided also, that the term coverings in this paragraph shall include packing boxes, crates, casks, cases, cartons, wrapping, sacks, bagging rope, twine, straw or other articles used in covering or holding goods imported therewith, and the labour and charges for packing such goods, subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.			
711	All goods not enumerated in this Act as subject to any other rate of duty, nor declared free of duty by this Act, and not being goods the importation whereof is by this Act or any other Act prohibited	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.

SCHEDULE "B."

GOODS SUBJECT TO DRAWBACK FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Item No.	Goods.	When Subject to Drawback.	Portion of Duty Payable as Drawback.
1001.	Oil, fuel, and other articles not machinery	When entering into the cost of binder twine manufactured in Canada	95 per cent.
1002.	Rolled iron, rolled steel, and pig iron	When used in the manufacture of mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments for binders	95 "
1003.	Hemp bleaching compound	When used in the manufacture of rope	95 "
1004.	Cotton seed oil	When used in the manufacture of liquid annatto	95 "
1005.	Steel under one-half inch in diameter or under one-half inch square	When used in the manufacture of locks and knobs	95 "
1006.	Steel cut to shape	When used in the manufacture of spoons	95 "
1007.	Flat spring steel, steel billets and steel axle bars	When used in the manufacture of springs and axles for vehicles other than railway or tramway vehicles	95 "
1008.	Spiral spring steel	When used in the manufacture of railway spiral springs	95 "
1009.	Steel	When used in the manufacture of cutlery, files, augers, auger bits, hammers, axes, hatchets, scythes, reaping hooks, hoes, hay or straw knives, agricultural forks, hand rakes, skates, stove trimmings, bicycle chains and windmills	95 "
1010.	Cloths of wool, cotton, silk, ramie or unions, fifty inches or over in width and weighing not more than seven ounces per square yard, not rubbered or made waterproof	When used in the manufacture of mackintosh clothing	50 "
1011.	Botany yarn, single numbers thirty and finer, on mule cops, tubes or cones, or in hanks, dry spun on the French or Belgian systems, in white only, not double or twisted	When used in the manufacture of socks and stockings	95 "
1012.	Hatters' plush of silk or cotton, hatters' bands (not cords), bindings, tips and sides, hat sweats and linings	When used in the manufacture of hats and caps	95 "
1013.	Fabrics of silk and satin, embroidered or embossed chiffon, casket gimps and fringes	When used in the manufacture of burial caskets and burial robes	65 "

SCHEDULE "C."

PROHIBITED GOODS.

1201 Books, printed paper, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable or seditious, or of an immoral or indecent character.

1202 Reprints of Canadian Copyrighted Works, and reprints of British Copyrighted Works which have been copyrighted in Canada.

1203 Coin, base or counterfeit.

1204 Oleomargerine, butterine or other similar substitutes for butter, and process butter or renovated butter.

1205 Tea adulterated with spurious leaf or with exhausted leaves or containing so great an admixture of chemical or other deleterious substances as to make it unfit for use.

1206 Goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labour, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, jail or penitentiary; also goods similar in character to those produced in such institutions, when sold or offered for sale by any person, firm or corporation having a contract for the manufacture of such articles in such institutions or by any agent of such person, firm or corporation, or when such goods were originally purchased from or transferred by any such contractor.

1207 Animals suffering from any contagious disease.

1208 Metallic trading checks.

1209 Any goods—(*a*) which, if sold, would be forfeited under the provisions of Part.....of the Criminal Code, or,

(*b*) manufactured in any foreign state or country which bear any name or trade mark which is or purports to be the name or trade mark of any manufacturer, dealer or trader in the United Kingdom or in Canada, unless such name or trade mark is accompanied by a definite indication of the foreign state or country in which the goods were made or produced;

Provided, that for the purposes of this item, if there is on any goods a name which is identical with or a colourable imitation of the name of a place in the United Kingdom or in Canada, such name, unless it is accompanied by the name of the state or country in which it is situate, shall, unless the Minister decides that the attaching of such name is not calculated to deceive (of which matter the Minister shall be the sole judge), be treated as if it was the name of a place in the United Kingdom or in Canada.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the government opposite has now filled in about an even ten years of its existence, during which time its policy and its administration have been in force with all the power that a large majority naturally gives. It will be instructive, possibly, at the end of that period to make a few observations with reference to their financial stewardship, as it is the finances really with which we are dealing to-night, and it will be instructive to examine for a little while the attitude assumed by them before taking the reins of power, the attitude, that is, in which they approached the period of their responsibilities, their own opinions, their own convictions, the pledges they make to the people, in fact, the platform on which they climbed into power. It will also be instructive to ask the question afterwards as to what all this tends towards, how long even a country like Canada can stand the pace and as to what the future holds for us, unless there be some signs of restraint and some faint glimmering, at least, of greater economy and fair reasonable prudence.

What was the attitude of these gentlemen as they approached the period of responsibility in the matter of taxation. Every one knows it. It is only necessary to ask the question to have it answered in the mind of every man who hears the question asked. From the right hon. gentleman who led the party then and who has led the government since (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) down through and out to the very humblest follower who took part in bringing these gentlemen into power, the attitude upon taxation was that it was abnormally high; that it ought to be reduced and that if they came into power it would be their duty as well as their pleasure to reduce it. Now, Mr. Speaker, how have these gentlemen maintained the attitude which they assumed and how have they fulfilled the pledges that they made previous to their taking the responsibility of government in the way of taxation? I think it would be a little startling to the country if only it could go out to the country without the glamour of party cast around it, and without the misrepresentations, conscious or unconscious, for they amount to that which go out with it through the party organs. Let us look at it.

In the years 1892-1896, five years, what was the amount of taxation which was raised in this country by the Liberal-Conservative party, to dethrone whom was the mission of these gentlemen—and it was their mission for other reasons, but for one especial reason, that the people should be relieved from the inordinate burden of taxation. The amount of taxation raised by that government in those five years was $138,106,054, an average of $27,710,412 per year.

These gentlemen came into power to reduce taxation and in the five years that

followed, 1897 to 1901, they took from the people $170,168,924, a yearly average of $34,033,785. But they had not yet sufficiently reduced the burden of taxation so they went at it again for the next five year period, 1902-1906, and they reduced the taxation by taking, instead of $170,000,000 in the five years, $260,160,877, or a yearly average of $52,080,438. Compare the mission of these gentlemen, compare their principles, their convictions, their pledges given to the people for the eighteen years that they were striving for power and this result in the way of taxation taken from the country, and comment is unnecessary.

The yearly excess in the period 1897-1901 over 1892-1896 was $6,323,373.

The yearly excess for 1902-1906 over 1892-1896 was $24,370,026, and the yearly excess in 1902-1906 over 1897-1901 was $18,046,653. They went that much better in their second period over themselves during their first period in the process of reducing taxation by the remarkable method of making it millions more ever year.

The taxation taken from the people in 1896 averaged $5.43 per head. The taxes taken from the people in 1906 averaged $10 per head. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) the other evening, or some one else, may be it was the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in arguing on that side of the House, was very careful to make a statement of the average per capita with reference to the public debt, but all of us saw how wisely and how shrewdly he steered clear of making a per capita contrast with reference to the expenditure and the taxation of the country, because it would not have fitted in quite so well, you see. So much with reference to the taxation of the country.

Now, Sir, let us go a step further and ask what the professions and what the record of these gentlemen are with reference to the total expenditure of these two periods, because upon this point they were more eloquent than upon any other, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in the maritime provinces, the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) everywhere; the present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in his own province of Ontario reverberated from Sarnia to the borders of Quebec with his rotund and vehement denunciations of the growing expenditures of this country. They all came in pledged up to the hilt to reduce the expenditures of the country and they proceeded forthwith to carry out their plan in this wise :

From 1892 to 1896 the total expenditures by the Liberal-Conservative party amounted to $210,708,889 from 1902 to 1906 the last five year period of the present government they carried out their pledges to decrease the expenditure of the Conservative government by expending $360,054,196, climbing up from an expenditure of $42,000,000 a year in 1892 to $83,000,000 a year in 1896. There again we see the novel expedient taken by this government to decrease the expenditure of the Conservative government, by almost mathematically doubling the expenditures in the last five years of their administration as compared with the expenditures in the last five years of the Liberal-Conservative administration. The average expenditure during the last five years of the Conservative regime which amounting to $42,000,000, becomes an annual average expenditure during the last five years of the present government of $72,000,000 per year.

The expenditure per head has not shown diminution either. In 1896 it was $8.14 per head of the population and in 1896 it was $14 per head of the population. There again the wisdom of the serpent—I was going to say—but I will say the wisdom of the Finance Minister is shown in not challenging a comparison on the per capita basis in anything else except the increase of the public debt. Well, with reference to this capital expenditure they have an argument—no they have a statement, and the Prime Minister uses it. Their statement is this : Of course we have spent money but we have done so for great public works ; you sometimes urge against us that we have not done anything with this money in the way of great public works but see what we have done—and the Prime Minister made quite an exhibition of great public works which had been carried out by his government.

Let us see about that. If you will take the great productive works of this country—and also the additions to the debts of provinces which I suppose in their way stimulate and help the provincial governments to carry on the work of development with more ease—we will find this interesting comparison : That if you take the eighteen years between 1878 and 1896 and the ten years between 1897 and 1906 you will find that the Liberal-Conservatives spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway, $50,000,000 ; while the Liberal government have spent on it $65,000. On the canals, the Liberal-Conservative Government spent $30,000,000 and the Liberal government has spent $24,000,000. Provincial debts have been added by the Liberal-Conservatives to the amount of $10,300,000 and by the Liberal government to the amount of $267,026. The Intercolonial Railway had spent upon it by the Conservative government $20,500,000 and the Liberals have managed to spend upon it in ten years $25,500,000. On the Transcontinental Railway the Liberal-Conservative spent nil, and the Liberals have spent $2,600,000. On the Northwest Territories the Liberal-Conservatives spent $875,000 and the Liberals spent $20,000. These are all of course capital expenditures and it foots up in this way : That the Liberal-Conservatives spent in their time out of the revenues they got from the country and the moneys they bor-

rowed $111,675,000 on what you may call the great productive works of Canada and the allowances to the provinces of added debt, whilst the Liberal government in their time have spent only $52,452,026 upon that same class of great productive works.

Look at the other side of the shield: The Liberal-Conservatives spent $111,675,000 on great works of that kind and they got from the people $597,000,000 as the total expenditure during that period, that is, out of the total expenditure of $597,000,000 in eighteen years they spent $111,675,000 on great works of this character which amounts to nearly 19 per cent of their total expenditure.

Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, that in ten short years this present administration has managed to spend $498,000,000 as compared with $597,000,000 of expenditures in the preceding eighteen years and out of that immense expenditure of $498,000,000 in ten years they have only spent $52,000,000 upon works of this great and productive character that I have mentioned. That, I think, disposes pretty effectually of the plea that though this government has spent lavishly and largely they have spent the money on great productive works. There is their record and by the record they must be judged.

The Minister of Finance takes great credit to himself that he has not increased the public debt largely. Mr. Speaker, I think he would be able to take more credit if he could come down after his ten years period and show that he had increased the the public debt a little more and had taken a great deal less taxation out of the country. Let me show you how it goes. I have been twitted by the First Minister with having had hard conferences with my deputy Minister of Finance because of the difficulties I found in making ends meet; that is, that I could not each year pile up a surplus. There is another side to that question and I don't propose that it shall be forgotten. From 1890 to 1895 the Liberal Conservatives increased the debt of the country $15,544,000. They had two alternatives; they could have added to the taxation and drawn the money out of the peoples' pockets and not increased the debt, or, they could have increased the debt and given relief to the pockets of the people in the matter of taxation, and they took the latter alternative. They added $15,544,000 to the debt and surpluses were allowed in part to slide, but, Sir, we went directly to the root of the matter and by the remission of the sugar duties alone, in that period we left in the pockets of the people $19,800,000.

Which is the better policy for the country? Which deserves more the commendation of sensible men? That we should in a a period of stress and trial remit $20,000,000 of taxation to the people although we increased the debt $15,000,000, or that we should have taken that $20,000,000 out of the pockets of the people so that we could have said to the country and the party opposite, we have not increased the debt? What happens? To carry the debt of $15,500,000 how much does it take? It takes about $500,000 per year. Now, suppose that we remitted $19,000,000 or $20,000,000 of taxation, as we did in that time, and simply charged up to the country what was necessary to carry the debt which resulted because of that remission of taxation, what happens? That a paltry sum has to be paid for the carrying of the debt, and that a vast amount of money is left in the pockets, in the industries, in the businesses of the people as working capital. In ten years—the figures are stupendous, we can scarcely grasp them—the present government have taken $430,000,000 in taxes and imposts out of the pockets of the people of Canada. By doing that they have avoided an increase of the debt to a certain extent. But where does this $430,000,000 come from? It must come out of the pockets of the people. What does that mean? If it were left every year in the pockets of the people, it would become working capital, so to speak, for the country. Let any one propose to bring into this country $500,000,000 to develop the ressources of this country; he would be called a national benefactor. If you take $430,000,000 of taxation out of the pockets of the people in ten years, you take by that much their working capital away from them. That is the real reason why economists tell you that you ought not to have surpluses, that you ought not to take from the people more than is actually necessary to carry on the affairs of the country, and to carry them on economically. If the $430,000,000 or a half of it or a quarter of it is not taken in taxation, then through expenditures and through the banks it goes into industries all through the country, from the farmer's individual industry to the wide corporate industries of the country. It makes working capital. Therefore I say it is not an economical process for the government of this country, young and urgently requiring capital to develop its ressources, to take improvidently in taxation in order that you may be able to say that you have not increased the public debt. It would be more economical to add $100,000,000 to the public debt and tax the country for carrying it as to the interest of three per cent upon it, and leave the remainder of the money as working capital in the industries and avocations of the country. It would give an impetus to the development of the country from one end of it to the other. Every drain of inordinate taxation is so much taken out of the business lifeblood of the country which if not replenished by any other method causes weakness and exhaustion.

The Minister of Finance has a good time with himself almost every time he makes a budget speech about his surplus. He loves that surplus. Seventy-seven millions it is now, and every year he adds a little more, and he says, just look at my surplus. And everybody on the government benches looks at it and admires it and applauds it and says it is good to look upon, even though they cannot have it. Well, it is new doctrine for the Liberal party. The doctrine that was instilled into them when they were children, and which they emitted in more or less sonorous tones during all the years of their wanderings in opposition, was that surpluses ought not to exist. Now it is their chief glory and pride that they do exist, and that the baby grows and becomes almost majestic in its proportions. Now, I am not willing to have the Finance Minister exhibit these surpluses for admiration on his side of the House and say nothing with reference to the work of the Conservative party in the years preceding. They had surpluses as well, but they were modest ones. When they went up to two millions, it was supposed that that was about the limit ; and if by any means they happened to go up to four millions, care was taken pretty soon, by the reduction of taxation or otherwise, that the surplus should not be inordinate. Why, it is the easiest thing in the world to make a surplus. The Minister of Finance and his colleagues can make it even larger than it is if they wish. All they have to do is to take out more taxation—to add on to the taxation million by million, and the more they take out of the people of Canada in taxation, the larger their surplus will become. Really the Minister of Finance condemns himself when he applauds his magnificent surplus. If you will simply adopt the expedient of taking $52,000,000 per year in taxation out of the people instead of $27,700,000 which we took in the last year of our existence as a government, it is very easy to build up a magnificent surplus. But is it really economical ? Is it really for the peace of mind of the minister himself and the government? It is well to have a care that the country's finances will always come out on the right side, in order to keep its credit good ; but it is uneconomical and dangerous for a government or a party to attempt to have a big surplus every year, because it means an abstraction of unwarranted sums from the pockets of the people and from the working capital of the country ; and it is an invitation to extravagance which cannot be resisted by most governments, and which certainly has not been resisted by the government at present in power.

But this expenditure seems to go on. I have a copy of the estimates in my hand, and briefly what I find in them is this: That we are not at all through with our expenditures. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speaking in this House on the Transcontinental Railway not many years ago, said that very little would be expended the first year, that the second year probably about $10,000,000 would be required, and after that some $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 per year. But what do we find in these estimates?. On page 38 to 40 we find that in the nine months of the current year there is an estimate of $12,000,000 for the Transcontinental and the following year an estimate of $28,360,000. In these two estimates there is $36,360,000 of extra expenditure on capital account. But that is not all. If you take the railways and canals you will find that for the twenty-one months there is an estimated capital expenditure in the main estimates alone of $47,000,000. But you will find more than that. The main estimates are for the nine months ending the 31st March, 1907, and they call for an expenditure of $72,605,864. And for the year 1907-08 the main estimates alone call for an expenditure of $105,689,519, besides the redemption of a debt of some $9,300,000, making in all $115,000,000 in round numbers required, according to the main estimates for the year 1907-8. Other estimates must be added to that. Eighty-three million was the total expenditure last year. One hundred and fifteen million—$105,000,000 of which being expenditure other than the redemption of the debt—is called for in the main estimates alone for the year 1907-8. And when we add the two supplementals we must conclude that that the expenditure will jump from $83,000,000, reasoning from these estimates, to some $115,000,000 or $120,000,000. Are we never to make a stop? I should think it would make a shiver run down the backbone of this country to feel that in eleven years its expenditure has jumped from $42,000,000 to $120,000,000. And while this rapid pace is set, there is no sign at all on the horizon or in the sky of anything like a restraining influence or a desire to put a bit and bridle upon this galloping steed. There is not the slightest sign of any prudential consideration of the precaution which every business man would take as to the future in view of these immense expenditures and obligations.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in a speech at Montreal rather flouted the idea that men should bother themselves about small things. We are, he said, a government of large expenditures. Well, we have an even choice on this side in the way of criticism. We can criticise them for magnificent expenditures, as I have just been doing, or for small but very corrupt, very unnecessary and very extravagant expenditures. But my hon. friend must not forget what he said in his budget speech of 1905, when he declared that a single dollar squandered or spent corruptly is open to the severest censure. That is a sentiment I endorse, and which we must

presume the Minister of Finance believes in since he gave expression to it. Why then did he criticise the opposition when he spoke in the city of Montreal as being critics of little things? He must know that the very essence of good finance and business is to look after small expenditures even more carefully and minutely than after the larger ones. But if for large expenditures we have abundant ground for criticism, we have equally good reason for finding fault with the smaller expenditure.

Suppose, for instance, I were to say a word regarding the expenditure in the Yukon. We do not hear so much to-day about the Yukon as formerly. I remember when Sir Richard Cartwright would stand up in this House and declare that while we could put a great deal to the debit of the Yukon, we must look at the treasures that spring forth from its mineral soil which balance and over balance any expenditure we made. Sir Richard Cartwright unfortunately is not here and none of his friends are very enthusiastic now about the conditions in the Yukon. The administration of that country is a sample of bad financial management. At the close of 1905 the government had spent in the Yukon $13,059,598, and had received in total revenue from that district $11,571,243, showing a deficit of $2,388,355. The deficit now, however, is $3,054,231, the deficit last year being $665,876. The total expenditure in the Yukon this year was $1,416,028 and the total revenue $750,152. There are about 8,000 people there now as compared with 28,000 or 30,000 not five years ago. But take some of the departments there in their operations. The Department of the Interior collected last year $336,695, and it cost the department $405,734 to make that collection. The post office took in $22,934,- and paid out $127,338. But this is to be said for the post office—that it cannot expect in all cases to make revenues equal to expenditures, especially in a country like that. The customs collections were $285,-837, or $11,000 less than the previous year. But it took $45,756, or $2,000 more than the previous year, to make the collection. And the expenditure was $15,000 more than in 1901, when the customs collections were $630,000. For the mounted police in this community of about 8,000 the country paid $395,851. The administration of justice for that handful of people cost $93,398, being $20,000 more than in 1891 when the population was fully three times as large. The government of the Yukon now costs just $160 per head of the population. It is interesting to note that at this rate the government of the province of Ontario would cost in a year about $360,000,000.

Now, let us consider another point in connection with the capital expenditures. Bounties are still charged to capital account. The Minister of Finance will not assert that they ought to be paid out of capital. When we were in power, we paid them out of revenue account, which is the account from which they should be paid. The Minister of Finance will not declare that that is not the correct method. But his excuse is that while we were in power, they were a small amount, and it did not matter much, but now they run up towards $3,000,000, and so he took occasion to pay the money out of capital, making his last surplus appear just $2,400,-000 greater than it really was. Now, I invite the Minister of Finance to use his own reasoning in another case. The government received in revenues from Dominion lands in the last ten years $12,913,000. How was that money treated? It was all put to the credit of consolidated revenue, to show how large the revenue under this government was. But, during the same time, there was paid out for surveys of lands, $3,800,000. But this money was not paid out of revenue account to which the other was credited, it was charged up, if you please, against capital account. Now, the Minister of Finance may say that when we were in power this same system of bookkeeping was followed. But, in our time this was a small thing and did not much matter, while it is a very large thing now. Why does he not follow the same principle as in the case of the bounties and reverse the operation when the amounts become large? Where is the sense of the present system? Last year the minister took in on account of Dominion lands $1,668,162, and all this counted as part of his consolidated revenue, so as to make his pet child surplus larger and trick it out in a new bit of finery. In the same year he spent $599,-780 for the surveying of lands. But he forgot to charge that up to revenue, but took the money out of capital account, making the surplus look just that much bigger. Of the revenue from Dominion lands $860,000 was for lands sold or homesteaded—that is lands that were absolutely alienated. Suppose that a railway company had a road which it cost $30,000,000 to build. Of course, that $30,000,000 would appear in the capital account. The yearly revenue and the yearly expenses would be counted on current account. If there were a surplus it might be spent in improvements. That would be all right. But, suppose the company one fine day sold its road and received $30,000,000 in cash, and suppose in its bookkeeping it took credit for this as current revenue, making no provision for its capital account—what would be thought of such bookkeeping as that? Yet this government is selling out and homesteading out lands, actually alienating them from the ownership of the Dominion, and are taking the proceeds and adding them, holus bolus to current revenue, while they charge the expenses on surveys to capital. These are some of the

methods of the new finance by which you can dress up surpluses and show large figures in your consolidated revenue account while reducing the apparent expenditures by the simple expedient of charging them to a different account—the account of capital.

All this is not merely subversive of every principle, conviction and pledge to which these hon. gentlemen gave utterance when in opposition, but it is a highhanded and extravagant way of treating the finances and resources of this country. It means that no provision is made against a rainy day, though everybody knows that there must be rainy days, there must be times of storm, for the country as for the individual. Already, the Minister of Finance is faced with loans of about $133,000,000, falling in between now and the year 1910, which must be met. To-day he is paying nearly 5 per cent for money with which to redeem a part of the debt of the country. The bank of England rate is 6 per cent, and in a week or two it may, or it may not, be 7 per cent. To-day, in all progressive countries industrial development is so strenuous, so all-compelling, that it is difficult to find money for the work, despite all the Cobalts, despite the immense production of silver and gold that is taking place the whole world over, greater than ever before in the world's history. In the United States to-day the call is everywhere for money, and the cost of money is rising. In Great Britain, in Russia and even in France, with the great development of the world which is in progress, money is likely to rise.

Yet the Minister of Finance, without laying by a single dollar, without making a single provision, walks forward to the days in the near future when he must meet the hundred millions and more, besides the immense obligations which he is taking with reference to public works, and especially the transcontinental railway which is now being built. If with all this there were the least signs that the ordinary expenses, the unnecessary expenses of this country were being pared down, diminished, brought under somewhat, we would have more hope. But no, there is extravagance in progressive ratio in all the smaller expenditures, with these immense obligations for larger expenditures, and for redemption of the debt which must absolutely come at higher rates of interest than we have been paying for the last few years. Why, Sir, a table I have with reference to the expenditures of the departments shows that, while the interest on the public debt in 1896 was $10,502,430 it is $10,814,697, not very much of an increase, owing to reduction in the rates of interest on the loans which have matured, loans at higher rates of interest which have been replaced by loans at smaller rates of interest, all other expenses are growing with mushroom rapidity. Let me read you the table:—

EXPENDITURE CONSOLIDATED FUND.

—	1896.	1906.	Increase per cent.
	$	$	
Interest on debt	10,502,430	10,814,697	3
Administration of Justice	758,270	1,171,358	54
Arts, agriculture and statistics	210,878	603,590	186
Civil government	1,396,628	1,911,611	37
Fisheries	427,251	968,702	126
Geological Survey	52,688	108,148	105
Immigration	120,199	842,688	601
Quarantine	95,247	624,758	555
Indians	880,408	1,198,350	37
Insurance Superintendents	10,039	18,146	81
Legislation	904,688	1,351,916	49
Lighthouse and coast service	466,058	2,530,307	421
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions	534,917	1,227,560	129
Militia and Defence	1,136,714	4,294,124	277
Miscellaneous	172,364	946,037	443
Mounted Police	533,014	1,004,079	88
N. W. T. Government	330,703	259,520	....
Ocean and river service	181,452	1,013,682	459
Penitentiaries	385,258	527,883	37
Pensions	86,080	179,023	106
Police	22,703	37,265	64
Public Works	1,299,769	7,484,715	508
Railways and Canals	126,444	452,058	250
Superannuation	311,232	356,280	14
Customs	896,332	1,548,384	73
Post Office	3,665,011	4,921,571	34
Railways and Canals (collection)	3,826,225	8,779,677	140
Trade and Commerce	9,462	63,625	551

EXPENDITURE CONSOLIDATED FUND—*Concluded.*

—	1896.	1906.	Increase per cent.
	$	$	
Weights and measures, &c	97,925	130,430	33
Inspection of staples	2,576	109,939	3,268
Excise	470,869	555,923	18
Dominion Lands	119,908	433,135	278
Steamboat inspection	26,321	37,576	42
Scientific institutions	81,700	284,271	248

Now that there should be an increase, a fair increase in these great departments of the public service, no one denies ; they will increase as the country increases, but I hold that these increases, many of them, are extravagantly great and inefficiently great, that much of the money which has been expended, has been misexpended, expended extravagantly, the money has been wasted before reaching the point of expenditure. I say that the Finance Department and the restraining departments of the government have not exercised the economy and supervision that they should have exercised over these expenditures. They have run riot under them, and the investigation we had last year shows the tendency, and shows the line in which they ran riot. So much, Mr. Speaker, for that side of the question.

Let me say a very few words on the commercial side. The increase of exports and the increase of imports are always looked to with satisfaction, but should never be given more prominence than is due to them. I ask the careful attention of the First Minister to the line of argument that he and the Minister of Finance take in endeavouring to prove that everything is right in the way of business and finance simply because, or largely because, he can point out to large exports and large imports. Large exports and large imports must be sifted before they are relied upon too much as evidence of good policy or of sound progress. You can make the exports larger per head in any country, and you can make the imports larger per head in any country by the simple process of selling more abroad and buying more abroad, and letting your home market on both those lines of buying and selling, fall into weakness. But does that help the country ? If, for instance, you were to abolish the protective principle in the tariff, as you pledged yourselves to do before you came into power, as the Farmer's and Granger's memorial placed before you the other day calls upon you to do to implement your promise; if you had eliminated the principle of protection from the tariff, and instead of manufacturing and buying in your own country, you had let other countries do the manufacturing for Canada, by sending your raw, or comparatively raw, materials abroad, you could have doubled and trebled the imports into this country, and the imports per head, and you would largely have increased the exports per head. But do you imagine that these would have been indexes of prosperity, and progress, and sound development in this country. We would always have been hewers of wood and drawers of water for other countries, we would always have been paying men in foreign countries to make what we wanted to use, instead of paying our own people to make a large portion of what we wanted to use. We would have had immeasurably higher export figures and immeasurably higher import figures, but they would not have been an index of the prosperity and progress of this country, quite the opposite. They would have been an index of the retardation of this country, of the decrease and diminution of its prosperity and of its development. So I say to produce that argument before people who do not look into, and have not the training to look into, the basis of things, is to produce a false impression. No, Sir, these exports and these imports are after all infinitesimal compared with the greater trade and the greater commerce. I asked my friend who sits behind me to-night what was the output of the manufacturing industries of this country. He told me that probably this year the output of the manufacturing industries of this country altogether would be between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000. Just take that into account for a moment. These industries make, we will say, $500,000,000 worth of goods. How many do they export ? Go to your trade and commerce, go to your navigation returns, turn up the columns and find out how many millions of manufactures are exported. Some $25,000,000. What becomes of the rest of the $500,000,000 that are made in the various industrial factories and establishments in this country. They do not figure in your foreign trade, the export is a mere flea bite. They are consumed by the great home market of this country. Take the farmers. Will anyone calculate how much farming produce is

raised by the farmers of this country, how many hundreds of millions have been raised in this last year ?

Then go to your reports and find how much they exported ; $120,000,000 worth. What becomes of all the other immense mass of stuff that is raised by the farmer ? It is consumed at home, it is bought or taken by the great home market of this country. So, on the home market of the country, its size and its capacity and its breadth, depends the prosperity and the progress and the development of the country. The others are but fleeting and illusory indices of the activity of trade, in a channel infinitely less important than is the domestic channel of trade in the great home markets of the country. Take the United States with its 80,000,000 of people and its almost incalculable output of industrial and farming products What a mere bagatelle figures in their foreign trade and what an immense and almost inconceivable quantity is consumed by the home market, keeping the life-blood of the country circulating continually to the upbuilding and growth of that great country which has been marvellous in all those particulars. Now why do I state that? First to meet the specious argument that the figures of the foreign trade have not any great value in estimating the prosperity of the country. But I have a deeper object than that. I say it is the wise statesman's wise policy to defend and broaden the home markets of this country for which he is legislating.

In the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and in the tariff which he has outlined, the features of which of course cannot be discussed by us from his imperfect reading of them, and could not be even if the complete tariff had been read, until we shall have had a full chance to examine it, one thing strikes me, and that is that no effort has been made to cope with one of the menaces to the home market of the country and to avert to as large an extent as we possibly can one of the menaces to the labour and the wage element of this country. If the government were to propose to go over to old Europe and import men, head, shoulders, body, legs, and bring them into this country and dump them here by the hundred thousands to compete with the labouring men of Canada how long would the government last that proposed to do that? But, Sir, is it anything worse to do that, any poorer policy than it is to import hundreds of millions of dollars worth of goods made by foreign labour? When these goods come into this country you do not see the heads and bodies and arms and legs of the labouring men brought in here to compete with our men, but you see their products competing with the products of our labouring men who might with wise provision be making these goods in this country and be receiving for their work on them wages to maintain themselves and their homes. So I say that to-day not one single effort seems to have been made to meet the menace to the home market of this country from the great nation to the south of us. Did you read, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Secretary Root's speech delivered about two weeks ago in a great centre in the United States? If you did not, I may tell you that it is well worth reading because it outlines a condition and a policy for one of the greatest, yes, the very greatest industrial country in the world. Mr. Root says two things, that protection has come to stay in the United States and that no party thinks otherwise —much the same here is it not, Mr. Speaker? The other thing that he says is that for the future the great need of the United States of America is foreign markets. Think of the immense productive power of the wheels and the engines which to-day are throbbing from the Pacific to the Atlantic and from the 49th parallel of latitude down to the confines of Mexico. They turn out everything that their 80,000,000 of people require, barring, of course, differences of climate and productions which will always induce importations no matter what tariff you put around a country. And, Sir, of the annual products of that vast manufacturing mechanism in the United States of America, three or four per cent would absolutely supply the whole of Canada's wants in some lines for the whole year. They have pretty well come up to the exigencies of their market, and to-day the best skill, the best brains, the best financial and business acumen of their country is trying to solve the problem of how to get into the markets of other countries, and significantly enough, as Mr. Root puts it, 'to get an entrance into the markets of other countries without sacrificing one single day of labour to the labouring men of our own country.' That is what they are after. Now, Sir, the United States of America sent into this country $180,000,000 worth of goods this last year and took out of this country in return somewhere about $80,000,000 worth of goods. That there is a balance of trade against us with this United States of America of one hundred or about one hundred millions of dollars. How often have we heard it stated by eminent financiers on the other side of the House that if you will not buy of a country therefore you shall not sell to that country, and yet the United States does not buy of this country, but sells to this country nearly three times the amount it buys from us. More than that, Sir, the tariff of the people to the south of us guards its home market by 50 per cent average duty on its dutiable goods. But when all that power seeks to find an entrance into the Canadian market it is barred by an average tariff of only 25 per cent, or a little less, upon goods from the United States of America.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman repeat his figures as to exports and imports of the United States trade for the last year ?

Mr. FOSTER. The exports and imports were $180,000,000 and $80,000,000 or somewhere about that. The first fact is that the United States puts an unfair disadvantage against us in their tariff; not only in their tariff but by their state regulations which also prevent Canadians from doing business in their country. There are some articles upon which they could take the duty off entirely and Canadian manufacturers and traders would think they could go right into the United States market, but the moment they cross the confines of a single state they would find state regulations of one kind or another which would paralyze and hamper them so that they could not do business. That has been already proven in several great lines of manufacturing in this country. The people of the United States are doubly protected in their own market in that way. From one end of Canada to the other there is a feeling that we ought not to submit to this disadvantage and that if we cannot have fair trade with the United States we have a perfect right to protect ourselves a little against the United States. Now, I do not say that the whole $180,000,000 worth, free and dutiable, coming from the United States to this country last year are of goods that we could manufacture or grow in Canada. The Minister of Finance tried to make it appear that there were people who said we ought to manufacture every thing in this country and ought to import nothing. Who, ever made a statement of that kind ? Who, ever tried to support a thesis of that kind ? The Liberal Conservative party does not say that, but the Liberal Conservative party does say: Wherever there is a single dollar's worth of goods that we can fairly well make in this country we had better make it here than employ the labour of a foreign country in its making. And so I say, that out of that immense quantity of goods which came from the United States it includes a large proportion of goods which could be made in this country by Canadian skill and Canadian capital, and that every dollar's worth that we can so make in this country we ought to make, and we ought to make it here in the interest of the wage earners of this country; yes, and in the interest of the farmers of this country as well. I could carry that out a little further but I do not want to trouble the House too long, and I go now to the last point that I wish to make a few remarks upon and that is the tariff.

Now, of course when my hon. friend the Minister of Customs had the kindness to hand me that tariff schedule just before I took my frugal meal, with the idea I suppose that I would thoroughly master it and digest it along with the bite I was eating and have it ready to be dished up here tonight at eight o'clock, he taxed my capabilities beyond what they are. I disclaim being able to do that. That envelope which he gave me lies safe in my desk in my room and it will lie there until I get time to study it.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). From the hasty glance you got of it, is it not a pretty good tariff ?

Mr. FOSTER. All I could notice from the hasty glance I got is that the paper it was written on was of good quality. What remarks I shall make upon the tariff will be therefore of the most general kind. But here again we find instruction and may be amusement. The tariff of 1897 was a good one, said the Finance Minister; the country has made marvellous progress under it, it worked successfully. Yes it did. But I want to ask the First Minister : Did the tariff of 1897 which was so successful and which produced such marvellous fruits, did it eliminate the principle of protection ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The word 'eliminate' is too strong a word altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. The word 'eliminate' is too strong a word, is it ? Did it allow the down trodden people of this country to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest ? Did it take the shackles off the trade of this country ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Did it abolish bounties in this country—by the way is the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) still a member of this cabinet; has he resigned within the last hour or two ? Don't you remember my right hon. friend when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (not then a minister) when some legislation with reference to bounties was being carried through in this House thought it encumbent upon him to rise and with all the authority of his party to declare that he then and there wished to give full notice to these bloated monopolists that he and his party would not for a single five minutes recognize any bounty legislation that was passed by the Liberal Conservative government and that when they came into power these bounties were to be cut off ruthlessly. And they came into power, and yet the bounties remained. Did that tariff of 1897 forbid the taking of money from the pocket of one and the handing of it over to the pocket of another by way of bounty or subsidy or tax ? Did it ? Did it do all those things which my right hon. friend and his party declared the Liberal tariff would do if the people would only put them into power ? The people took them at their word, put them into power

and none of these things took place. But a tariff was framed which was successful and under which marvellous progress has been made, and it was successful and the progress was made because it embodied, and embalmed, and perpetuated the principle of protection.

And now five years have passed, yea, ten years have been added to time and there comes a second revision of the tariff and we have the Finance Minister almost with his first word saying: There will be no radical change. And there is no radical change. And the Tariff Commission worked for a year, for two years, and spent a lot of money in their work, perambulated the country and then came and told parliament they were going into this matter so thoroughly that parliament would have to wait another six months, and then afterwards told parliament it would have to wait another year. Could they in the face of that come down to parliament now without making changes. And so they have made changes. They have gone a little way up the hill; they have come a little way down the hill; they have thrown up a little dirt here and thrown away a little dirt there; they have made changes, they have justified the expenditure on the Tariff Commission; but after all the Finance Minister says: There are no radical changes and on the average the tariff is just about the same as it was in 1897.

Then you have not eliminated the principle of protection, and you have not made it so that any man can buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and you, my right hon. friend, have not taken the shackles off that bond-slave which in Winnipeg you declared in such sympathetic tones was ill-used and down-trodden and waiting for the deliverer to come. You have not abolished bounties; on the contrary you have revived them and set them up after they had nearly gone down; put them back on their legs afresh, started them out for another course. All of these things you have done and you are still allowing some people to take money out of other people's pockets and to transfer it to their own, according to your own theory. And that is your reasoned conviction, and that is your settled policy now after ten years. I suppose the Minister of Finance is amongst that class, who, as he told us, are in favour of protection, but are not very willing to acknowledge that they are. I think the Minister of Finance might have added another class to that category.

He might have told us that there were a great many people who not only believed in protection, and were not quite willing to confess it, but who believed in protection and yet, like Peter, denied it when they were accused of it and began to curse and swear and leave their master. Those in the party opposite who are protectionists and say so and who stand by it, those who are protectionists, but are not quite willing to acknowledge it, and those who are protectionists and swear that they are not, take in about all that are in the party opposite. But outside, where the farmers congregate, where the grangers have their discussions and pass their resolutions, there are a good many old fashioned Liberals who yet are amazed and in perplexity as to what understanding they caught from these great leaders in the times before 1896 and as to where they are at at this blessed moment, following those leaders still, who are in neither of the classes that have been defined here, but in that class that does not believe in protection and wants them to go back to the elimination of protection from the tariff entirely.

No wide difference now, the Finance Minister says, on the basis of the tariff. Very well, let it go at that; I am glad it is there. It is a great glory for the Liberal-Conservatives everywhere in this country. It is with great pride that we recall the fact that, starting out in 1876 a little band, persecuted on every hand, standing for the principle of protection as a vital principle in the development of this country, we fought the beasts at Ephesus, fought the giants in the party opposite, on the hustings, at the polls, through the newspapers, through the country and here in this House; being instant in season and out of season, reading them object lessons, appealing to their convictions and to their sound intelligence and good reasoning and at last after twenty-five years, we have converted the country. And now the Liberal party comes up manfully—well, fairly manfully—on this evening of November 30, 1906, and declares that there is no wide difference now between us, that we are all protectionists, that the only difference is as to what we may consider sufficient for the items on which we are engaged.

Well, we are to have a general tariff and we are to have a British preference—and on this I pause for a thought or two. The Finance Minister declares that it is kept, and if anything strengthened. I am not going to quarrel with him on that; but I suppose he has made it up with the Minister of Agriculture and with the First Minister when he declared here to-night that we would all be glad if we could get the mutual preference. Why, I thought the First Minister had taken occasion to declare in Great Britain that what he gave he gave as a free gift, and that he would not on any account have Great Britain depart from its old policy of free trade, which was so good for Great Britain, in order to give us anything. Coming out of the very midst of the fray, he gave to them the sage advice of a contestant and to a certain extent a victor, when he said to them: Do not take up protection; I come from a country that has adopted it, and I tell you it would be a bane and a curse to your country; do not take it. And the Minister of Agriculture also took occasion, in the great city of Mont-

real, to send his powerful opinion across the Atlantic to the effect that the farmers of this country did not want a mutual preference even if they could have it. You know the strongest argument that is used in Great Britain against you if you put before them the idea of a mutual preference ? They say : it cannot be so ; Canada does not want it—why ? Because Sir Wilfrid said so and Mr. Fisher said so ; why do you ask for a mutual preference which we do not want and which Canada does not want ? Why should there be any more ado about it ?

The Minister of Finance says we want it, but we must not press for it. Well, what about the cattle embargo which the Minister of Agriculture has been pressing for for many years, which the member for Montreal has made two or three speeches about in this House, berating the people of Great Britain because they do not take it off ? However we have now the authoritative statement of the Minister of Finance that we would be glad to have a mutual preference and hope it will come, but we do not think it well that we should press for it now that it has become a party question in Great Britain. Well, there may be something in that—I am not going to carry that any further.

One thing I am glad of is that the flat rate has been abolished. I never thought it was a scientific or sensible way—applying a certain fixed tariff to everything, no matter what the conditions of the item or the industry were. I think it is far more sensible that the amount of the preference should be stated opposite the item to which it refers, so that there may be some fair and reasonable apportionment of it according to the state of the industry or the class of articles which are affected.

When we come to the intermediate tariff I confess that I do not quite understand what is meant by that and what the minister proposes to do. At first I thought it was a big stick which he was going to use à la President Roosevelt to make certain countries give us better trade relations. I am not going to criticise it strongly ; it may be of some use ; but at the present time I cannot see where it is going to specially benefit us, from the very fact that we are bound by the most favoured nation clause. For instance, if Belgium or some other country whose tariff is very low were allowed to come in under the intermediate tariff, then under the most favoured nation clause we would have to give the same concession to all the countries to which that clause applied; and while it might be a good thing so far as one country was concerned, it might be a bad thing to open the door to all the countries that come under the favoured nation clause. Again, you are going to give a British preference ; but what kind of a preference will it be, if you are firm and straightforward, to give Great Britain an advantage of fifteen per cent on a certain article, to get them to arrange their trade on that basis, and then some day by an order in council to let the United States or some other country have the very same preference in our market ? The United States does not come in under the most favoured nation clause, but it might be done for some other country. Anyway, it will lend itself to instability and uncertainty, The very stability which the Minister of Finance argued for with reference to the tariff is just as necessary to individual items of the tariff as it is to the whole tariff; and what stability is there when you say to Great Britain and other countries, here is what you have to pay to come into our market, and when they have made their arrangements on that basis, you suddenly pass an order in council giving other countries the same thing, and taking away the ground of preference to Great Britain entirely ? Then as to stability and certainty, what set of traders will ever know what they are going to have ? No preference trader will ever know exactly where he is situated and for how long. There is great objection to order in council tariff legislation. There is great objection to the Governor in Council putting a nation on a favourite footing without leave or license of parliament. However much faith we may have in the wisdom of the government, I think that this is a matter which parliament ought to hold very carefully within its own control. When I was not in the government I never thought that we had all the business wisdom and ability in the country. No government has. In fact what a government generally misses is the keen, well founded business knowledge of practical business men. It is better that these things should come before parliament where we will have focused upon them the best opinions from all parts of the country.

Then as to bounties I do not know that I need read the views of Sir Richard Cartwright. I have them here.

Mr. BERGERON. Read some part anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one part I would like to read because it has reference to my right hon. friend, and I would like to see the bouquet presented to him again which was presented in 1902 in this House. Sir Richard Cartwright said:

> I think the House should understand one thing, and that is this : That protection—at any rate as they practise it—and corruption are practically convertible terms. I do not mean to say that a government may not be corrupt and yet not protectionist. They may be. But I do say that human nature, being as it is, it is almost impossible for a government to be protectionist and escape being corrupt. And I will add this further. I will add that while I think protection and corruption are practically inseparable, I likewise believe that protection and true freedom are all but absolutely

incompatible. On that I will give you words of another more eloquent than any I can utter. Here are some remarks which are very much indeed to the purpose. That gentleman whom I quote said :

I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that that policy may be resumed in the good Saxon word 'freedom' in every sense of the term—freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life.

These gentlemen opposite talk of freedom, but before a man can get a steel rail into this country he has to pay $7 on every ton. Freedom—when he has to pay up to 37½ per cent before he can bring some goods into this country.

Freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life. . . . In the American republic you have the line of cleavage which exists between the Liberal party and the Conservative party—the question of free trade—we stand for freedom, they stand for restriction. They stand for servitude ; we stand for freedom.

I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage—yea, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage. Not in the same degree perhaps, but in the same manner. . . . In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master, who takes away, not every cent of profit, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings for which you toil and sweat.

In the name of the poor bond slave, a slave, physically and otherwise, enshackled, according to my hon. friend of that day, and enshackled yet by this protective policy of the government, twice reiterated and now made permanent, to-night I ask him look round and strike the shackles off that poor bond slave without further delay.

Mr. BERGERON. Who spoke like that ?

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend the leader of this government. He was then erecting a platform by which he could get into office. He did erect it and got into office on it and then kicked it away the first opportunity. But the farmer—he gets 2½ per cent reduction on implements. But he does not get anything on his sugar. To sweeten his sugar, however, you give him rice. Sir Richard Cartwright proposed sundry resolutions in this House, with the consent of the party opposite, and amongst them was one which was pressed once, twice or thrice, in which he and the party with him declared that cottons should be free for the people of this country. The cotton lords should be made come down. Yet cottons have been boosted up, if anything, a little by my hon. friend. He has not taken anything off but added a little on. Two and one-half per cent is taken off agricultural implements. A man buys one agricultural implement, he buys of the agent who is a retail trader, who buys it from the wholesale trader who buys it from the maker. I would like to ask my hon. friend how much cheaper the farmer will get his agricultural implement because of this 2½ per cent reduction. If they wanted to help the farmer, why did they not take off 10 per cent ? Then they would have done something, but they will now go to the farmer and say : Ah, you should be very grateful to us and vote for us because of what we have given you. But there is another set of people who make these implements wholesale, and to whom 2½ per cent is taken off each of the thousand machines they make and cuts a large hole in their profit and perhaps changes their profit into a loss. That the government will have to settle with these people. But they have tried to make things pleasant for the farmer by giving him a reduction which will not benefit him to the extent of ninety-nine one-hundredths of a dollar.

They have however made a change in the sugar duties. They have added to the duties on sugar. Sir, it is impossible to add to the price of the raw material without adding to the price of the manufactured article. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) cannot impose a higher rate on raw sugar and have the refined sugar sold to the consumer at the same price as before. It I had anything to say about this tariff at this time, it would be that it is a kind of scrappy, choppy concern. There seems to have been the belief that some change should be made in form, if not in substance ; that there should be motion, whether there was progress or not; that there should be great activity, whether something was accomplished or whether nothing was accomplished. It is like taking good, wholesome beef, and, instead of serving it as a joint, English fashion, you chop it and mix it with condiments, and serve it up as an entirely new dish. The criticism of the items of the tariff, of course, will have to come when we get into committee of the whole. But, so far as this new tariff as a whole is concerned, it seems to me that it has no decided trend. These hon. gentlemen made a protective tariff in 1897, which is now re-established in 1906. While many changes are made in detail, there is no change in the trend of the tariff either more toward protection or clearly in the direction of the opposite principle. I would rather have something which indicated a road to be travelled, rather than this business of going round and round in a circle establishing nothing as a trade policy with an outlook upon the future.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—COAL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any further news of the strike at Lethbridge? I would like to know also whether the deputy Minister of Labour is at Lethbridge or where is he?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no further news with regard to the strike.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it true that the deputy Minister of Labour has gone to the United States?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot inform my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) as to that. It is quite possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what purpose?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In connection with matters arising out of the strike, of course.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. To confer with the labour leaders there?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Why not, if it will help toward the end in view?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not make any objection—

Mr. FIELDING. I was answering the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes).

EVIDENCE BEFORE THE TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the government what they propose to do with regard to the evidence taken before the tariff commission? Has it ever been laid upon the table of the House?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has it been printed?

Mr. FIELDING. No. It was referred to the committee on printing, and my recollection is that they did not recommend it to be printed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask also what business will be taken up to-morrow? Are we to have a continuation of this debate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Mr. MILLER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 30, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) called my attention yesterday to an item in the Trade and Navigation returns on which I promised to give him information. I might have done it privately, but perhaps some other member will experience the same difficulty as he has. I would therefore say that in the Printing Bureau they keep these forms standing and pages 22 and 23 had apparently escaped the notice of the proofreader. They are the same as for the older returns but instead of being for 1903, 1904 and 1905 they are for 1904, 1905 and 1906 in the order I have mentioned. I may also add that I understand there has been a copy of the old tariff placed on the desk of every member but if every hon. gentleman has not got one I have some copies with me and I will be pleased to let him have one.

Mr. SPROULE. What about copies of the new one?

Mr. PATERSON. They will be published, I suppose.

INDEX OF TARIFF.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance when it is probable that we shall have the index to which he referred?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I will endeavour to let the hon. gentleman know later in the day. I understood it was well advanced but I would not like to make a definite statement.

COAL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). Concerning the coal strike at Lethbridge I beg to inform the House that we have received a telegram from the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The following telegram was sent yesterday by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the House, to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy,
President Canadian Pacific Railway Company,
Montreal.

I am informed that there is a coal famine at Bladworth, Saskatchewan, and that there is coal now available at Lethbridge. May I ask you if at all possible to send immediately by

special train, with rights over all traffic, coal to Bladworth and some other places in the same situation. Condition of things is very serious. Please answer.

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Answer :

Winnipeg, Manitoba, November 29, 1906.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier, Ottawa.

Afraid that even if the mission of the premier of Saskatchewan and the Deputy Minister of Labour to Mr. Mitchell at St. Paul be successful it will be some days before Lethbridge can furnish any quantity of coal. Meantime the provincial authorities and Mr. Whyte are co-operating with a view to preventing any suffering for want of fuel. We are drawing upon our own coal supply at Fort William and forwarding rapidly as possible to points designated by the authorities. Shipment made to Bladworth Monday should reach there to-morrow. Anticipating present condition because of strikes, instructions were given end of September to put every available car into coal traffic even at the risk of delaying grain shipments. Had this not been done there would indeed have been a famine. As it is Mr. Whyte does not think that you need fear any serious difficulties.

(Sgd.) T. G. SHAUGHNESSY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date of that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yesterday. I received late yesterday a telegram from the deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. King, informing me that he had received a previous telegram which I had addressed to him at a certain point near the Canadian border in the west. In that telegram he advised me that he had received my telegram and that what I had told him as regards an interview which I had had Wednesday afternoon with Mr. Nanton, the managing director of the coal company, would have the desired effect; that is to say would have the effect of putting an end to the strike. I inform the House that I expect now to receive a telegram to that effect from Mr. King at any moment.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, for the House to go into committee, to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. HENRY HORTON MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, it must, I am sure, have been with very great pride and with very great pleasure and gratification that the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) yesterday delivered to us his eleventh budget speech, great pride and great gratification to have delivered in such splendid form a speech containing such splendid matter, a speech full of such magnificent facts. If it was with great pleasure and with great satisfaction that this speech was delivered by the minister (Mr. Fielding) I may say that it was listened to by every loyal and patriotic Canadian with pleasure, gratification and satisfaction just as great. It was listended to with pleasure and gratification by those of us who heard it delivered in this House ; it will be listened to with pleasure just as great by those who have the privilege of listening to it through the medium of the press. A revision of the tariff must always be a matter of great difficulty. It will as a matter of course be impossible in revising the tariff to please the opposition in this House, an eagerly critical opposition, always willing, always ready to censure and find fault. In the daily press we noticed the other day that our Conservative friends in the House held a caucus and it is reported that one of their number enthusiastically stated that they had decided to decide nothing. That, Sir, I believe has been the policy of our Conservative friends and is likely to be their policy, they decide to decide nothing. They decide to decide nothing save this, that in the matter of the revision of the tariff, whatever course the government may take, they will be prepared to adopt the other issue and to find fault with equal vigour no matter in what direction the government may go.

It is not only difficult to please the opposition in the House but it is difficult to please all the people of the country or indeed to thoroughly and completely please any of the people. Every one is apt to be pleased with some things, nobody will be pleased with everything. At no time does the selfishness of human nature become more apparent than during the time of the revision of the customs tariff. Take a family of brothers, if you will, brought up in the same home, whether that home be in the city or upon the farm, brought up amidst the same surroundings, equally honest, equally intelligent, equally patriotic. Some of these brothers may go into the world and become farmers. They will be almost certain to become advocates of a low tariff or of free trade. Others of them, perhaps, become manufacturers and they will be just as certain to be in favour of a high tariff and high duties. The peculiarity of the case is this that none of those men are intentionally or even consciously selfish. The farmer believes in his heart that it will be most conducive not only to his success and prosperity but also to the success and to the prosperity of the country that there should be a low tariff or free trade. The manufacturer just as sincerely and as honestly believes that it is important in the interests of the whole country as well as in his interests that there be a high protective tariff, But, Sir, even those who are theoretical protectionists, do not always agree. For instance, we find that men whose business it is to manufacture lumber, believe that we should have a high tariff on lumber, but the manufacturer whose business it is to take

that lumber and manufacture it into furniture or other wooden goods, thinks that lumber, as his raw material, should come into the country free of duty. In the same way the manufacturer whose business it is to manufacture tin plate believes there ought to be a protective tariff that will protect him in the manufacture of that tin plate, but on the other hand the manufacturer, however ardent a protectionist he may otherwise be, who uses the tin plate as his raw material, believes it should enter free.

A government in considering a tariff revision should not be influenced by any unworthy motives; it should not be a matter of the most votes or of the greatest support, but of careful and impartial consideration of the best interests of all the people, and of the upbuilding of the whole country. Some people have the idea, some people say that governments have little to do either way with a country's prosperity either in adding to it, or detracting from it. I know it is true that governments cannot, that governments do not, that governments never will and never can bring prosperity and wealth and success to the man who is lazy, to the man who is extravagant, to the man who is without brains or without character; but surely a government collecting and expending year by year and every year some $80,000,000 will have something to do with making times better or worse, with making it easier or more difficult to attain success. It is not only a matter of collecting and distributing year by year large sums of money but it is a matter of fixing prices and thereby to a large extent directing and deciding to what markets we shall sell and from what persons we shall buy.

What then shall be done in the matter of the revision of the tariff is a serious and an important question, not to be lightly considered or hastily answered, a question, Sir, that necessitates and demands careful inquiry, patient research and wise deliberation, and I believe that the tariff submitted to us yesterday by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), revised as it has been, shows every evidence of being the result of that careful inquiry, patient research, wise deliberation, honest and impartial consideration of the will of all the people. We are proud to realize what, as Canadians, we have perhaps been far too slow in realizing the wonderful extent, the wonderful richness, and the wonderful variety of our natural resources, rich in timber, rich in mines, rich in fisheries by salt water and by fresh, rich, Sir, in agricultural lands of vast extent, devoted or capable of being devoted to the raising of every kind of farm product, live stock and fruit; rich, too, in water-powers and waterways, affording or capable of affording to us cheap power and cheap transportation. Everything appears to have been generously provided to enable us to become what I am confident we will become and what in these days we are fast becoming, a great agricultural country, a great commercial country and a great manufacturing country.

The very extent, the very widespread abundance and the great and wonderful variety of these natural resources but add and add largely to the difficulty of the task that is now before us. The interest of the lumberman, the interest of the farmer, the interest of the miner, the interest of the fisherman and the interest of the manufacturer, will not always, narrowly weighed and narrowly considered, harmonize or be in accord. Yet in a broader sense it is true that to a certain extent at least we cannot help or assist any one industry or branch of industry without coming to the assistance and help of every industry and every branch of every industry, and on the other hand, we cannot do anything that will cripple or retard the progress of any industry or branch of industry without in some degree crippling and marring and retarding every other. The government then must not consider and support only the interests of any one or of any number less than all of our many industries or line of industry. It is just as necessary for our people, however varied and conflicting their interests, however different their vocations, or callings, however different may be the investments of their capital—it is just as necessary for our Canadian people to learn to give and take, to live and let live, to reasonably and loyally consider each the interest of the other. As we have a great variety of industries founded on our varied resources, so we have a great extent of territory, creating again difference of interests because of difference of locality, of difference of soil, of difference of resources, difference of climate and difference of population.

A wise and faithful government must consider not merely the interest of any one province, but rather the interests of the whole broad, wide Dominion north and south, east and west; and the people of the several provinces realize, I believe, that, whatever our differences, we are one people, each desiring and striving not only for his own individual or local success and prosperity, but also the success and prosperity of the whole Dominion of Canada. I believe, Sir, that in our tariff regulations we ought to be guided more by our own experience than by any matter of theory. If we find ourselves enjoying unprecedented prosperity, as we do to-day; it would be unwise for us to change the conditions under which we prosper merely because of a mere matter of theory, whether it be the theory of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, the Hon. George E. Foster, or any other political economist either ancient or modern. I believe, Sir, that as we must be guided rather by our experience than by theory, so we must be guided rather by our own experience than by the example of any other country. If we are to be guided by

the example of other countries, then some will point us to Great Britain and will say that because Great Britain has prospered as a free trade country, therefore we ought to have free trade. But others just as reasonably point us to the United States and will say that because the United States with a very high tariff has prospered, therefore we should seek prosperity through having a very high tariff. But, Sir, I take it that as our conditions are not similar to those in Great Britain and are different from the conditions that prevail in the United States, so our tariff should be of our own creation and should be adapted to our peculiar circumstances and conditions. I was glad to hear the hon. Minister of Finance at the beginning of his speech yesterday say that there would be no radical change in the tariff. Sir, the people of this country are neither requiring nor demanding, and I believe they were not expecting any radical change. The 'Monetary Times,' one of the chief commercial papers of Canada, published in the city of Toronto, contained in its issue of November 10, an article upon the tariff session. I quote from that article this one paragraph—and I may say that the 'Monetary Times' advocates and represents the interests of the commercial, manufacturing and industrial world rather than the interests of the farmers :—

> One or two lines of industry are crying for more assistance, such as woollen and cotton manufacturing. But, on the whole, prosperity is so general that a radical change in the tariff policy would be like flying in the face of Providence.

Now, Sir, I believe that in revising the tariff as it has been revised without radical change, we have been perhaps flying in the face of the opposition in this House; but I would sooner fly in the face of the opposition than, in the words of the 'Monetary Times,' fly in the face of Providence. The 'Farmers' Advocate,' the leading agricultural paper of Canada, published in the city of London, Ontario, and in the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba, contains in its issue of November 1, a short article on the revision of the tariff, that article which is very short, being as follows:

> 'Moderate tariff a necessary evil,' is the way we epitomized our views on the tariff question in an editorial heading last spring. We still hold to that view, but wish to add that we regard existing schedules as none too moderate, and some of them might well be lowered somewhat in the coming revision.

I am pleased that the view of that agricultural paper is exactly the view of the hon. the Finance Minister; and exactly what that paper advocated is what the Minister of Finance has done, that is, he has lowered to a reasonable extent the duties on some of the items. The article goes on to say:

> We do not want to see Canada's natural resources exploited to be manufactured for us abroad, neither do we wish to see ourselves in the position of a one-industry nation. Symmetrical development of all lines of activity is to be desired, but we do not want and will not endorse any attempt to augment tariff tolls for the sake of making a few manufacturers rich at the expense of the general consumer.
>
> Most strongly of all, we repudiate the gold-brick suggestion——

The 'Farmers' Advocate,' in making reference to that gold brick bargain, must have had in mind some of the utteranes of our genial friend the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson):

> Most strongly of all, we repudiate the gold-brick suggestion that farmers should join in demand for more protection, which, in the nature of the case, can do us little good, and is only desired in order that our friends, the manufacturers, may have a show of justification for requesting increased duties on their products, to enable them to squeeze consumers the tighter. Manufacturers are weakening their case and alienating fair-minded support by employing chaff arguments to cover their snouts while reaching greedily for the bin of grain.

I think, Sir, that the farmers of this country accept it as true, that an increase of duty upon farm produce cannot be of use to the farmers. There are perhaps two instances in which an increase of tariff duties or the regulations of the Customs Department have been of some use to the farmers of Canada. The one was in regard to importations to Canada of American hogs. In that case the government acted very promptly to the great satisfaction and benefit of the Canadian farmers. The other was in regard to the importation of American scrub horses, which not only came into competition with horses raised on Canadian farms, but hindered the raising of the standard of horse breeding in the country. While, as the 'Monetary Times' has said, some few industries are asking for greater assistance, the manufacturers of this country generally are, I think, well satisfied. And well they may be, for notwithstanding the gloomy predictions and pessimistic utterances of Sir Charles Tupper when the first Fielding tariff was introduced, there has never been a period in Canada when the manufacturers have had such splendid success as they have had during the last ten years. There never was a time when they were so enlarging their establishments or extending their productions. There never was a time when they were working overtime to the extent that they are to-day, or when they were further behind in the filling of their orders.' I was talking the other day to the manager of one of the largest of the Canadian cement factories, a gentleman who usually votes Conservative, and he said to me : 'We do not want one cent additional protection ; we have to-day all the protection we ought to have or can reasonably ask for.' He added: 'We would be pleased if we could secure better railway rates.' I call-

ed his attention to the fact that a Liberal government has established a Railway Commission, and advised him, if he had any grievance with regard to the railways, to carry it to the Railway Commission, where it would be fairly and honourably dealt with. I was talking a little while ago with a furniture manufacturer in my own town who was advocating an increase of duty on furniture. I said I could not advocate an increased duty on furniture; I did not think the customers to whom he sold his goods ought to be burdened with an increased duty, or that it would be a benefit to him as a manufacturer of furniture. An increase of the tariff on furniture would only make it easier for what I deem to be the greatest curse to-day in Canadian business life—the company promoter—to multiply the number of Canadian furniture manufacturers and thus cause over production which would result in an unnatural and unwholesome competition.

True not every manufacturing industry in this country is prospering to-day. No tariff can or ought to endeavour to bolster up and maintain manufacturing industries which are labouring against the heavy disadvantage of insufficient capital or lack of skill or which are endeavouring to manufacture against very great natural advantages. There are in this country factories endeavouring to manufacture against natural disadvantages so great that no government would be justified in endeavouring to pamper and feed them simply because, without that pampering, they cannot and will not succeed. Again it is true that in some cases American and other foreign manufacturers have sold their output to Canadian dealers, not because of the cheapness of their goods but because of the quality. I do not want to say a word reflecting upon Canadian manufacturers. I believe they manufacture their goods, as a general rule, just as honestly and just as carefully as those which come from the factories of any people over the broad earth. But there have been instances where American and other foreign manufacturers have sold their goods to Canadian consumers, and the Canadians have bought them even at higher prices rather than from Canadian factories, because the foreign goods, even at the higher prices, in the long run prove more economical and cheaper. In that case the Canadian manufacturer, finding difficulty in making sales, must not seek a remedy in the tariff but use greater care in manufacturing and in choosing his material.

I was very pleased to notice that in the revised tariff there is retained the machinery which has been used in the past and may be used at any time in the future, when occasion requires, for the suppression of combines. I was not less pleased to find that the dumping clause has been retained—not only retained but made to apply, not only to goods from the outside that are subject to duty but also to those that are on the free list, and that thus, to even a greater extent than in the past, the clause has been made a sure means of preventing Canada from becoming a slaughter market for the over-production of outside factories.

In the matter of iron and steel bounties, I realize that to-day, in many parts of this country, bounties to the manufacturers of iron and steel are not popular, but I was pleased to hear the minister make the statement that the various industries which have been built up and maintained by means of the Dominion bounties have paid into the treasury of this country, through the tariff, sums equal in extent to the bounties, and which otherwise would not have been paid. I have hoped it would not be necessary to renew for any further period or longer term the bounties on iron and steel manufactured from foreign ore, but I am pleased to see that the amount of that bounty is a great deal less than the original figures, and that the extension of the term has only been made for the short period of three and a half years. I look upon the bounty on iron and steel manufactured from our Canadian ore as quite a different matter. We have in this country great iron deposits and are hoping that the time may soon come, if it is not already here, when we may successively smelt our iron ore by means of electricty. As a general rule, these iron deposits are in regions and tracts not fit for agriculture or cultivation. And if in places that are now vast wastes we may, by some encouragement, build up great industrial undertakings and establishments, that shall manufacture their goods from our Canadian ores, thus keeping the money within the country ; and if by building up those large institutions we may increase our home market for our farm products and the products of the looms and machines of our manufacturing establishments, it will be worth our while, I think, to give that encouragement.

I was again pleased to see that the iron and steel bounties are so arranged as not to provide prey for the greedy iron trusts of the American republic.

I was also pleased to notice that gasoline has been placed on the free list. This may perhaps by some be deemed a small and unimportant matter. But, as has been pointed out by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), gasoline is coming much more largely into use from year to year. It is more and more being used for small powers on the farms, in the boats of the fishermen, in the printing offices of the country, and in many other places where small powers are required. And it is a matter of still greater importance, because the greater number of our manufacturers of gasoline engines to-day are manufacturing

them in such a manner that, with but little cost and trouble, they may be arranged so as to use denatured alcohol. The matter of denatured alcohol was referred to in the budget speech, but as that is rather a matter of excise than of customs tariff, I shall at present pass it by without remark.

I must say that we are particularly pleased to notice that binders and mowers and scythes and spades and shovels and other articles used by our farmers are benefited by a reduction in duty to the extent of 2½ per cent. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rather ridiculed the idea of a reduction of 2½ per cent, and said it would be little or no value to the farmer. He said that our agricultural implements are sold by the manufacturers to the wholesale merchants, by the wholesale merchants to the retailers, and by the retailers to the people who use them. As a matter of fact, this is not the case. Our agricultural implements are sold directly from the manufactory to the man who uses them in his field, through the medium of an implement agent, who is usually paid a commission. And in these days of very keen competition among the vendors of agricultural implements, I believe that every cent of that reduction will go into the pockets of the farmers as was intended. But my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asks why not make that reduction to the extent of 10 per cent. I notice that he is not in his seat to-day. If he were I would ask him to state honestly and frankly whether, if he were in control, he would give the farmers a reduction to the extent of 10 per cent on agricultural implements. I would ask him to state frankly not only to the farmers but to the manufacturers, whether he would grant such a reduction. But I am confident that should the farmers want a reduction of duty on their implements, they will not go to the hon. gentleman or party to which the hon. gentleman belongs.

I am sure it must have been exceedingly gratifying to the hon. Minister of Finance and every member of the cabinet, as well as to every well wisher of the country that every single department in the government last year showed a substantial surplus. But I remember that when the Finance Minister delivered his budget speech last session, he announced a surplus in the Post Office Department not so large as the one he announced yesterday. And he offered then the suggestion that, in his opinion, it was a question whether it was in the best interest of the country that that particular department should show a surplus. Sir, I am delighted that the Post Office Department has been so successfully administered by the present Postmaster General and his predecessors in office that the old time deficits have been entirely wiped away, and that, notwithstanding, a substantial decrease in the postal rates, we have to-day the magnificent surplus of over $1,000,000, But, I would like to see that surplus, or a large part of it, in time to come, devoted to a still more rapid extension and improvement of the rural mail service. And I am exceedingly pleased, and I am sure the people of Canada will be pleased, to know that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is contemplating the establishment of a postal express that will be a matter of great convenience to every Canadian whether he dwell in the city or upon the farm. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) a former Minister of Finance, with all his experience, with all his craftiness in manipulating words and handling figures, wriggled and twisted and turned to every point of the compass in delivering his speech last night, in the vain endeavour to detract from or obscure the splendid showing of the Minister of Finance. But the case the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had to handle was a very difficult case indeed. He had to do something; and, as there was nothing else to do, he endeavoured to throw a mist before the eyes of the people of the country by a jumbled mass of figures. His first censure was that the Reform party, previous to 1896, said, if we are placed in power it will be our pride and our duty as well to give a reduction in the tariff, and that, coming into power it did not adhere to that attitude.

Sir, I claim that that promise has been fulfilled and that there has been a reduction in the tariff—under the general tariff somewhat of a reduction, and under the British preference a great reduction. Perhaps the change was not so great as was anticipated either by leading members of the Reform party of that day or by the general public. But, Sir, it must be remembered that changed conditions require, as well as excuse, change of method and change of attitude, and the party or the government that is unable to change its method or its attitude, because of changed conditions ought not to be entrusted with the management of the country's affairs. Even if the change was due, not so much to changed conditions as to the modification of ideas, the people of this country will not be so anxious to know whether the views held by the Reform party previous to 1896, or by some members of that party, were the correct or the best views, or whether their attitude then was the best attitude as to know what they do know—that when the Reform party was placed in power in 1896, when upon them was cast the responsibility of government, they thought wise thoughts, that their actions were wise actions and their attitude was the proper attitude, which, being steadfastly continued to this day, has brought

a degree of prosperity such as this country never before rejoiced in.

It is charged that there has been an increased expenditure and an increase of taxation. Sir, there has not been an increase of taxation. There has been an increase of revenue and an increase of expenditure, but there has been a decrease of taxation. I think that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and every man behind him or beside him will admit that the percentage of duty collected is less to-day than it was under the old Conservative regime. The hon. member for North Toronto has often said, and has truly and correctly said, that the principles and methods that may be properly and profitably employed to conduct an ordinary business can be properly and profitably employed in conducting the political affairs of a nation. Let me use an illustration. A young man comes to the city of Ottawa. He engages as a vendor of smallwares and notions. He has little or no expense—he has no rent to pay, no taxes, no clerk hire, no advertising bills. But, after a time, that young man leases a small shop and places therein a larger stock of goods than before. Now, some of his pessimistic friends will say: His expenses will be greater and he will suffer financial ruin. But I see the young man prosper in his larger venture. And, after a while, I see him take larger premises, employ a staff of clerks, establish a system of delivery rigs, and pay higher insurance and taxes and pay out large sums for advertising. But still, time after time, he enlarges his business. At every enlargement he increases his expenses, and his friends say that surely he will be ruined. But, in time, I see him conducting a splendid, prosperous wholesale business, making money at a rapid rate and enjoying every degree of prosperity. And so, when this country was controlled by the hon. member for North Toronto and his friends they were selling smallwares and notions—mostly notions. But to-day, under the splendid management of our present Prime Minister and the able, honest and businesslike men associated with him, our country is conducting a splendid, thriving, prosperous wholesale business, the benefit of which goes to every Canadian citizen.

A certain man of my acquaintance is engaged in business as a small manufacturer. His wife is somewhat demented. Every time that poor woman sees a roll of raw material go into the premises to be manufactured into the goods which are the output of the shop she becomes more and more violently insane, believing that the money that goes to pay for the raw material is lost and that they will come to poverty. It is hard for her to realize that her husband is making for her to-day a better living than she ever had and that, year after year, he is laying up money in the bank. Sir, there are in this country to-day, I venture to think, other crazy people besides that poor demented woman.

The hon. member for North Toronto, in his speech last night, said that when they were in power they were face to face with two alternatives. Now, what were the two alternatives? He said: Either more tax or more debt, and we said: More debt. Now, Sir, that was an honest confession, good, I think, for the soul, a very frank avowal. We said more debt, and surely it is true that those were the days of more debt when by leaps and bounds our debt was increasing year by year. But, Sir, if just those two alternatives seemed to face the Conservative party ten years ago when they were relieved from the worries, toils, anxieties, and the honour and emoluments of office, another alternative seemed to appear to the great Reform party of Canada into whose hands the people entrusted the government. That great Reform party of 1896, not less great to-day, said: We will get busy, we will stir things up, we will put life, and energy, and snap into the management of the business affairs of this country; we will set in motion the wheels of progress, we will appoint a minister to look after the great west, that great lone land, who shall develop it, open it out, and discover it to the people of the world; we will stop the emigration of our best people to the United States in quest of employment, we will turn the tide the other way, and we will bring to our shores American citizens, people from Great Britain, people from Germany, and people from many other of the best countries of Europe. We will advertise our country, we will let the world know that we live, we will let the world know what we have to offer. We will deepen our canals, we will give to the great west a competitive railway, we will lower our postage rates and enable our business men to communicate one with another at lesser cost. We will provide for the labouring man of this country; we will establish a department of labour and put it in charge of a minister of the Crown. We will look after the farming interests of this country. We will not appoint, as did our Conservative friends, to be Minister of Agriculture, a brewer of ale or a doctor of medicine; but we will put at the head of that very important department, to consider the welfare, progress and success of our farmers, a man, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, who, as Minister of Agriculture has never had an equal, either in any Dominion government or in any provincial government prior or subsequent to confederation, with the one single exception of the Hon. John Dryden. They said, the Reform party in 1896, we will attract the attention, we will touch the heart of the old mother land by giving to her a preference

in our market. They said again: Whatever may be the different origins of the various elements of our population, from whatever people they may have sprung, from whatever countries may have come their forbears, whatever blood may flow in their veins, whatever language they may naturally speak, or at whatever altar they may worship, we will do away for ever with the dissensions, quarrels, and bickerings of race and creed, and a united people shall pull together for the greatest development of this grand, great Dominion of Canada.

Sir, by choosing this other alternative, by adopting these business methods, we were able to get along, and have to this day been able to get along, without any increase of taxation and without any increase of debt. I think, Sir, that the Reform party chose the better alternative. I say less debt. The hon. member for North Toronto advocated rather an increase of debt. I am glad to be able to tell the people of this country that, man for man, individual for individual, we as Canadians are owing to-day in our national debt, $3 a head less than we were ten years ago, or $15 less for every family of five people. The hon. member who spoke last night advocated an increase in the national debt. There are some people, Sir, to-day who think that this government ought to have laboured even more strenuously for a reduction of the debt, and I myself hope that the time will come when our government may prudently, wisely and expediently, not only not increase, but may materially decrease, the debt. Talk of increased taxation. If, as a Canadian citizen, to-day I buy no more goods than I bought in the old days when the Conservative party were in power if to-day I do not extend my business any more widely than I did in the old days, I am not contributing a cent more to the revenue or paying a single cent more taxation, but rather less. But if, because of increased prosperity, because of the better market we have to-day, I choose to extend my business, or because of greater prosperity and greater wealth to-day I can afford to live somewhat more comfortably and am able to afford luxuries and comforts that in the old days of the Conservative party I was not able to enjoy, then I expect to contribute and am glad to contribute more largely to our revenue.

It was said by the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance that increased exports and increased imports were not always a true indication of the trade of a country. He said that these were not usually a flea bite in comparison to the home market. I thank him for the word. I thank the hon. member for calling our attention to the importance of the home market. Sir, I say that never before in the history of our country did our manufacturers enjoy such a splendid home market as they have to-day, due to the opening up of the great west and to the rapid settlement of that country, due to the greater prosperity of the country throughout its length and breadth. I say again that never before did our farmers have such markets for their products as they have to-day, due to the general prosperity of our manufacturers and to the building up of our cities, towns and villages. I say that we have to-day, under the splendid management of this government, that symmetrical development that is advocated and desired in that editorial in the 'Farmer's Advocate.' A market for farm products is often talked about by our Conservative friends, but they have forgotten the importance of a home market for our manufactured products. Sir, I say it is just as important that we have a home market for the products of our manufacturing establishments; and I call the attention of our manufacturers to this fact, that they have not any other market so valuable to them as the market they find on the farms of the different provinces of this Dominion. I say then that our manufacturers ought to be willing, as I believe they are willing, that such conditions shall prevail as will enable the Canadian farmer not only to be willing to buy, but able to pay, and they must not cripple the farmer, because when they do that they will cripple themselves.

It has been said again by the hon. member to whom I have referred that a surplus is a bad and evil thing. At least the hon. member was very consistent, because in his time he carefully abstained even from the appearance of this evil. I presume, however, that if that hon. member were Minister of Finance to-day he would look upon surpluses with different glasses than he uses now in opposition. He has said that it is a wrong thing to have a surplus, to take money from the pockets of the people that is required for the extension of the trade and the development of the country.

Sir, the hon. gentleman was quite right in saying that there never before was a time in the history of Canada when such large sums were being invested, or have been invested, in trade and commerce, in manufacturing industries and in the various enterprises of Canada, and yet, notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding that such large sums have been so invested, the fact remains that while the deposits in the chartered banks in 1905 amounted to $180,000,000, the deposits in our chartered banks to-day are $468,000,000 or nearly three times as much. We were told that the importing of manufactured goods is in competition with our workmen, but I ask the speaker of last night if our workmen ever enjoyed better times than they are enjoying to-day? I ask if it was ever possible for our workmen, labourers and mechanics, more readily and more easily to find employment or whenever before in Canada they found employment at better wages than they are receiving to-day. Ten years ago our working-

men were flocking in large numbers to the United States seeking employment but to-day our workingmen are remaining at home happy and content, with plenty of work and splendid wage for the work they perform. We were told that last year the United States sent us goods to the amount of $180,000,000 and that we in turn sent to them goods only to the amount of $70,000,000. The statement is perfectly true; perfectly correct. We did last year buy from the United States goods to the amount of $180,000,000 but a large part of that was made up of gold and silver imported and of goods that were not subject to duty but were imported into this country as raw material for our manufacturers. Then there are other goods that we import from the United States and will continue to import because they grow and produce them in the parts of their territory where their climate is so different from ours that we cannot grow the same things. Even under the fostering care of a Conservative government, bananas, oranges, lemons, sugar cane, rice, and other such products as grow in the southern states will not grow within the borders of the Dominion. In conclusion, the hon. member for North Toronto expressed his delight that the Conservative party had converted the great Liberal party to their way of thinking. In this he was surely inconsistent. After berating us because of our policy and because of our action, he says that we are following in the footsteps of the party to which he belongs. Surely he cannot be right in both cases. But that is after all the doctrine, or the statement, that we so frequently hear repeated by our Conservative friends. They say that the prosperity of this country to-day is due to the inauguration of the national policy by the Conservative party in the years of the past. I heard a Conservative speaker at a political meeting some years ago illustrate that in this way: He said that a farmer said to him: I, fifteen years ago, planted an orchard; I have taken care of the trees for fifteen long years and they are only now coming into bearing. He said: So, the Conservative party planted the national policy, it took time to mature and it is only now bearing good fruit. Sir, I say that if the Conservative party planted that tree—the national policy—and if under their fostering care the tree only succeeded in producing scabby, tasteless ill-flavoured ill-keeping crab apples and if under the care of the Reform government that same tree, it may be, is producing luscious, well-coloured, well-flavoured and apparently splendidly keeping apples of a good size and if we have proved to be so much the better horticulturists we had better continue to take care of the tree which they say they have planted. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the old Liberal farmers, as they gather together in the corner grocery and upon the street and as to-day they behold the policy of the Liberal party, must be in a great maze, but if the old Liberal farmer is in a maze to-day it will not help his confusion of thought to turn to the hon. member for North Toronto who advocates not a decrease but an increase of public debt and who points us to the great republic to the south of us with its fifty per cent tariff which he asks us to imitate and follow. But, Sir, I am pleased that to-day we may read more cheerful words, that we may listen to brighter utterances than the words and utterances of the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred. The Manufacturers' Association of this Dominion, on the 17th of September last, held a large and well attended convention of manufacturers in the city of Winnipeg and that convention was addressed by Mr. C. C. Ballantyne, the president of the association. In addressing the association, Mr. Ballantyne used these words:

> It is a great privilege to look back over Canada's activities during the past year and see on every hand evidences of comfort on the part of our people and the prosperity of our business institutions.
>
> Canada's foreign trade has shown a remarkable increase. The total trade is $73,046,000 in excess of 1904-5 and our exports have increased $53,270,000, or in round figures, $20,000,000 more than our imports. The imports from the United States show another increase. This year they reached $180,729,000, or an increase of eight per cent over the previous year. A gratifying feature of our trade is that the imports of British goods have increased more proportionately than imports from the United States. The increase is thirteen per cent; the total imports, $69,298,000.

And then the president of the manufacturers' association goes on to say:

> There is no doubt that a large proportion of this increase——

That is the increase in our imports from Great Britain——

> —is as a direct result of the preferential tariff. The value of the exports of agriculture and animals and their products was $120,518,000, an increase of $30,197,000 over 1905. Manufactured goods have increased from $21,191,000 to $24,561,000, showing a gain of about sixteen per cent.

Now, Sir, if in the past year, our exports of agricultural products amounted to 25 per cent more than those of the year before and if our exports of manufactured goods were 16 per cent greater than the year before, which would mean double the amount in the short period of six years, then I think that no one has any great ground of complaint. I trust that year by year we may have the same evidence of continued prosperity, the same picture of happiness and content upon the face and countenance of every Canadian citizen, a happiness and content due to the fact that never before

did Canadian farmers succeed in so improving their farms, never before did Canadian manufacturers succeed in so enlarging their output, never before did the Canadian people succeed so well in reducing their mortgage debts and wiping out their liabilities at such a rapid rate, never before was the Canadian workman so well supplied with work at good wages, and never before has there been such general prosperity as there has been in years past. I trust that at every annual gathering, whether it be the annual gathering of the agriculturists, whether it be the annual meeting of the manufacturer's association, whether it be the delivery of a budget speech, year by year, we shall have the same splendid story of general prosperity and national development as we have had in the ten years that have passed. I remember that before 1896 the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) used words to this effect: If the Canadian people will place my party in power they will not need long columns of figures to prove that there is prosperity; prosperity will be general, they will all receive their share of it and they will feel the jingle of the coin in their pockets. If that was a covenant the covenant has been carried out; if it was a prophecy, the prophecy has been fulfilled.

I trust, Sir, and I believe that our Canadian people, realizing well the different conditions that were theirs under the old Conservative rule, and the present business-like administration of the Laurier government will continue for many, many long years to maintain in his present position the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who to-day, assisted as he has been assisted by the capable, patriotic, business-like men whom it has been his good fortune and good judgment to select. Sir, if this be true I predict it will be many, many years before we will have any more convincing proof that our country is going to the dogs and being badly mismanaged, than we had last night in the agonizing, frantic attempt of the ex-Finance Minister to prove it by his long column of figures, that ex-minister, that man of the past, that debt advising, debt-begetting, debt-increasing, ex-Finance Minister.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would my hon. friend state if he would oppose or support a decrease in the duty on agricultural implements of 10 per cent if at the same time he favours the large amount of imports of American agricultural farm products now entering into Canada?

Mr. MILLER. I think the first person to propose the ten per cent reduction on agricultural implements was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); when he gives you his opinion I will be glad to give mine.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, the long-heralded tariff changes have come at last. We have waited patiently and patience has had its reward and we have had the pleasure of hearing from the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) his propositions with regard to the tariff changes that are to take place. It is always interesting to hear the tariff discussed. All our business men, manufacturers and others are especially concerned in any change in the tariff. I think that perhaps the present government have shown rather too much hesitation in tackling the work. I wish to say in the first place that I give the hon. gentlemen (Mr. Fielding) every credit for having brought down what he conscientiously believes is a good, sound, business tariff. I believe the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to do that and in that way I desire to congratulate him. But I must to-day not spend my time in throwing bouquets across the floor to the hon. gentleman but rather play the part of the candid friend. I do not desire to be at all personal but simply to make a plain statement in a business way as far as I am able of my ideas in regard to the tariff. I propose to deal almost entirely with the tariff, leaving the other considerations affecting the budget speech for some other person and for some other occasion.

The tariff in these days has become a science. I think the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised us a year or two ago that when the changes did come we would have a scientific tariff. That, if carried out, I think, would be a very desirable thing and is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but the criticism I have to make, and it is perhaps the strongest criticism I will have to make to-day on the efforts of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), is that whereas we were promised when these gentlemen came into power that all tariffs would be done away with as far as possible, we are to-day witnesses of the hon. gentleman rising in his seat and stating that he is going to give us four tariffs, and not only that but several adjuncts or lean-to's to these tariffs. First, he describes the preferential tariff, then the general tariff, the surtax, the intermediate tariff and then we have the dumping clause, the anti-combine clause and other clauses too numerous to mention. My criticism of the hon. gentleman's effort is that this complexity in all these tariffs is going to be a source of difficulty to the importer.

I desire to say, before I go any further, that I do not come here as a manufacturer, as I am so often called. I desire to make this personal explanation, I am not and never have been a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, I have frequently been taken for a member and have frequently been criticised as a member, but the fact is, I am not now and never have been a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and whenever I have been at any of their gatherings it has been as a guest, just as hon. gentlemen opposite

themselves frequently attend these gatherings. But in speaking of this question to-day I do not desire to speak as a manufacturer or merchant, as I have been all my life, but I wish to state what I conceive to be the general interests of the whole country. I think I may safely say that the constituency which I have the honour to represent is a fair average constituency, as representative as can be picked out in this broad Dominion. It is called Brantford, it is true, but that is a gerrymandered name that arose during the last rearrangement of the voting constituencies. Although it is called Brantford it is not simply the city of Brantford, but it contains two townships of prosperous farmers, so that when you speak of the constituency of Brantford you refer to the city of Brantford, largely manufacturing, and two townships of prosperous farmers, and with that arrangement I think possibly I have as good an insight into what is required both by the manufacturers and the agriculturists as can be got in most constituencies in this country. In this way I desire to debate the question, not from the standpoint of any one class, but in the general interests of all. That shall be my attempt in any remarks I have to make.

The tariff that is proposed, or rather the number of tariffs that are proposed are very intricate and will make it difficult for business men to understand just what their goods are going to cost them. That is always a serious consideration when a man is placing an order to know what the goods are going to cost him laid down in his warehouse. Under the various and complex tariffs no importer in this country can say: These goods will cost just so much when laid down and ready for sale in my warehouse. He does not know, when he is buying the goods, whether or not he is going to be subject to the dumping clause or whether the price in the invoice is going to be the accepted price at the custom-house; he does not know whether he will be called on to pay a considerable increase in duty not only after the goods have been received, but when a large part of them have been sold, and he is unable to recoup himself because the goods have left his warehouse; they are in the customers' hands and the price cannot be changed. In all these conditions there is too much complexity. The hon. gentlemen said they were going to do away with tariffs, yet they had given us four distinct tariffs in this proposition. Let us liken it to a pasture field. The Conservative tariff introduced in 1878 was one good substantial fence around that home pasture field It served the purpose well; it was brought in in 1878 and the basis of our great industries was laid upon that tariff regardless of the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite; the great stability, the great industrial skill of this country was established upon a sure and certain basis by the introduction of the tariff of 1878 and it has maintained a steady growth ever since, in spite of many difficulties. In 1878 we had then this one fence around this field, so to speak. To-day we have the same pasture field, but we have a number of fences. We have the very high fence, the general tariff, the intermediate tariff and then the preferential tariff, with all these adjuncts I have spoken of. That is a very complex proposition and you must say that it is a difficult feat to enter this field, that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to find out what it would cost to lay down goods in this country, but it may be that an animal, if it knows enough, can go through all these fences. It is a good deal like entering a maze: you enter here, go forward, and after wandering about, finally come to the centre without having to jump a fence. One substantial fence around the industrial and commercial life of this country is better than the half-dozen the hon. gentleman seeks, and I think he will find that the business men of the country will severely criticise him for the tariff he has brought down. The importers of this country are not enemies of the country. They pay the taxes into the coffers of the country, and are entitled to consideration, and their business should not be hampered; and they should not be asked to pay a price for goods which, when they are in their warehouse, they do not know whether they are going to make a profit on or not. That is my first and main criticism of the manner of bringing in this particular pronouncement of the hon. gentleman.

It has been stated that there is considerable conflict between the agriculturist and the manufacturer. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is grossly exaggerated. I believe there is a good understanding all round between the agriculturist and the manufacturer in this country; and the conflict between them, if not fanned by passion and a desire for political advancement, will grow less as the years go on. It must be remembered that we have in this country two great sources of wealth and prosperity, the one agriculture and the other manufacturing. I contend that we were intended by Heaven to have both. We have the material resources, the people, the energy, the brains and all other requisites for a manufacturing as well as an agricultural country. These two things cannot be in opposition to each other; they work best hand in hand, and I propose to take my own riding—not that I wish to make any flourish of trumpets about it, but because I know it best—to show how the tariff has worked there both for the farmer and the manufacturer, so far as I understand it. In the year 1878 we had in the city of Brantford a few small industries—good, sound, little industries, but of very small proportions. The tariff of 1878, introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley was probably the best all-round tariff we have ever had in this country; I do not know that we shall ever see its like again. By that tariff

a general impetus was given to industry of all kinds throughout the country. It is true, it was opposed at the time by many of our most intelligent agriculturists. I had the privilege of debating on that tariff in the first public discussion in which I ever took part, and from that time to this I have been a steadfast believer in the policy of moderate protection. I do not claim to be a high protectionist, but I stand for adequate protection. I have sometimes been asked to define what I mean by adequate protection, and I have replied that adequate protection is a protection that will protect. What I mean by that I explain in this way. If you ask me what weight of clothes I am going to put on to-day, I ask you what kind of weather we are going to have, and if you tell me, I will know how to dress for it. If it is a cold day, I will put on a heavy overcoat ; if it is a moderate day, I will put on a light overcoat; and if it is a warm day, I will go without an overcoat. So it is with the tariff. In some cases ten per cent is adequate protection, in other cases twenty per cent is adequate, while in other cases thirty or even forty per cent may be entirely inadequate. I do not say that Canada is fitted for every industry. Some industries are not suitable to the conditions of the country, and it would not be wise for us to attempt to establish them. But I am speaking of the great basic industries for which we have the natural resources and the labour, and in which, if given a fair chance we can compete with the world. That is, I think, a fair proposition—and I do not wish to exaggerate. Now, from 1878 to the present time, I have seen the city of Brantford multiply its population by at least three, while its industries are perhaps ten times as great as they were in 1878. With a population of about 20,000 we employ in the factories about 5,000, or twenty-five per cent of the population. It is true, all that population do not live in Brantford. Many of them are farmers who come into the city in the autumn and spend their whole winter in the factories. There is a fact which hon. gentlemen may not have noticed. Many of these farmers are among the best operatives in the factories. The days are gone when the farmer of Ontario can go into the woods and cut down timber; he has little stock to feed, and his boy can perhaps attend to them. The result is that he is able to work in the factories during the winter, drawing $2 or $2.25 a day at a comfortable job, instead of remaining idle at home. That is one of the advantages to the farmers that have come from the establishment of factories in the city of Brantford. To those who contend that a high tariff and low-priced goods are inconsistent, I want to point out that in the United States, the most highly protected country in the world, you will find the lowest priced farming implements, whereas in free-trade English farm implements cost twenty-five per cent more than they do in moderately protected Canada. Under our moderate protection we are able not only to manufacture in Canada all the implements that Canada requires, but to ship a large quantity to free-trade England. What have we seen since 1878? I can remember when a self binder produced by the Harris Company in Brantford cost from $300 to $350. That seems a pretty high price, but that was the price in the city of Brantford less than thirty years ago. A mower at that time cost from $150 to $200. Since that time we have seen these prices immensely reduced. For the sake of accuracy I want to give a few figures of the prices of mowers and reapers in the last few years, so that you may understand what the prices are to-day as compared with the prices in former years. The retail prices of binders to farmers in the last few years have been as follows :

	1 payment.	2 payments.
1894..	$113 00	$120 00
1895..	113 00	118 00
1896..	113 00	118 00
1897..	113 00	118 00
1898..	113 00	118 00
1899..	113 00	118 00
1900..	123 00	128 00
1901..	118 00	123 00
1902..	123 00	128 00

There is about $5 difference between the cash price and credit price. A similar condition has existed with regard to the prices of mowers, as the following figures show :

	1 payment.	2 payments.
1894..	$50 00	$52 00
1895..	48 00	51 00
1896..	48 00	51 00
1897..	48 00	51 00
1898..	48 00	51 00
1899..	48 00	51 00
1900..	51 50	52 50
1901..	51 50	53 50
1902..	51 50	52 50

I quote these figures simply to show that during this high tariff period which we have heard so much about the prices of these implements have been more than cut in two. They have been reduced by one half which is, I think, a pretty considerable concession to our agriculturist friends, and when I speak of these two large implement factories, I might add a very large number of smaller factories to the same category.

Mr. LALOR. Has the price of agricultural implements been increased by the present government ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The last figures show that the prices have been slightly increased within the last three or four years. That is accounted for by the higher cost of living and the higher wages paid the workingmen. While I have shown that these implements have been reduced in price, I want also to show how a protective policy has acted on the products of the farm in the town of Brantford. During that time, farm produce

has very steadily increased in price, and I wish to commend this to our agricultural friends. The prices in Brantford are from 25 per cent to 100 more than they were in 1878. At that time we could buy butter at about an average of 15 cents per pound. Now the average price is 25 cents and it frequently runs to 30 and 35 cents. Eggs used to sell at 10 cents per dozen but now they sell at from 20 cents to 30 cents. These are the open prices on the market and have been during a good part of the season. What applies to butter and eggs applies equally to cheese and milk. Thus a home market is furnished for all these perishable products, which could not be marketed were it not for the presence in Brantford of a very large consuming community supported by the factories. What is the use of talking of raising stuff for export if it is stuff that cannot be exported. This produce, to which I have referred, consists largely of material which could not be exported because it will not keep, but the farmer finds a market for it at home and sells it to the workingmen at a higher figure. If however there were no manufacturing centre there, he would not be able to do that at all.

I have here a memorial from the Farmers' Association, and as the farmers represent the largest perhaps, and the most intelligent, to a large extent, industry in this country, I think we are entitled to give this memorial every consideration. I do not desire to criticise anything the farmers have set forth in this memorial. It is signed by gentlemen I do not know, but I think that in some of their findings they are not accurate. They say that the tariff has not helped and cannot help them. I have shown that the tariff has helped the farmers and can help them more ; and although I have not had time to go into the schedules which were brought down yesterday, I understand the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) intends putting on a general advance on all farm products. That is quite right. I would like to see the farmers protected, and I think they can, to a very large measure, be protected in the various products they produce. Take the riding I have the honour to represent, many of its agriculturists are engaged in raising vegetables and get from them a very large return, particularly from onions. The lower part of the county of Brantford produces more onions than any other like centre in the Dominion. I was out there a few days ago and the farmers told me that up to that time they had shipped eighty car loads of onions, that they grew 200 to 400 sacks per acre, and that the price was fair. When the hon. the Minister of Finance was at Brantford, a deputation of the farmers waited on him and asked that a duty of 25 cents a sack be put on onions. I do not know if he has gone that far because I have not had time to look up that particular item in the schedule but I trust he has given that memorial of the farmers every consideration.

What applies to onions applies equally well to all sorts of market garden produce. If my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) were here, I am sure he would agree with me that it is desirable this government should see that the farmers are protected on all the items they grow and can grow to such an extent in Ontario.

The farmers' memorial goes on to say that the population of the cities is steadily increasing and the rural population diminishing, and they regret the fact. I would like to submit, as a proposition, whether if we send more men on the farms, that will put up the price of farm produce. In the cities we are asked not to bring in more labour because that will put the labour market down. But the farmer desires that the urban population be sent to the country to help them to grow more produce. I do not see how the increase of the farm produce would raise the price. I admit it is very desirable that we should have more settlers on the farms, but I want to point out that if the population of Ontario is a little less than it was, that is not so much because they have gone to the cities as that our young men have emigrated to the Northwest and taken up farm there. True they have taken a large amount of capital with them, but they have planted themselves in the Canadian west and we wish them every success. We are glad to help the west, and I do not see much difference between the east and the west in this connection. But I do not want it altogether forgotten that the province of Ontario produces a large amount or agricultural products still. If my information is correct, the province of Ontario is still producing more than the three new provinces combined. That is a very large statement, but I believe it is backed up by the figures, and further there is more capital employed in the agricultural industries in Ontario than in the three new provinces. In saying this, I am not saying anything to the detriment of our west. They will soon be away ahead of us, but in the meantime the factor of the farmers in Ontario has to be considered, and I contend that the presence of manufacturing industries in Ontario has been a vast advantage to the farmers by furnishing a home market for his supplies of perishable products which would otherwise never have been marketed. That is a self-evident fact which no one can gainsay. The west has my sympathy in this respect that they have not yet got manufacturing centres. And I want to throw out a hint to our manufacturers. that if they want to hold the tariff where it is or increase it a little, their best policy is to get out to the west with branch industries as quickly as they can go. Such object lessons in Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary,

Edmonton, Brandon and those other promising places would soon convince our western farmers that protection is the best policy all round. That has been the history of Ontario and will be that of the west. If our manufacturers would establish branches, beginning at Port Arthur, then in Winnipeg and west right out to the coast, I believe that those manufacturing centres would give such an object lesson to our western brethren that they would all say the policy of protection is the policy of Canada, if Canada is ever going to be a great nation. It is not possible to raise a great nation without having a variety of industries and those cannot be built up without a high or a fairly high tariff. That is self-evident to all. And I trust both sides will see that no retrograde step is taken and that there will be no reduction of the tariff to such an extent as to injure the industry we had been at such pains to build up in the last thirty years.

We have built wisely and well. We have a capital of $400,000,000 now invested in manufacturing industries. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that these industries were producing $500,000,000 worth of goods annually. I believe that that is a very moderate estimate. The last census, that of 1901, showed that we were producing at that time, $450,000,000 of manufactured goods, and I think it is a very mild assumption to say that $50,000,000 has been added to the product in the meantime. So, as I have said, $500,000,000 is a very moderate estimate of the product of the factories of Canada to-day. That, I believe, is a larger amount than is produced by the forests, the fisheries and the farms of Canada all combined. I am not in a position to give the exact figures, but I have made a careful study of the matter, and, according to my best calculation, that is the result arrived at. And it must be remembered that we have almost as many men employed in the factories of Canada to-day as are employed on the farms of Canada. These men are entitled to consideration, their labour ought not to be interfered with, and they should be given such conditions as will enable them to earn a fair wage, as they do in the manufacturing centres of Ontario to-day. It is true that wages have vastly increased, and I trust that they will increase more, for, the cost of living has gone up. In nothing has the cost of living risen more rapidly than in the products of the farm. I submit that to our agriculturists and ask them to consider the facts. Practically all the items of farm products that the people of our cities have to buy have advanced in price within the last twenty years, while almost every manufactured article has gone down in an equal proportion. That is a notable point, and I trust that it will not be forgotten by our agricultural brethren. I admit that the price of grain is lower than it used to be. That is not because of any tariff, or lack of tariff, it is because Ontario is no longer the only wheat field as it was in former times. The vast plains of the west now produce millions upon millions of bushels, and this has cut down the price of wheat in Ontario from about $1.50 to about 75 cents a bushel. It is competition at home that has done that, and no tariff can help it, because our surplus of wheat must be sold abroad. But I hope to show that it can be helped by the preferential tariff, of which I shall speak in a short time. The farmers of Ontario, I believe, are in a very prosperous condition. They are suffering more, perhaps, from lack of help upon the farm than from any other one cause. That, I know, is the main factor in our part of Ontario. I think it is the duty of the Immigration Department, while they are bringing out the vast number of stalwart men from the old country that they do, to see to it that old Ontario is not wholly passed by. They have taken from us our best young men for the west. And with all our hearts we wish those young men well. Our sympathy is with them and our best wishes for their prosperity. I believe that nearly fifty per cent of the settlers in the west come from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Having lost our young men, the farmers of Ontario have none to fall back upon except the immigrants. But the immigrants are going right through, and so the farmer is without help and has not been able to take advantage of the prices that are going so much as he would have done if he had been able to hire others to help him produce a larger quantity of goods.

Time would fail me to dwell on all the points of the farmers' memorial. I desire to say something on the subject of the preferential tariff. It is true that the Minister of Finance said yesterday that there were only two or three that believed in a mutual preference between Canada and Great Britain. I am afraid I must confess that I am one of these. At the same time, I think that there are more people engaged in this movement than the hon. gentleman would give us credit for. Since the House rose last session I have had the honour to be in the old country as a representative of the Toronto Board of Trade and the Brantford Board of Trade on the delegation sent over to the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. That delegation from Canada represented every town and city of any size from Victoria to Halifax, and I think it must be considered a fairly representative gathering under any conditions. There were between 110 and 115 delegates from Canada alone. In the congress, there were gathered about 500 delegates from all parts of the empire. A resolution was submitted and carried, which, I think, it would not be amiss to

place upon 'Hansard' in order that the Minister of Finance may be appraised of the opinion of the average business man not only throughout Canada but throughout the empire. I think I am justified in putting it that way because of the widely representative character of that congress. I have before me the official report of that congress with the names of the gentlemen present. If any hon. gentleman wishes to verify what I am saying I shall be pleased to lend him the book. Without entering too much into detail, let me read for the information of the House the finding of the business men of the empire on the question of preferential trade:

Whereas, in the resolution of the Fifth Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, held in Montreal in August, 1903, it was stated that the bonds of the British empire would be materially strengthened by a mutually beneficial commercial policy;

Whereas, it is the opinion of this congress that it is in the interest of the component parts of the empire that steps should be taken towards consummating such an arrangement;

Whereas, there are in the United Kingdom, her colonies and dependencies, natural resources and industries which, if developed, would be sufficient to provide the British empire with its food supply and all other necessaries and requirements of life;

Therefore resolved, that this congress urges upon His Majesty's governments in the United Kingdom and in the various colonies and dependencies, the granting of preferential treatment in their respective markets on a reciprocal basis, each to the other, believing that thereby the bonds of union will be strengthened, and the British empire largely freed from dependence on foreign countries for food and other supplies.

And that this congress further urges upon the governments of the empire that they treat this matter as of present practical importance and that each organization represented at this congress pledges itself to press their respective governments to take such action at the Colonial Conference of 1907 as will give effect to the principle advocated in this resolution.

That resolution was submitted and debated for a day and a half in the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. I believe that 181 voted upon the resolution. The final vote showed that an immense majority of this gathering of business men were in favour of the resolution. Not only did every Canadian vote for it, but we carried a majority of the British Chambers where this was supposed to be a dead letter. The number of chambers of commerce voting for the resolution was 105 for, 45 against, 31 Chambers remaining neutral, and 6 were not represented when the vote was taken. There you have the representative opinion of the business men of the empire on what is known as the Chamberlain Policy. Though the west does not seem to be so cordial with reference to the policy as other parts of Canada, still I may point out that there were five gentlemen from Winnipeg and all voted for it. One has fallen foul of what was done since he came home, but he had not the courage to say a word on the floor of the congress, and, as I say, all the Winnipeg men voted for the resolution. That is the declaration of the business men of the empire in favour of an imperial preferential trade policy, a policy of mutual preference between Great Britain and the colonies of the empire. I contend that is sound policy. It is a policy that should give great advantage to our farmers. The farmers of the west, if they had this preference, would soon find a vast increase in their trade with Great Britain they would find that they had an advantage over our brethern to the south, they would find in the near future a very large increase in their export of wheat and all kinds of cereals, of cheese, butter, cattle, and all those great products which the farm yields so profusely. That advantage would accrue to them from being a part of this great federation of the British empire if a mutual preferential trade policy was adopted.

Now, I am not alone in this matter. I am going to quote a gentleman whose authority I think will be recognized as pretty good, and that is no less a person than a former Canadian, now a resident of the United States, Mr. J. J. Hill. When that gentleman moved away from Canada to the United States, I think we lost one of the best of our assets, because I look upon J. J. Hill as one of the clever men of the United States to-day. Just for the information of the House I want to read a few remarks he made in Chicago upon this question a few days ago. I am quoting from the Brantford 'Courier' of the 13th inst., these remarks taken from a speech of Mr. Hill:

North of us lies a country of enormous possibilities for development, inhabited by between five and six million people. It has over 20,000 miles of railways with several other great projects under way. It has a foreign trade of over $500,000,000 a year. Its capital invested in manufactures is over $400,000,000——

That agrees closely with the figures I stated.

—and the value of its product is $480,000,000. Its people have deposited in their savings banks $82,000,000.

It has achieved this growth without outside aid, exactly as the United States has grown, by virtue of its inheritance of fertile land, rich mines and noble forests, and by the industry and integrity of the people. And it is only at the beginning of its development. Its unworked resources are immense. There is land enough in Canada, if thoroughly tilled, to feed every mouth in Europe. There are more than 250,000 square miles in each of the two new Northwest provinces, and there is 250,000,000 acres of timbered land in the Dominion. This is a neighbour to be taken note of. Canada has already one transcontinental railroad system, others

will soon be added. It has a system of waterways which is justly its pride. On this it has spent nearly $100,000,000.

Next he deals with this preferential trade question, and it is to this part of his subject that I wish to direct the attention of the Finance Minister, who, I regret, is not in the House. This is what Mr. Hill has to say about imperial preferential trade, and I contend that he has spoken good sense, and used good business judgment when he arrived at the finding we have here. Speaking of the Chamberlain policy, he said :

> Had that been ratified, had England really granted to the colonies a preference in its markets for their products based on reciprocal advantages, this country would have felt the double thrust in a decline of business with its greatest and its third greatest customers on two sides of the Atlantic. The defeat of this plan has not greatly disappointed the dependencies, but it has assured them that for the present they must seek for commercial alliances elsewhere. It is perhaps the time when reciprocity with Canada can be considered with more favour than ever after.

There is Mr. Hill's idea, that reciprocity can be considered now better than ever after.

> For no man who understands industrial conditions in Great Britain will believe that the issue raised by Chamberlain has been permanently settled, or that unrest and distrust there will not at some future time bring it again to the front with better prospect of success.

It is Mr. Hill's opinion that this question will again come to the front, and that when it does come it will have a better chance of success. His advice to the American people is to strike now when they have a chance, and to start in a reciprocity treaty with Canada if they can. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we do not want reciprocity with the United States to-day. We are prosperous without that. We have resources here in Canada that can do without it, and if we are going to form any reciprocity treaty it should be within the empire. Why did not this government begin with Australia, when they had a chance a few months ago? Why did they not endeavour to spread our trade throughout the four quarters of the world where the British flag floats? There was the best chance to extend our markets. There is a sympathetic people like ourselves, ready to trade with us, anxious to trade with us. Why did not this government take active steps then to have this great policy put in force? I contend there has been some bad bungling somewhere, and I trust before the session is over we will know what has caused this great falling away, when Australia made us an offer and we did not take it up. I contend that this preferential trade question is one of the great questions to-day in Canada and the empire, and that it is fraught with greater advantage to the farmer than to any other section of the community. I trust this government will give early attention to this matter so that we may have in the near future a reciprocal treaty not only with Great Britain, but with Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, the West Indies and all other British possessions that are ready and anxious to increase their trade with us.

We have seen what a preference can do for the West Indies. Look how they have increased their sugar exports. The Finance Minister told us last night that Britain was largely drawing her sugar from the West Indies, and exporters had to pay double freight, to England and back again. I take issue with the hon. gentleman. Britain is not taking nearly so much sugar from the West Indies as she has done, and not nearly so much as she is taking from continental countries. An infinitesimal part of our sugar imports from Great Britain is made from cane-sugar. What is imported into Canada almost without exception is made from beets bought from Germany, Austria and France. If the hon. gentleman was as well versed in that part of the tariff as he should be, he would not have stated that a large part of this sugar was coming over from the West Indies to England and being reshipped to Canada. That is not the case, so far as I understand it, and I have been engaged in the sugar business and know how it works. I desire to dwell upon this sugar matter for a few minutes because it is a sweet subject, and I do not think the minister put that before the people as I think the facts required him to do. He went into a lengthy explanation of what is intended. He raises the duty on raw sugar about 7½ cents. I understand the proposition is to make it 34 cents under the present preferential tariff, 45 cents under the intermediate, and 52 cents under the general tariff, that is on the raw article. You will understand that this raw sugar is not consumed by the people in that shape at all, it is sugar which is imported by the refiners for manufacturing purposes. Now the duty upon the manufactured articles is a very different thing. The duty on the manufactured article is 72 cents under the preferential tariff, 98 cents under the intermediate tariff, and $1.08 cents under the general tariff. We have that very important difference, and I contend the people of this country are not aware exactly what they are paying upon imported refined sugar, because this government has taken upon itself to introduce, as the minister mentioned last night, what is known as the polariscope test. I do not quite understand the meaning of the word, but I propose to show how it works out because I have had a little experience. The polariscope test as the hon. gentleman presumed to explain last night, works in this way: That you bring sugar into this country at on basis of 88 per cent of purity, that is the refined sugar that

comes into the country is presumed to be of 88 per cent purity. On that sugar the duties I have just read apply, but instead of doing, as I contend they should do, give the purest article the best chance, they give it the worst chance.

That is what they call the polariscopic test. Apply that polariscopic test and what do you find ? You find that this $1.08 sugar which is supposed to be the best granulated sugar is not admitted at $1.08 at all. I hope the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will follow me in this because I know he is just as well aware of this as I am, but I do not know that he has ever explained it to the House. This $1.08 is not the full duty that the people are paying because I have had the privilege of importing a few carloads and I know how it works out. This rate is based on 88 degrees of purity, but for each degree over 88 one cent per 100 pounds is charged under the preferential, one and a half cents under the intermediate and one and a half cents under the general tariff. How does that work out ? I buy granulated sugar in New York at four cents, we will say. When I bring it into this country you would think that I was going to pay $1.08 and so would I. But, that is not the case. I contend that there are a great many hon. members on the other side of the House who could not tell from that tariff what we are paying on sugar today. I am certain that I would not have known if I had not had some practical experience in bringing in sugar and passing it through the customs house. I am giving the figures to the best of my recollection, I think they are accurate and I am going to show you how this duty works out. I bring in sugar that costs four cents a pound, the duty on which would be $1.08 if it tests 88 degrees of purity, but the sugar I bring in is very nearly 100 per cent pure. What do the government do ? For every additional degree of purity over 88 they add one and a half cents. Therefore you have $1.08 for that sugar to start with, then you have 12 degrees to add at one and a half cents which makes 18 cents for the polariscope test ; 18 cents and $1.08 make $1.26 and then you must add two cents for the barrel or bag, so that your sugar of that standard of purity costs you $1.28 duty when you get it laid down in the warehouse. You do not find that out until you have sent a sample to Ottawa. You give your provisional cheque for the whole amount and they give you a refund afterwards if it can be made. You are asked to pay this $1.28 under the government's polariscope test. I have a fond recollection that this government used to promise us a free breakfast table. I wonder how that sugar duty works out on the free breakfast table. As far as I can remember there never was a higher duty on sugar under any tariff in Canada than that which we have to-day. To the best of my recollection we never have paid a higher rate on manufactured high grade sugars than we pay to-day under the government's $1.28 rate on sugar. I am speaking from memory, but I think I have shown you how this works out and I could prove the statements which I have made if I had the entries which I believe I have in my office at home but unfortunately forgot to bring with me. So much for the free breakfast table as far as sugar is concerned. The refiners of Canada are perhaps not as much entitled to consideration as some other industries because I do not think they use the people as fairly as many other industries have done and I am therefore surprised that this additional duty is put on when they already have so large a protection. There is a very small amount of refined sugar imported into this country.

The government have not seen fit to treat other industries quite as fairly as they have treated that industry, and I propose to show that some of the industries in which my city is particularly interested have not been treated so well as those industries that I have spoken of. I find in the trade and navigation returns just issued the importation of agricultural implements down to June, 1906, and I think it is well just to read these figures so that the House may understand how things have been going. In the past year there were imported into Canada the following :

	Quantity.	Values.
Cultivators	3,826	$ 26,394
Drills	2,835	117,000
Forks, pronged	8,565	5,249
Harrows	4,387	66,232
Harvesters, self-binding	932	96,756
Hay loaders	582	26,000
Hay tedders	815	34,000
Hoes	4,902	873
Horse rakes	872	20,000
Lawn mowers	2,679	13,000
Manure spreaders	1,133	108,054
Mowing machines	766	24,000
Ploughs	17,034	477,000

And so on down through all the smaller implements. The total importation into this country then as far as I have been able to run over these for the past year has been $1,615,117. That is a pretty large and pretty respectable amount to be imported into Canada during the past year. I have a memorandum in my hand showing the imports, and I think it would be well that we should see how these have increased during the last few years because a great many may think that the implements we import into Canada represent a very small amount in proportion to the consumption here. I have here the imports since June 30, 1896, and with the indulgence of the House for a moment I will give these figures so that hon. members may see how they have grown.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1896..	$ 445,070	$ 595,277
1897..	575,000	762,000
1898..	905,000	1,444,000
1899..	1,639,000	1,867,000
1900..	1,826,000	1,693,000
1901..	1,898,000	1,740,000
1902..	2,655,468	1,820,000

The House will observe that in 1901 there were more imports than exports of agricultural implements. In 1902 the imports were again considerably greater than the exports. This is as far as my paper goes except the figures which I have just read from the blue book of this year which show $1,600,000 of imports, a reduction that I am glad to see. We have a total of imports of nearly $9,000,000 while the exports total nearly $10,000,000 so that this statement shows practically a balance for all these years between the bringing in and sending out of agricultural implements.

The question has often been asked : Cannot you manufacture agricultural implements in Canada with a 20 per cent or a 17½ per cent duty ? Yes, we can if we can have these goods on the ground. But, I want to point out that a large part of that 20 per cent is consumed in freighting these goods up to their market in the west. The freight on the large bulk of these goods such as mowers, reapers, cultivators and all these heavy implements consumes about half the duty. Provided it is 20 per cent, it costs us nearly 10 per cent as compared with Chicago or Minneapolis to deliver the goods in the west. That should not be lost sight of. The freight that is required to lay these implements down in the west from Ontario where they are manufactured consumes about half the protection which we have, leaving us only about 10 per cent to compete with our American neighbours with their vast and increasing output.

I want to point out something further. The Americans are able to produce in very much larger quantity than we are, it is true, but our factories are increasing very rapidly and we will very soon be able to produce as cheaply as any country in the world, and there is no country to-day that can beat us in this respect in agricultural implements except the United States, and the lead which they have is growing less and less. Why did an American implement firm come to Hamilton a short time ago ? Because you had a duty of 20 per cent against agricultural implements and you brought in an industry employing from 2,000 to 3,000 men that would be on the other side to-day if you had not had that duty. That is plenty of competition, keep up your tariff and you will bring in more of them. They are figuring all the time how to get hold of our industries ; American capital is seeking investment in Canada. They are coming in ; if you throw down the tariff they will not come in. Keep up your tariff and you will have an industrial population and cheap goods.

I have shown that the United States is the cheapest country in the world and the greatest protectionist country in the world, simply because they have a vast output, they have a vast market and the little surplus they send to Canada is a bagatelle. Our harvest is later than theirs. When their harvest is over they may say : We have 1,000 binders left over, our harvest is over, what shall we do with them ? Send them to Canada, Canada's harvest comes on a little later than ours. The result is that the overflow of their product is sent into Canada and competes with our manufacturer right in the height of his season.

Then look at the case of binder twine with which they supply us particularly and in which the farmer is interested. The farmer is a manufacturer of binder twine. Probably no one is more interested in the manufacture of binder twine than the farmer. Let the government say what happened when binder twine was put on the free list. Did it come down in price ? No, Sir, it went up and it is higher to-day than it was when you had a tariff on it. How do you explain that ? If a high tariff produces high prices, how is it that free trade in binder twine has put binder twine up ? That is the fact, I challenge contradiction, that twine is costing to-day a great deal more than when there was a duty of 12½ per cent on it. You have injured a great industry in which 40,000 farmers are holding stock. We have two binder twine factories in Brantford, that have struggled on under difficult conditions. I am glad to say that this year they have had a good season as the harvest was large and the straw plentiful ; otherwise had the straw been small the American twine would have come in. Now there is an example. You put binder twine on the free list and increased the price. You put barbed wire on the free list and wiped out every factory in Canada, there is not one left in Canada to-day where there were seven or eight, and when you put it on the free list, what happened? The Americans put the price up. That is just what will happen ; they kill out your industry and they put up the price and control the market. The only way is to look after yourself. That is what I think, we should look after ourselves and I mean by that to look after every industry, the agricultural as well as the manufacturing. Every industry should be looked after and given a legitimate chance to live and let live. That is how the tariff should be framed according to my best thinking. I see that hon. gentlemen opposite have made further reductions that interest some of our friends, not political friends of mine, while they are personal friends. One of them sat in the gallery last night, the largest and best manufacturer of windmills in the world, at least

he told me he took the prize in Great Britain in a Royal Agricultural Show in a 60-day test against all comers and all nations, and he won by 93 per cent. What have this government done ? They have reduced the duty, which he wanted increased from 25 per cent to 30 per cent. I see that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said that this is a perquisite of the House of Commons, that we want wind here and therefore he has reduced the price so that we will have more wind. We will probably have as much wind as we want, and I do not know that the minister made a good hit if that was his sole purpose.

I point this out to show that we can make and are making the best goods in the world if we get a chance, and there is the evidence that it is not because Canadian goods are inferior that American goods are coming in. That is not correct, or why should we export to Great Britain and Australia and the open markets of the world if our implements were not just as good as the best, and under certain conditions, as cheap as the best ? It costs us a great deal in freight to get to the western markets and that is the reason the price is not as low there as it might be, but I have shown that the price has been very materially reduced since the duty was put on and that if this country, instead of reducing the duty had increased it, I believe I could promise you that the manufacturers' association, if necessary, would have given an undertaking that so far as they were concerned, and the conditions remained the same, the price of implements would not have gone up, that the prices of manufacturers would not as a rule have gone up, but in many instances would have come down because of the greater output.

I contend that this great excess of imports over exports should be reduced, and that we should make those goods in Canada and in that way we would give this largely increased home market for our manufacturers and they would be able to manufacture cheaper and to reduce the cost to all our agricultural friends and others who consume these manufactures. That is my view regarding the manufacturing industry of this country.

Mr. PATERSON. What rate would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) suggest to place upon these articles ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, I think it rests with hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps, to give a policy and to tell us what is just and right.

Mr. PATERSON. We have done that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If the hon. gentleman gives us a chance at making a tariff we will try to do it to his taste and to the King's taste, but in the meantime I do not know that I need express my views to the hon. gentleman in so many figures. The hon. gentleman did not consult us about the changes before he made them, and if I gave my advice now I do not think he would take it, so I do not know why I should give him any advice.

I may say that I think most of the reductions are not well advised in a general way. I think that any reductions that have been made would have been better not made, and that in some instances there should have been an increase where a reduction has been made. I admit that we have to consider all kinds of people in this country. I admit that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has a very difficult and delicate task to perform and I think perhaps he endeavoured to discharge it to the best of his ability, but there are a good many things in the tariff that I do not think are as good as they ought to be, that are not as much to the advantage of our citizens as they ought to be, and at the same time they are producing a vast revenue, which is taken out of the pockets of our people and which should remain there, and which would remain there if we had a higher duty upon some products, so that there would not be so many imports and not so much revenue going into the coffers of the government. I know that this government cannot afford to lose revenue. They say that they do not want to see the revenue cut down. They promised to reduce the revenue, but have not seen fit to carry out that pledge, it has gone by the board the same as their free breakfast table and many others.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the hon. gentleman give me the benefit of his experience because he has studied this matter out? He has alluded to some millions of dollars worth of agricultural implements and expressed a desire that they should be made here, and has said that that should be accomplished through the tariff. Has he a conception of the amount of tariff that would be required to compel the manufacturing of these implements in this country. Would he be pleased to give us his idea?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have an idea but I do not know that I am called upon to give it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson). I thing that a very moderate rate tariff would be sufficient. I look upon a 20 per cent tariff as a very moderate tariff. I think that should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished. I have shown that the price of agricultural implements has been cut in two and more since the duty first went up. I do not think that can be gainsaid. I spoke to a distinguished senator last night, belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who is interested in this industry and he told me that that is substantially correct and he corroborates my figures that the price has been more than

cut in two during the time the tariff has been in force. When the output is increased, it is possible to sell here cheaper and in this way the price is lower. I have shown that agricultural implements are sold in Canada at as low a price as any place in the world except the United States. In Australia they pay 75 per cent more than we do here and in free trade Great Britain, 25 per cent more. I think that is a very fair price to allow a free trade country. If Canada is actually selling implements to-day at 15 per cent and 20 per cent less than they are sold in Great Britain and our implements are going there, I think it shows that we are manufacturing the right kind of implements at the right prices.

The hon. gentleman has asked me if I would not give him my views as to what should be done. I believe he should give us sufficient protection to keep out those goods provided our own factories can turn out all the goods required, and I believe our factories are in a position to do that. They are manufacturing goods of a quality equal to the best; but they cannot all stand the onslaught of these American agents who visit the farmers personally and who are such good talkers that they sometimes sell a farmer an American implement against his inclination. His inclination is to buy Canadian goods, and I am told that in the Northwest to-day the Canadian implements stand as high as any others and that they are gaining ground all the time. Then, why should we jeopardize the $500,000,000 of capital embarked in these manufacturing industries in order to give a very slight advantage to the agriculturist? He does not buy a mower or a reaper every day It means a great deal to those engaged in manufacturing implements, while it means very little to the farmer. I doubt whether it will give him an advantage of more than $2 or $2.50 on a mower or a reaper, and for that you jeopardize an important Canadian industry. It is a retrograde step. This country has gone too far in the direction of adequate protection to home industries to take such a retrograde step towards free trade. I contend that the agriculturists of Canada as a class are not against protection. What did the agriculturists of England ask for the other day? I will not read the article, but here is the heading: 'British Farmers Favour Protection; Chamberlain Committee Report in this Direction; Desire Tariff Revision; Statement Issued Respecting Advantages of a Preference.' This is a statement of the farmers of Great Britain asking for protection. They say: 'Protect the farmers there and give a preference to Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa;' and that is what this government should strive for. The right thing is to trade with the family first, and Great Britain and her colonies are a family of nations. I have read the opinion of Mr. Hill on that question. He enunciated that in Chicago the other day and was applauded to the echo, and the immediate result of his speech is the formation of a large association of men for the purpose of promoting reciprocity with Canada before we can get it from Great Britain. It is true, Mr. Hill is looking after his own interests; he would like to see our wheat carried south instead of east, so that he can manufacture them and sell them as American products. Mr. Hill is a far-seeing man, and that is a business proposition from his standpoint. In these remarks he struck the nail on the head, and I believe they will have a far-reaching effect with the average American citizen. We know that the New England States want reciprocity with Canada, and if you do not stand by the principle of adequate protection, you will jeopardize the millions of capital invested in the factories of Canada and the interests of the labouring men employed in them. I hope, however, that it will be continued, and that in the near future we shall see branch industries established in the west so that the farmers there will see the advantage of Canada being an all-round country. We can never hope to be a great country without having a diversity of industries. We are not all cut out for agriculturists. I would make a poor fist of farming, I know; it would probably cost me $5 to raise $3 worth of goods. Why drive to the farm against his inclinations a man who could be made a success in a city industry? To have a variety of callings in life you must have a variety of industries, and you can only have them by having a tariff to start those industries.

I wish to refer to the statement of the Finance Minister that he does not intend to help to establish a tin-plate industry in this country. I am one of those who think that basic industry should be established, and if it could not be done by the Finance Minister putting a duty upon tin-plate, he might have provided a bounty for it, as he is doing for iron and steel and a number of other things. He would not have increased the price, while he would have encouraged the industry. I contend that protection pure and simple is a tariff only. That runs around the borders of the country it is supposed to encircle. That and that alone is protection. All these other devices, such as bonuses, drawbacks and rebates, are not protection in the true sense of the term, and never should be confused with the word 'protection.' They are simply encouragement to industry, but there is a vast difference between them and protection. Protection gives an industry the market, but the bonus, the rebate or the drawback does not. By giving protection you keep goods out; by giving a bonus you let goods in. You may offer a man a bonus, but if he has not the output he cannot draw it; and he cannot have the output if he has not a tariff that gives him the home market.

Therefore let it not be supposed that a bonus or rebate or drawback is protection, for it is not. To have encouraged a tin-plate industry in Canada, even by a bonus, would have been, I think, a proper thing to do. You have encouraged the lead industry in British Columbia in that way, and why not encourage all these basic industries by means of a bonus or drawback or rebate on the amount of the goods they put out in the meantime, so that they may become established?

That gives you cheap raw material and at the same time it may start an industry. You have worked it out well on steel and iron products, why should it not be a success on tin? I submit that for the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the position they take is not irrevocable—and I hope it is not—I say that a great basic industry could be established here without injury to the agricultural classes of the urban citizens, for the article of tin is one which enters into common consumption everywhere. What I contend is that by giving a bonus or drawback to those people you could encourage a new industry and not hurt anybody. We have the money to do it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) claims to have a surplus of $12,000,000. If he would spend a few thousand dollars in encouraging this new industry, we would get back through the customs four or five times more money than we would spend in that direction. I am not advocating the system of giving bonuses because I do not believe in it on general principles. I would prefer that the government would stick to straight protection which would give us a home market and not resort to this system of bonuses. But in the meantime if we cannot have a sufficiently high tariff on iron and steel goods and kindred things which the minister enumerated, I say that the government should continue those drawbacks to the manufacturers of iron and steel and similar products, because we cannot get on without them if we are to have cheap raw material. The duty on the finished articles of mowers and reapers and other agricultural implements is from 17½ to 20 per cent, but a very large amount of the material that goes into these machines pays from 22½ to 100 per cent, so that the manufacturer of agricultural implements is paying on many of the raw materials that go into his machines a higher duty than we charge on the finished article. Consequently he has little protection. In making these tariff changes, the industry that uses any of these items changed should be taken into account because one item tumbles against another in the tariff, and if you touch one you affect another. You may therefore injure some one you had no intention of injuring. I trust therefore that the government will see the necessity of giving a tariff which will not jeopardize any of the interests I have spoken of and at the same time give a home market that will be as satisfactory.

When the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) interrupted me, I was about to read the total exports and imports of Canada and draw a lesson from them. In 1905 the total exports in Canada amounted to $203,316,872 and the total imports to $266,834,417, or in all an aggregate trade of imports amounting to $470,000,000. The balance of trade against us in 1905 was therefore about $63,000,000 in round numbers. That is far too large for a country of our resources and should not be continued. In 1906, I am glad to say, it was not quite so bad because there was a considerable increase in our exports. Although the imports also largely increased, they did not increase in quite the same ration. We exported in 1906 $256,586,630 and imported $294,286,015, giving a total imports and exports of $550,872,645. We ought to be a large exporting country. We ought to export very much more than we are importing, yet our exports fall far below our imports. I contend that in a country such as Canada, this is an economically unsound condition, and we should see at once that our farming and lumbering interests and mining and fishing and manufacturing interests should export quite as much goods as we import. The United States is the only example pretty much we have of that, and its success should be an example to us in this respect.

In speaking of the preferential duty, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) took the opportunity of showing how the tariff works out with regard to Great Britain. I admit that the tariff has been of considerable advantage to Great Britain. I admit that the preferential tariff has been taken advantage of to a considerable extent by our fellow subjects across the sea. I do not however approve of the preference in the shape in which it is and have seen no reason to change my view. I am glad to see that our imports from Great Britain have increased considerable but they are still vastly below our imports from the United States. In 1905 our imports from Great Britain amounted to $60,342,700 and in 1906 to $69,194,588, an increase of about $9,000,000. In 1905 our imports from the United States amounted to $162,738,571 and in 1906 they were $175,862,071, or a total increase from the United States of about $13,000,000 as against $9,000,000 from Great Britain. True we have not yet perhaps brought the full influence of the preferential tariff to bear. We are reducing the lead of the United States to a certain extent but we have not gone nearly as far in that direction as I think we should, because when we come to examine it, I find that while Great Britain has taken a very large amount of our exports yet we are buying a great deal less from her than from

the United States. Our exports to Great Britain in 1905 amounted to $101,958,771 and in 1906 to $133,094,937. Whereas to the United States, where we buy $2 worth for $1 worth we buy from Great Britain, we exported last year to the value of $77,-404,071 and this year $97,806,552. That is our total export to Great Britain amounted to $133,000,000 in 1906 against $97,000,000 which we sent to the United States. Whereas from the United States we imported $2 worth to every $1 worth from the mother country. That is a matter the government should set themselves to remedy as far as possible. I hope that the figures I have quoted will convince hon. gentlemen opposite that these matters can be arranged by a tariff, and that a tariff can be so framed as to encourage all these classes of industry without injuring any.

The various classes interested in this matter have all to be considered. I do not wish to speak from a selfish standpoint. I trust that anything I have said will be considered as what I truly believe, as a business man, to be in the best interests of the whole country. I do not want to advocate the success of one class of our citizens over another or at the expense of another. I represent a constituency composed of agriculturists and manufacturers. I desire as far as possible to speak on behalf of those two great interests. All other interests are equally entitled to consideration, whether they are great or small.

I have endeavoured, so far as I am able, to criticise the views put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite in a straightforward way. I do not wish to make any undue or harsh criticism of anything that has been done; for I know the difficulties of the situation, and I believe the hon. gentleman has lent himself to the task to the best of his abilities. At the same time, I think he has not given due consideration to very many of the industries of the country and that he has not given help to the agriculturist to any material extent. Because, as was pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) what he has taken off in one place he has put on in another. And I believe that he expects, by the increase in the sugar duties to make up all his losses, and I am inclined to believe he will. So, this is a sort of evening up and evening down process, and there will be no material result in a general advancement of our industries. But these changes will affect a considerable number of people and they may be more far reaching in their effect than the hon. Finance Minister supposes. True, many of our industries are very successful at the present time—never more so. But it is to be hoped that the policy of the government will not be, as soon as a man has got on his feet and begun to make money, to throw difficulties in his way. That seems to be the argument. We are told: It was said that if we would put on a duty, then, after a time, it might be taken off. But that is not the proposition as I understand it. I do not think that any industry should be taken off its feet. A vast amount of capital is engaged in manufacturing industries in Canada. The loss of any part of that capital is a loss to the country, and there should be no enactment that will wipe out the capital of any manufacturing concern or any industry that is established. The policy should be conservative—it is no advantage of any one to destroy wealth, while it is to the general advantage to conserve it. I submit that manufacturing in this country is an economically sound proposition because you have the goods and you retain the money also. That is a proposition, I think, that cannot be gainsaid. On a former occasion I quoted the statement of Abraham Lincoln with regard to this principle, but there can be no harm in our refreshing our memories with such words of wisdom. Abraham Lincoln, years ago, in explaining and defending the policy of protection, gave an illustration which has always seemed to me most true and most apt. He said: If this nation of the United States wants a ton of pig iron and sends the money abroad and buys it, it has the ton of pig iron, but it has parted with its money. But if this nation digs the ore from the ground and makes a ton of pig iron, it has the pig iron and it has the money as well. Now, as a commercial axiom I do not see how we can get away from that. Old Abraham Lincoln had a pretty long head, and he sized up protection in these few words, better I believe than any man has done it before or since. I do not believe an illustration could be given that would more clearly convey to the average mind the advantage of protection than the one I have cited. Hon. gentlemen opposite lay much stress on the total aggregate trade. That is a most fallacious argument, in my opinion. It is because of dependence on that argument that Great Britain is dragging behind in the race of trade although she makes a big showing on paper. She is not nearly so prosperous, economically or otherwise, as our great neighbour to the south. And why? She is a very large importing country and a very large exporting country. She buys, let us say for illustration, £500,000,000 of goods and sells £400,000,000 worth. And she says: Look at the vast trade I have handled, no less than £900,000,000 of business. But she bought £500,000,000 worth and therefore she has not advantaged herself to anything like the extent that the figures would indicate. Had she manufactured all these goods at home and had a million to export over the amount she required at home, so that the balance of trade would be in her favour, she would

have been really benefited. But she has brought in a vast amount of goods and sent out a vast amount of goods and these when added together make a great showing on paper. The United States, on the contrary, shows much smaller figures in the matter of exports, but she has her home market and I suppose that over 90 per cent of her products are consumed at home. She is approaching the time when all her wheat and farm produce will be required for her own consumption. The time is close at hand, according to statistical authorities, when the United States will have no cereals to export. If that is the case there is a chance for Canada. We should make a forward movement, not a retrograde movement. We ought not so to change our tariff as to interfere with great national industries or jeopardize capital while spoiling the prospects of our working people. We should have adequate protection for every industry that is well established in the country. Those industries can give the people value for their money, as they have done in the past—and they will do it better and better as time goes on. If Canadian goods are good enough for foreign markets, they should be good enough for use at home. Americans sometimes say: We are bringing in our goods into your Northwest, in spite of your tariff, and that shows that our goods must be better than yours. Not at all. The American has probably cut down his price in order to get his goods in. Or, it may be, he has a better agent to sell them. Sometimes an American agent overtalks our man and sells an implement. We know that the Americans can talk a little faster and better than we can, and that they sometimes misrepresent their goods to a certain extent to make the farmer believe that they are better than the Canadian goods. But the fact is that the Canadian goods are as good as are made anywhere in the world to-day, and we are improving our manufacture all the time. Give us a little more chance, gentlemen; do not get discouraged; and what has been accomplished in the city of Brantford, in the city of Hamilton, in the city of Toronto, will shortly be accomplished in the Northwest, and you will there have cities springing up filled with men of industry, men who will consume your perishable products. And, instead of a policy of retracing our steps, steps which would mean going on the down grade, we must have a policy that will bring greater prosperity and success than ever to this great and growing Dominion of ours.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take part in this debate. But I understand that it is the desire of hon. members generally that the debate should close to-night. Under these circumstances I desire to give notice to the government that, at a later date, I shall move that the British preference shall be confined to goods which are brought into Canada through Canadian seaports.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Will the House go on with these tariff items at the beginning of next week's sitting?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Monday will be a private member's day.

Mr. SPROULE. And the House will go on with the usual order of business?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 3, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Mederic Martin, Esq., for the electoral district of Montreal (St. Mary's).

QUESTIONS.

McLAREN'S CREEK—FENELON TOWNSHIP.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government this year to complete the roadway across McLaren's creek, in Fenelon township, Victoria county?
2. Why has the work been delayed?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No.
2. Government has never undertaken to construct the roadway; but merely to aid the municipality.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—QUEBEC AND MONCTON SECTIONS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked:

1. What is the actual state of the work on that portion of the eastern section of the

National Transcontinental Railway between Quebec and Moncton ?

2. Are the reports of the engineers sent to survey that part of the proposed railway for the National Transcontinental Railway Commission completed ?

3. If so, when is the construction to be commenced ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Preliminary and first location surveys have been made over the whole distance between Quebec and Moncton, and a revised location has also been completed over considerable portions of it.

2 and 3. The reports of the engineers are not yet completed.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SURVEYS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Has the resurvey of the two proposed routes for the National Transcontinental Railway, from Grand Falls, New Brunswick, to Moncton, New Brunswick, been completed ?

2. Has the government yet determined which of the proposed routes between Grand Falls, New Brunswick, and Moncton, New Brunswick, shall be adopted for the location of the said railway between these two points ? If so, which of said routes has been determined upon?

3. Have the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway made any recommendation to the government as to which of the proposed routes between Grand Falls, New Brunswick, and Moncton, New Brunswick, should be adopted for the location of the said railway between these two points ? If so, which of the said routes have they recommended ?

4. Has the district engineer of district A, of the engineering and surveying department, organized by the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, or any other engineer or surveyor employed in said district made any recommendation to the commissioners or to the government as to which of the proposed routes between Grand Falls, New Brunswick, and Moncton, New Brunswick, should be adopted for the location of the said railway between these two points ? If so, which of said routes have the engineers or surveyors recommended ?

5. If the government has not yet decided as to which of the proposed routes between Grand Falls, New Brunswick, and Moncton, New Brunswick, shall be adopted, is the government able to say when a decision will be made in the matter ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. First location surveys of the two routes between Grand Falls and Moncton are finished, but the plans, estimates, &c., for same have not yet been completed.

2. No.

3. No.

4 and 5. When the preliminary surveys were completed over the two routes in New Brunswick between Moncton and Grand Falls the district engineer of district A reported the back line as the shortest and cheapest, but before finally deciding this matter it was considered advisable to have a first location made over both routes. This has now been done, and the plans, estimates &c., for same are expected to be finished shortly.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Have the lands expropriated by the government in connection with the construction of Murray Harbour and Montague branches of the Prince Edward Island Railway and wharfs been paid for ?

2. If not, who are the parties who have not been paid, or finally settled with ?

3. What are the dates in each case on which said lands were expropriated ?

4. Why have not the parties not paid or finally settled with been paid or sent to the Exchequer Court for adjudication ?

5. Have any of these claims been referred to any person for settlement ? If so, what was the report in each case, and has the report been accepted by the government ?

6. Were any petitions of right transmitted to the Secretary of State during the present year in reference to such lands, if so, what action has been taken in connection with them ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Not all. Negotiations are still in progress and others are in the Exchequer Court.

2. Trustees school district No. 94; Carney McClure; Mrs. Debora McKenzie; Daniel McGregor; John Hines; William D. Shaw; David Shaw; John S. Nelson; Captain William Gordon; trustees Owen Connolly Estate; Mrs. Euphemia McLeod.

3. Attempts were made to settle for the lands when they were taken possession of and valued, and these attempts were repeated until June, 1906, when it was found impossible to come to a reasonable agreement. Expropriation plans and descriptions were then filed in the Registrar's office for the county in which the lands are situated. The owners of lands refused to accept the offers made and after repeated attempts to settle, the cases have been referred to the Exchequer Court and will probably be tried in December.

4. They refuse to accept, after repeated attempts to settle, the cases have been referred to the Exchequer Court, and will probably be tried in December.

5. A valuator was appointed to value the properties, and his valuations were offered.

6. Yes, and twelve cases have been sent to the Exchequer Court which will probably be tried in December.

SPEECH AT WIARTON.

Mr. ROBITAILLE asked :

1. Did the Minister of Justice pronounce the following words or others to the same effect

at a public meeting at Wiarton, on the 27th of October last, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of the 25th :—

'Only yesterday in the county of Quebec the fires of sectarian hatred have been lighted, on the ground that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too British for his political opponents there. . . . And just as those in Quebec, who wish his downfall, are to-day having the victory they say they have won on the plains of Quebec, those in Ontario who are exulting in the victory over Sir Wilfrid Laurier, are, if they knew it, digging the very grave of British institutions in Canada.'

2. If so, upon what ground did the minister base his opinion ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice).

1. Yes.

2. On the course of public affairs in this country.

EXPENDITURES ON LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What was the total expenditure in connection with the lighthouse and coast service for the years ending 30th June, in each year, for 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896 ; and what was the amount expended in each year separately ?

2. What was the amount expended for the same service for the years ending 30th June, for 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906; and what was the amount expended in each year separately ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1.	1891-92	503,639 12
	1892-93	503,011 66
	1893-94	476,635 07
	1894-95	475,903 72
	1895-96	466,057 55
		$2,425,247 12
2.	1901-2	696,311 02
	1902-3	964,143 74
	1903-4	1,275,016 87
	1904-5	2,507,307 03
	1905-6	2,688,484 52
		$8,131,263 18

PURCHASES FROM GEORGE T. MERWIN.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of goods have been purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from one George T. Merwin in each year during the years ending 30th June, for 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

2. Were tenders called for ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1.	1901-2	Nil.
	1902-3	2,314 00
	1903-4	142,758 99
	1904-5	158,301 29
	1905-6	110,238 59

2. No. Mr. Merwin represented the only firm that could supply these goods.

PURCHASES FROM BROOKS & CO.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of goods have been purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from Messrs. F. L. Brooks & Company in each year during the years ending 30th June, for 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906?

2. Were tenders called for ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1.	1901-2	Nil.
	1902-3	Nil.
	1903-4	Nil.
	1904-5	53,927 78
	1905-6	151,557 70

2. Quotations were obtained in 1905-6 before purchasing.

PURCHASES FROM CANADIAN FOG SIGNAL COMPANY.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of goods have been purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from the Canadian Fog Signal Company in each year during the years ending 30th June, in 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

2. Were tenders called for ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1.	1901-2	Nil.
	1902-3	Nil.
	1903-4	16,600 00
	1904-5	428,298 12
	1905-6	47,602 89

2. Tenders were called in 1905-6.

PURCHASES FROM WILSON & CO.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of goods have been purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from Messrs. Thomas Wilson & Company in each year during the years ending 30th June, in 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

2. Were tenders called for ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1.	1901-2	Nil.
	1902-3	Nil.
	1903-4	Nil.
	1904-5	192,500 00
	1905-6	336,104 65

2. Owing to the fact that the articles purchased are patented no tenders could be called for.

PURCHASES FROM CHARLES STRUBB.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of goods have been purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from one Charles Strubb, in each year

during the years ending 30th June, in 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

2. Were tenders called for ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1	1901-2	Nil.
	1902-3	Nil.
	1903-4	Nil
	1904-5	8,236 45
	1905-6	13,372 30

2. Tenders were called for cement and the lowest tender accepted.

CONTROL OF EXPRESS COMPANIES.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

1. Is the Minister of Railways aware that along the Intercolonial Railway, in the province of Quebec, the Canadian Express Company has an excessive monopoly, and that it takes advantage thereof to place its agents only at such stations as it pleases to select, thus depriving trade in certain important centres of the advantages that others alone enjoy ?

2. If so, does the government intend : (a) to place that express company, and all express companies in general, under the control of the Railway Commission ; (b) or else, to establish an express company for the Intercolonial which will accord justice to all without any discrimination whatsoever ?

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

1. The Candian Express Company has had for years a contract with the Intercolonial Railway, and it is still in force. The department is not advised of any discrimination against any particular place. A strike has been on between itself and its agents for the past season, which no doubt is a source of irritation to the men concerned and to the public; but it is now happily at an end.

2 (a). Statute 1906 chap. 42, sec. 27 gives Railway Commission control of express companies so far as rates and regulations are concerned.

(b). At present the Canadian Express Company has a contract in force. On its expiration, no doubt, steps will be taken to provide against the possibility of a recurrence of the trouble heretofore had.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH UNITED STATES.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Have the postal arrangements between the United States and Canada been cancelled, or notice given of cancellation ?

2. If so, for what cause or causes ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to negotiate for a new arrangement ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes. In so far as second-class matter is concerned.

2 and 3. As the matter is still under negotiation between the two departments, I would be much obliged if the hon. gentleman would not press these questions at the present time for reasons of state.

PIER AT PORT MAITLAND.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a pier at Port Maitland, Ontario ?

2. Has the contract been given ? If so, to whom ?

3. What are the names of the different persons or firms tendering, and the amount of each tender?

4. When is the work to be commenced ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). There is no information in regard to this question in the Public Works Department.

DRILL HALL AT DUNNVILLE.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is the government aware that there is no armoury or drill hall at Dunnville, Ontario, for the use of rifle companies at that place, or for storage of arms and ammunition ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to build an armoury or drill hall at Dunnville, Ontario ?

3. When can the officers and members of the volunteer company at Dunnville expect the work to be commenced ?

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

1. The government is aware that there is no building owned by the government at Dunnville available to be used as an armoury, but an allowance such as is paid to commanding officers at many other places and provided for by regulations duly promulgated is paid the officer commanding the Dunnville company.

2 and 3. Under consideration.

BOER WAR RELICS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Were any guns, field pieces, rifles, small arms or munitions of war of any description, presented to the Canadian government by the British War Office after the late Boer war ?

2. If so, when were these articles received?

3. Are these articles trophies of the late war ?

4. What was the number and description of such articles ?

5. Has there been any distribution yet made of the same ?

6. If so, when was the distribution made, and to whom ?

7. If no distribution has yet been made, when may such be expected ?

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

1. Yes.

2. January, 1905.

3. Yes.

4. 1.75 M.M.B.L. gun, 1.65 M.M.B.L. gun, 1.37 M.M.B.L. gun, 1 Maxim gun, 700 Mauser rifles.

5, 6, 7. On February 17 last a militia order was published as follows:

'A limited number of Mauser rifles, trophies of the South African war have been received from the imperial government for distribution to centres in which an active part was taken in supplying men for the several contingents which left Canada during the war.'

It is proposed to distribute them as under: 1, Military museums; 2, military institutes; 3, Dominion and provincial libraries; 4, public libraries; 5, militia units from which men were enrolled for South Africa; 6, athletic associations; 7, Y.M.C.A. associations; 8, historical societies.

Applications for rifles should be made through the officer commanding the military district. Issues will be made after the first day of May next.

In reply 137 applications were received by the department. The pressure of work in connection with camps prevented an earlier distribution. The shipping of these rifles necessitating the making of special boxes. The whole distribution will be completed within a week.

The following distribution by districts is being made:

Military District 1, 34; 2, 68; 3, 12; 4, 29; 5 and 6, 6; 7, 35; 8, 7; 9, 6; 10, 18; 11, 8; 12, 10.

It is proposed to place two guns on parliament grounds, another at the disposal of the Improvement Commission and the maxim in the military museum.

NORTH RUSTICO BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Is the work at present under contract on the breakwater at North Rustico, Prince Edward Island, being completed?

2. Is it the intention of the government to still further extend it, in order to make it more serviceable?

3. What is the engineer's report in reference to having it extended?

4. Who are the contractors, and the amount of the contract?

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

1. At North Rustico proper, the department is spending a sum of $2,000 in repairing by day labour, the breakwater and in constructing hurdles for the protection of the beach.

2. At Robinson Island, on the eastern side of the entrance to the harbour, the department is building a breakwater 750 feet long. The work is being done under contract by Mr. Geo. Matheson, for the sum of $13,275.

3. The question of further extension will not be considered until the contract under execution is completed.

GRAIN EXPORTS.

Mr. DANIEL asked:

What portion of the grain produced in Canada during the year 1905 was exported from Canadian ports, and what portion was exported from United States ports?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

EXPORT OF CANADIAN GRAIN, FISCAL YEAR 1905, AS PER EXPORT ENTRIES.

—	Bushels.	Value.
		$
From Canadian seaports direct to countries other than United States.....	21,187,886	17,519,572
Via United States ports in transit to other countries.....	19,909,453	15,651,919
Total.....	41,097,339	33,171,491

SCHOOLS OF MILITARY INSTRUCTION.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many schools of instruction for purposes of qualification of officers and men of the non-permanent force are there in Canada, and where are they located?

2. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men are employed, respectively, in each of these schools of instruction, and at what rank are the officers?

3. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men presented themselves during the past year for purposes of qualification?

4. What is the average length of time required by an officer or man of the active militia for qualification?

5. What was the cost of maintenance of the schools for the past year?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. Permanent schools of instruction are at present located as follows:

Cavalry—
Winnipeg, Man.,
Toronto, Ont.,
St. Johns, Que.

Artillery,
Kingston, Ont. (Horse and field),
Quebec, Que. (Garrison),
Halifax, N.S. (Garrison),
Esquimalt, B.C. (Garrison).

Infantry—
Winnipeg, Man.,
London, Ont.,
Toronto, Ont.,
Qubec, Que.,
Fredericton, N.B.,
Halifax, N.S.,
Esquimalt, B.C.,

In addition to the above, temporary schools of instruction for all arms of the service are authorized at centres of population, according to requirements in the interests of the service.

2. The instructional staffs are as follows-:

Cavalry—

Winnipeg, Man. : 2 officers (1 brev. colonel, 1 lieut.) 2 sergeant instructors.

Toronto, Ont. : 2 officers (1 brev. colonel, 1 captain) 3 sergeant instructors.

St. Jean, Que. : 2 officers (1 major, 1 lieut.) 3 sergeant instructors.

Artillery—

Kingston, Ont. : 3 officers (1 lieut-colonel, 1 captain, 1 lieut.) 7 sergeant instructors.

Quebec, Que.: 3 officers (1 colonel 1 captain, 1 lieut.) 4 sergeant instructors.

Halifax, N.S. : 3 officers (1 lieut-col., 2 captains) 1 sergeant instructor.

Esquimalt, B.C. : 1 officer, with the local rank of major. No. sergeant instructors.

Infantry—

Winnipeg, Man. : 2 officers (1 brev. colonel, 1 lieutenant) 2 sergeant instructors.

London, Ont.: 2 officers (1 brev. lt.-col., 1 lieut.) 2 sergeant instructors.

Toronto, Ont. : 2 officers (1 brev. lt.-col., 1 lieut.) 6 sergeant instructors.

Quebec, Que. : 2 officers (1 major, 1 1 lieut.) 4 sergeant instructors.

Fredericton, N. B. : 2 officers (1 brev. lieut. col., 1 lieut.) 3 sergeant instructors.

Halifax, N.S.: 2 officers (1 lieut.-col., 1 lieut.) 5 sergeant instructors.

Esquimalt, B.C. : 1 officer (local major) no sergeant instructors.

Musketry—

Ottawa, Ont.: 3 officers (1 lieut.-col., 1 major, 1 captain) 3 sergeant instructors.

All officers, N.C.O.'s and men of the permanent force are available for instructional purposes in addition to the regular instructional staff, as required, at the schools and camps.

3. The number of certificates granted during the year 1905, is as follows:—

Officers	688
N.C.O.'s	361
Total	1,049

4. The average length of time required to obtain a certificate is as follows :

Long course—

Cavalry and infantry.. 6 months.

Artillery.. .. .. 9 "

Each of the above includes three months at the Royal Military College.

Short course—

All arms.. .. .. 3 months.

Special course—

From 7 days to 3 months.

5. It is impossible to separate the cost of the schools from the cost of maintaining the permanent force at the depots mentioned. The total cost however of maintaining the depots referred to is about $650,000 for 1,000 officers and men including clothing, travelling and all other expenses.

SIX NATION RESERVE SCHOOLS.

Mr. LALOR asked :

1. Has there been any change in the regulations as to schools upon the Six Nation reserve ? If so, what is the nature of the changes ?

2. Are the schools of the reserve permitted to use the text books, as permitted by the provincial government of Ontario ?

3. Are the schools upon the reserve inspected by the provincial or county inspector ?

4. Are the teachers upon the reserve qualified teachers, and are they compelled to hold the ordinary teachers' certificates for the province of Ontario ?

5. If provincial text books are not permitted, qualified teachers not employed, and schools are not properly inspected by county inspectors, will the government give the reason for not placing the Six Nation Indians upon the same educational conditions as other citizens of the country ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

Nature of changes :—

(a) From two school boards to one.

(b) Provision made for adoption of Ontario course of study.

(c) Provision made for inspection of schools.

(d) Provision made for compulsory attendance at schools.

2. Yes.

3. Permission granted to have the schools inspected by provincial or county inspector.

4. Not all. Qualified teachers are employed when obtainable.

5. It will be seen from the foregoing that the Six Nations Indians are placed upon the same footing as to educational conditions as other citizens regarding inspection of schools, text books and qualification of teachers.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has any circular recently been issued by the Superintendent of Immigration, Department of Interior, to agents in Great Britain, relative to immigration and the methods of conducting business ?

2. Has a recent circular been issued by the Superintendent of Immigration, or the Department of the Interior, to booking agents in the United Kingdom, relative to bonus per head on certain classes of immigrants, and in substance as follows : 'A bonus of one pound will be paid for each adult over eighteen years of age booked for Canada, of the following classes : farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway servicemen, navvies or miners, and female domestic servants. To secure the bonus an immigrant booked must have followed for the previous twelve months one of these vocations. Such immigrants must be landed at Canadian ports,

but in winter time the provision will also apply to passengers landing at Portland, Maine. A bonus of ten shillings will be paid for immigrants booked between one and eighteen years. No bonus will be paid to head officer of steamship or railway companies ?'

3. If not, what are the latest instructions or regulations issued in this regard by the Department of the Interior ?

4. Will the minister lay upon the table of the House copies of all recent regulations issued in this regard ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. The circular is substantially as stated in the question.

3. Answered by answer to second question.

4. Yes, on an order of the House being obtained.

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Has the government taken any steps to provide and operate life-saving stations on the Pacific coast since last session ? If so, what has been done ?

2. How many new lighthouses or improvements to old ones, or aids to navigation of any kind, have been established on the Pacific coast in the year 1906 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. A self-righting and self-bailing life-boat was built in Vancouver last summer, and is now manned by a crew in Victoria who have been under training and is held in readiness for emergencies.

Tenders are being invited for the construction of three light surf-boats, two of which it is proposed to establish at Clo-oose and Ucluelet, to be manned by local crews under trained coxswains, the third to be carried on the 'Salvor,' part of the crew to be trained to man her.

Investigations are being made into the best type of motor life-boat, with a view of procuring one for Banfield Creek, where it is proposed to establish and maintain a fully equipped life-saving station.

2. The following work has been done on improvements to aids to navigation on the Pacific coast in 1906 :

1. Pachena Pt.—A first-class lighthouse and fog alarm under construction, and a temporary light maintained.

2. Lookout Is.—Kyuquot—Thirty day light established.

3. Entrance Is.—Quatsino—Thirty day light established.

4. Amphitrite Pt.—Ucluelet—Thirty day light established.

5. Swale rock—Barkley Sound—Thirty-day light established.

6. Green Is.—New lighthouse under construction.

7. Lennard Is.—First order fog alarm established.

8. Crofton—Thirty-day light established.

9. Sooke—Fishing light established.

10. Egg Is.—First order fog alarm established.

11. Trial Is.—Light and fog alarm established.

12. Gallows Pt.—Nanaimo—Mechanical fog bell established.

13. Pulbeney Pt.—Hand fog alarm established.

14. Scarlett Pt.—Hand fog alarm established.

15. Lucy Is.—Lighthouse under construction.

16. Pine Is.—Lighthouse and fog alarm under construction.

17. Race Rocks—Light improved.

18. Discovery Is.—Light improved.

19. Dock Is.—Light improved.

20. Berens Is.—Fog alarm improved.

21. Cape Beale—Lighthouse rebuilt.

22. Horda Rock—Buoy improved.

23. Sparrowhawk Rock—Buoy improved.

24. Hankin Rock—Clayoquot—Buoy established.

25. Hankin reefs—Chatham Sound—Buoy established.

26. Port Simpson—Buoy established.

27. Swiftsure bank—Whistling buoy established.

28. Sandheads—Buoyage improved.

29. Prince Rupert—4 buoys established, 2 pairs of beacons erected and the harbour surveyed.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Was Captain Anderson of the Marine Department, sent to British Columbia, to look into and report upon the necessity of increased aid to navigation to Pacific coast shipping ?

2. Has such report been presented to the government ? If so, what has been done or is being done to improve such navigation, as the result of Captain Anderson's recommendations?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. Several reports have been presented, covering different departments of work, including reports on new aids to navigation required, on a wireless telegraph service, on a life-saving service, and on improvement of land communications on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

All Colonel Anderson's recommendations for aids to navigation have been approved by the lighthouse board, and several new stations are being built, and old ones improved, the most important new installation being a new first order lighthouse and fog alarm at Pachena Point, now under construction, a new first order lighthouse at Estevan Point, and a fog alarm at Cape Beale, to be erected next spring.

A system of wireless telegraph will be established in the near future. Tenders have been received and are now under consideration.

A life-boat has been built and manned, and is now held ready for service. The questions of extending and improving the life-saving service, and of building a coast road are now engaging the attention of the government.

MARINE ROAD ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries been in correspondence with the Premier of British Columbia, on the desirability of joint action in the building of the road along the west coast short line of Vancouver Island, for the purpose of rescuing distressed mariners?

2. Have they expressed any desire to assist in the building of the road? If so, to what extent?

3. Will the government bring down the papers or correspondence between the Marine Department and the Premier of British Columbia?

Mr. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. The Premier of British Columbia stated that 'were it possible to build such a road it would be of no utility locally, but its uses would be confined entirely to the life-saving service, and it is very questionable whether, on account of the exceedingly rough and broken nature of the coast line a road, or even a trail, could be constructed near enough to the shore to be of any benefit in case of shipwreck'

3 Yes, if desired. There are only two letters on each side and the gist of the reply of the Premier of British Columbia is contained in the foregoing quotation

THE REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Blain—asked :

When will the revised statutes be available for the use of members?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). As soon as they come into force, which it is hoped may be about the 1st of January next.

DREDGING IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Was a new dredge recently completed for work in Prince Edward Island, and what is her name?

2. What dredging was done by the government in Prince Edward Island waters last season, and what dredges were engaged?

3. Was work undertaken completed?

4. What dredges are available for work next season in Prince Edward Island waters?

5. Has the government received a request or communications from any source re dredging at Summerside and Alberton, or other points, and in Prince County, P.E.I.?

6. Has the government arranged any schedule or plan for this work, and what?

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

1. Yes, the dredge 'Montague.'

2 and 3. The dredge 'Prince Edward' was engaged at Charlottetown and at Pownal. The dredge 'Montague' worked at Victoria.

4. Dredges 'Prince Edward' and Montague.'

5. Yes.

6. No.

THE ROBINS IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. What action has the government taken with reference to the application for 144,323 acres of land in the vicinity of the juncture of the Bow and Belly rivers, made by E. H. Cuthberton, to which reference was made in 'Hansard' of 1906, page 1677?

2. Also with reference to a similar application by Guy Tracy Robins?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). These applications were merged in the application of the Robins Irrigation Company, which was granted.

MARINE MEDICAL INSPECTOR AT CANSO.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Is the position of marine medical inspector at Canso, formerly held by Doctor Brine, at present vacant ?

2. What were the salary and emoluments of the late incumbent for each of the three years prior to his decease?

3. Under what arrangement are the medical services attached to this position now being performed?

4. What amount has been paid by the government since the first of March, 1906, for such services, to whom have these sums been paid, and what unpaid claims are there in this connection?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. $280 per annum including all medicine supplied.

3. Dr. P. A. McGarry attends the sick seamen when the services of a physician are required, and his services are paid according to the work performed.

4. $210.15 to Dr. P. A. McGarry. There is a balance of $68.75 claimed by Dr. McGarry which is under discussion.

MR. B. J. SAUNDERS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Was Mr. B. J. Saunders at one time assistant engineer of irrigation for the Dominion government ?

2. If so no longer, when and for what reason did he resign from this position ?

3. What salary did he draw at the time he left the employ of the government ?

4. Is he at the present time in any way connected with the Department of the Interior ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Yes.

2. Promoted to position of chief engineer on 1st January, 1903, which position he

resigned on 31st March, 1904. No reason given.

3. $900 per annum paid by the Dominion Government and $2,000 by the government of the then Northwest Territories.

4. Yes. Has a contract for subdivision of townships in eastern Manitoba.

SAULE STE. MARIE IMPORTS.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What quantity of hay, potatoes, and other farm and garden produce, was entered at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Canada, during the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1906 ?

2. What duty was paid upon such articles, respectively ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

The following articles of farm and garden produce, entered for consumption at the port of Sault Ste. Marie, together with the duty collected thereon, during the fiscal year 1906, were as follows :

Articles.	Unit of Quantity.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
			$	$
Oats	Bush.	125	44	12 50
Apples, green	Brls.	12	58	4 80
Strawberries, &c	Lbs	7,684	759	153 68
Cherries	"	650	104	13 00
Grapes	"	7,092	597	141 84
Peaches	"	32,282	1,310	322 82
Plums	Bush.	225	440	110 00
Fruits, green, N.E.S.	"	....	466	93 20
Hay	Tons.	604	4,657	1,208 00
Potatoes	Bush.	1,863	1,076	279 45
Tomatoes, fresh	"	98	338	72 60
Vegetables, green and dry	"	...	913	228 25
Indian corn	Bush.	7,235	3,557	Free.

PUBLIC WORKS AT PORT COLBORNE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has a contract been let for the erection of a government-owned grain elevator at Port Colborne ?

2. What is its capacity in bushels ?

3. How many tenders were received, and the amount of each tender ?

4. When was the contract, if any, executed ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Plans have been prepared for a storage capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. Doubt having been expressed that this capacity would not be required, it was determined to cut down the storage bins to a capacity of 800,000 bushels, to test the matter, when, if it is found desirable to increase, the original plans will be carried out.

3. Three tenders were received for the superstructure, viz. :—

Canadian Steel Construction Company, for.. ..$1,925,000
The Dominion Bridge Company, for.. 652,500
Peter Lyall & Sons, of Montreal, for.. 637,000

Three tenders were received for the substructure, viz :—

M. J. Hogan, for.. .. ..$ 97,481
Haney & Miller, for.. .. 166,000
Larkin & Sangster, for .. 90,000

4. The contract for the substructure has been completed.

The contract for the superstructure was executed on the 8th of October, 1906.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

How much has been expended at Port Colborne since 30th June, 1906, up to date, in improvements at Port Colborne, (a) by the Department of Railways and Canals ; (b) by the Department of Public Works ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

(a) The Department of Railways and Canals has expended $1,207,959.10 up to the 30th June, 1906.

From the 30th of June, 1906 to the 1st of December, 1906, $222,288.58 was expended.

Total expended by the Department of Railways and Canals up to 1st December, 1906, $1,430,247.68.

Expended by Public Works Department: $828,187.85.

BELLE RIVER PIER, P.E.I.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government engineer reported on the extension and improvements of the Belle River pier, in Prince Edward Island ?

2. If so, what is the value of the report and estimated cost of the work ?

3. Has the government decided to proceed with those improvements, so necessary, for the shipping of the large section of country ?

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

1 and 2. A report has been received from the resident engineer in Prince Edward Island, placing at $6,000 the cost of improvements, repairs, &c., required.

3. Report is under consideration.

GRANT OF GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has the government granted a grazing lease affecting in whole or in part townships 32 and 33, range 18, and townships 33 and 34, range 19, west of the fourth meridian ?

2. If so (a) to whom was such lease granted? (b) from what date and for how long is it to run ? (c) was it conferred by order in council ? If so, when was said order passed ? ; (d) what payments have thus far been made to the government by the lessee or his assigns ; (e) what assignment or transfers have

been registered with the Department of the Interior in respect to these grazing privileges ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. (a) Thomas Dahl, St. James, Man.; D. C. Cameron, Winnipeg, Man.

(b) From October 1, 1905. For twenty-one years, subject to cancellation on two years' notice.

(c) Under orders in council of April 23, 1904, and July 27, 1905.

(d) Payments have been made as follows:

On Nov. 22, 1904..	$ 20 60
" Feb. 28, 1905..	12 25
" June 7, 1905..	876 80
" Nov. 3, 1905..	50 67
" Nov. 5, 1906..	826 64

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

In respect to the northeast quarter of section 2, township 25, range 28, west of the second meridian, (a) in whose name is it held ? (b) when was the original entry made? (c) what extension has been granted, and for what reason ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The Northeast quarter of section 2, township 25, range 28, west of the 2nd meridian was never homesteaded. It was included in the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

RIFLE RANGE AT CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What steps has the government taken to provide a new rifle range at Charlottetown ?

2. Has a contract been let ? If so, who is the successful tenderer, and the amount of the contract ?

3. How many tenders were received, the name of each tenderer, and the amount of each tender ?

4. (a) When is work to be commenced ? (b) and when to be finished ?

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

1 and 2. A site has been purchased, and a contract for the construction of a new range has been awarded to Messrs Lyons & White, who were the lowest tenderers, for $11,250.

3. Five, as follows :

Lyons & White, Ottawa..	$11,250
V. W. Giroux, Ottawa..	11,400
H. C. Lowe and S. Lowe, Charlottetown..	12,400
T. Campbell, Charlottetown..	13,930
Rogers, Prouse & Nickelson, Charlottetown..	16,748

4. (a) As soon as the weather permits ; (b) not later than July 1, 1907.

CONTRACT FOR A ROUNDHOUSE FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL AT HALIFAX.

Mr. GAUVREAU asks (Translation) :

November 30—1. Who obtained the contract for the construction of the roundhouse for the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax ?

2. Who were the tenderers ?

3. What were the amounts of their respective tenders ?

The Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prme Minister) (Translation):

1. Mr. E. Keefe, Halifax.

2 and 3. The names of the tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders are as follows:

M. E. Keefe, Halifax, $122,373.

E. A. Walberg, Montreal, $126,540.

John McInnis & Son, Halifax, $198,000.

Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst, $161,400.

Dubé & Dumont, Rivière-du-Loup, $147,000.

J. B. McManus, Memramcook, N. B., $168,000.

CONFERENCE OF PROVINCIAL PREMIERS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to lay on the table of the House a full report of the proceedings of the conference of provincial premiers, held recently in Ottawa ?

2. Will the government be able to do so at an early date ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). These papers have been printed and will be brought down probably this week or next week.

COAL MINING RIGHTS IN WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Did C. F. Caldwell, Kaslo, British Columbia, make application during the year 1906, for surface and coal mining rights in either or any of the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta or British Columbia ? If so, how many acres in his own name ?

2. Did C. F. Caldwell, Kaslo, British Columbia, make application on behalf of any other person or persons for similar rights ? If so, how many persons, and what was the total number of acres applied for ?

3. Have any mining rights been granted C. F. Caldwell, or any person for whom he applied ? If so, how many acres ?

4. Have any transfers been made of any mining rights granted to any application made by C. F. Caldwell, or any one through him ? If so, to whom were said transfers made ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes, in the province of Alberta, 320 acres.

2. Yes. 235 persons. 75,200 acres.

3. Yes. 640 acres.

4. No.

MAIL CARRIAGE, HARBOUR AU BOUCHE.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Who has the contract for conveying the mails between Harbour au Bouche and the railway station, Nova Scotia ?

2. Were tenders called for, and if so, when?

3. Who tendered, and what was the amount of each tender, respectively ?

4. Was the lowest tender accepted? If not, why not?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. John E. Corbett.

2. Yes. Received at the department on July 27, 1906.

3. John E. Corbett.. .. .. $ 74 00
Michael Pelrine.. .. .. 85 00
Paschal Levangie.. .. .. .. 119 00

4. The lowest tender was accepted.

RECESSION OF NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Were any copies of a certain map prepared by Dr. J. W. Spencer, printed, or engraved, by any department of the government, to illustrate a report on the recession lines of Niagara Falls?

2. If so, how many copies were printed or engraved?

3. Why was not the map included in the summary report of the Geological Survey for the year 1905?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Yes.

2. 5,550.

3. The map was intended to accompany J. W. Spencer's report, the manuscript of which has not yet been received from Dr. J. W. Spencer.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What action does the government propose to take to prevent a recurrence of the recent marine disaster, involving the loss of life which occurred just outside the entrance to Toronto harbour, by reason of the insufficient depth of water in both entrances to the harbour, in consequence of which the wrecked vessels were unable to obtain the shelter of the harbour?

2. What life-saving appliance or equipment does the government maintain at Toronto harbour?

3. Under whose management or superintendence is the said life-saving station?

4. What is the annual cost of such life-saving station?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. As this question contains argument and opinion concerning the cause of the accident referred to, which casualty is now being investigated, I do not think this question is according to the rules of the House.

2. A fully equipped surf boat, which is kept in good order and ready for launching.

3. Captain William Ward who lives at the life-saving station on Centre Island selects the crew from the best and most convenient men, who are drilled periodically and kept together as an efficient crew and can be called together at short notice in case of need.

3. The annual cost of this station has averaged about $320.

COAL STRIKE AT LETHBRIDGE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Who is the Mr. Mitchell whom the Deputy Minister of Labour has been meeting, in connection with the coal strike in the Northwest?

2. Where did the meeting of the deputy minister with said Mr. Mitchell take place, and what was its object?

3. What was the result of said meeting?

4. Was the Deputy Minister of Labour directed or authorized by the government to meet Mr. Mitchell?

5. Did the Deputy Minister of Labour solicit an interview from Mr. Mitchell?

6. What communications were made to Mr. Mitchell by the government of Canada, or by the Deputy Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Canadian government, to Mr. Mitchell, in regard to said meeting?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). Before answering this question I wish to make a statement to the House in order to explain my answer. Pending the difficulties which accompanied the settlement of the strike in the coal district at Lethbridge, a committee of miners was sent to Indianapolis to meet Mr. Mitchell, who is the president of the International Union of the Miners of America. They were sent by their friends to Indianapolis in order to confer with Mr. Mitchell and inquire whether they could accept the clause which had been drafted by Mr. Mackenzie King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, and submit it to the manager—

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I do not think he is in order.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said that before answering I wished simply to make an explanation of the answers I was to give.

Mr. MONK. As I understand the rules of the House, questions must be answered without any comment or explanation. Perhaps I am wrong in that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that only what is necessary properly to explain the answer is permitted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was saying that a committee of miners had been sent to Indianapolis to meet Mr. Mitchell and submit to him the clause which had been drafted by Mr. Mackenzie King as a basis of settlement between the miners and the proprietors of the mines. In order to avoid any delay in the exchange of correspondence between the directors of the mine and the miners, Mr. Smith, Mr. King, the deputy minister, and Mr. Walter Scott, premier of the province of Saskatchewan, accompanied that committee, but as a matter of fact they had no interview with Mr. Mitchell. The miners' committee held their interview and reported to Mr. King, and

immediately afterwards the strike was declared off. Now I will answer the questions by numbers :

1. The government is not aware that the Deputy Minister of Labour has met any Mr. Mitchell.

2. The government is not aware of any meeting having taken place.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. There were no directions given, but the deputy minister was authorized to use his best judgment and to take what steps he deemed necessary to effect a settlement.

5. He did not.

6. None.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND THE INTERMEDIATE TARIFF.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has any foreign country applied to the government of Canada for admission to the benefits of the intermediate tariff ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to grant the advantages of the intermediate tariff to countries whose tariff against Canada averages less than four per cent ?

3. Will foreign countries, whose average tariff against Canada, amounts to less than three per cent, be admitted at once to the favour of the intermediate tariff ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. No.

2 and 3. It is not the intention of the government to admit any foreign country at once to the benefit of the intermediate tariff. The matter will be one for future consideration.

PIER AT PORT MAITLAND.

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a pier at Port Maitland, Ontario ?

2. Has the contract been given ? If so, to whom ?

3. What are the names of the different persons or firms tendering, and the amount of each tender ?

4. When is the work to be commenced?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes. To Edward Conroy.

3. Edward Conroy, $29,831: Joseph Battle, $32,045; Geo. A. Begy, $33,364.

4. Contract was signed on October 15, 1906.

SUSPENSION OF MR. C. F. JUST.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, in reference to the question asked on the 28th ultimo by the hon. member for North Toronto as to the cause of the suspension of Mr. C. F. Just, of the Department's London Emigration Office, I beg to say that the reasons given by Mr. Preston for the suspension of Mr. Just do not appear to be on file here. Speaking from memory there were numerous allegations which summed up amounted to a degree of insubordination and inattention to duty.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Postmaster General's department and any person or persons, relating to the forbidding the use of the mails to the newspaper known as ' Lowrey's Claim,' and copies of the articles complained of.—Mr. Galliher.

Copy of all correspondence and documents on file referring to the sale of any timber upon what is known as the Light House reserve, on Hope island, in the Georgian bay.—Mr. Bennett.

Copy of all correspondence, despatches, &c., exchanged between the imperial government and the Dominion government, concerning the taking over by Canada of the dockyards, docks, arsenals, &c., at Halifax, and at Esquimalt, and the conditions of said transfer. Also a copy of reports made both by imperial officers and Canadian officials, as well as estimates and statement of expenditure made or required to be made at each of said places so taken over, now in the possession of the government.—Mr. Monk.

Copy of all correspondence, contracts and appointments of overseers, in respect to Port Burwell harbour, in the county of Elgin, Ontario, since 1st January, 1905. Also a return showing pay-sheets, amount of new material used, from whom purchased, of all day or contract work on said harbour, giving names of overseers, and when appointed from the same date.—Mr. Marshall.

Copy of all correspondence, contracts, appointments of overseers, in respect to Port Stanley harbour, in the county of Elgin, since 1st January, 1905. Also a return showing voucher pay-sheets, amount of new material used, from whom purchased, of all day or contract work on said harbour, giving the names of overseers and when appointed, from the same date.—Mr. Marshall.

Copy of all correspondence, contracts, appointments of overseers, in respect to Port Bruce Harbour, in the county of Elgin, Ontario, since 1st January, 1905. Also a return showing voucher pay-sheets, amount of new material used, from whom purchased, of all day or contract work on said harbour, giving the names of overseers and when appointed, from same date.—Mr. Marshall.

Return showing what properties, if any, have been purchased by the government during the past two years, in the city of Ottawa, between Sussex street and Mackenzie avenue; the properties acquired by the government in that locality; the names of the vendors; the dates of the purchases, the price agreed upon in each case; the superficies of the property acquired; the date on which the government took possession in each case.—Mr. Morin.

Return showing for five years past the annual shipments across the Atlantic of butter, cheese, apples, pears, other fruits and other products, classifying them, (a) in cold storage; (b) in cool air compartments; (c) in ordinary storage.—Mr. E. D. Smith by Mr. Blain.

Copy of contracts with transatlantic steamship lines, in force during the season of 1906, that were entitled by such contract to receive bonuses or subventions from the government.—Mr. E. D. Smith by Mr. Blain.

Copy of all thermograph records of temperature on ocean-going vessels taken during the past season; stating names of vessel, and date of sailing, and port from whence sailing. Also stating if in cold storage chambers, cool air chambers, ventilated chambers or unventilated chambers. Also in case of ventilated chambers, stating the method of ventilation.—Mr. E. D. Smith by Mr. Blain.

Copy of all correspondence had between the government of Canada, or any member thereof, or any official thereof, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any officer or official thereof, or any other corporation or person, respecting the landing of mails and passengers from the steamers of said Canadian Pacific Railway Company, coming from Great Britain, at Halifax, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Stockton.

Copy of all orders in council, leases, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda, letters, telegrams, correspondence, and other documents and papers, relating to, (a) the granting of grazing lease No. 2013 issued to J. D. McGregor, and of grazing lease No. 2014, issued to A. E. Hitchcock; (b) the assignment of said lease privileges to, or the enjoyment of the same, by the Grand Forks Cattle Company; (c) any further transfer or sale of said privileges by the Grand Forks Cattle Company; (d) all transactions between the government and the assigns of the Grand Forks Cattle Company.—Mr. Ames by Mr. Bergeron.

Copy of all orders in council, leases, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda, letters, telegrams, correspondence, and other documents and papers, touching, relating to, or concerning, (a) the granting of grazing lease No. 2009, issued to C. E. Hall; (b) the enjoyment of said lease privileges by C. E. Hall; (c) the assignment of the same to the Milk River Cattle Company; (d) the enjoyment of the same by the Milk River Cattle Company; together with a statement showing all amounts received by the government by way of rentals, bonuses, or otherwise, from each of the parties herein above-mentioned, with date, amount, and object of each such payment.—Mr. Ames by Mr. Bergeron.

Copy of all orders in council, leases, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda, letters, telegrams, correspondence, and other documents and papers, touching, relating to, or concerning, (a) the granting of grazing lease No. 2059, issued to H. P. Brown, of Grand Forks, Montana; (b) the assignment of said lease privileges to the Galway Horse and Cattle Company, and the enjoyment thereof by said company; (c) the further assignment of said lease privileges by the Galway Horse and Cattle Company to John Cowdry, of Macleod, and his enjoyment of the same, together with a statement showing all rentals or bonuses received by the government from any of the above parties, with date, amount and purpose of each payment.—Mr. Ames by Mr. Bergeron.

Copy of all documents relating to the application of, (a) J. T. Robbins, for land in townships 10, 11 and 12, ranges 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, west of fourth; and of (b) E. H. Cuthbertson, for land in townships 11, 12, 13, ranges 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, west of fourth, for purposes of irrigation.—Mr. Ames by Mr. Bergeron.

Return showing all, if any, islands or portions of islands sold since the first day of July, 1896, adjoining the townships of Baxter and Gibson, in the district of Muskoka, on the Georgian bay, and the prices received therefor, respectively.—Mr. Wm. Wright by Mr. Bennett.

IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION OF CANNED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr Blain—moved for :

Return showing : Quantity or value of green fruit, canned fruits and vegetables, fruit jams, preserves and jellies, classifying them wherever practicable, imported into Canada, and exported therefrom, during each of the past ten years; stating also whether from Great Britain, United States, or other countries; and during the past two years the quantity imported through ports of entry, first, in eastern provinces; second, prairie provinces; third, British Columbia.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). There is no objection to the motion at all. I think it desirable to mention that the hon. member will see that it will take some little time to prepare it.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved for :

Return showing the number of acres of Indian lands sold in each year since 1896, with the price received per acre, and where selected in each case; a statement of the manner in which said lands were sold in each case per acre, whether by public tender or private sale. If sold by tender, in how many papers were advertisements printed, in each case; also giving the number of days from first appearance of such notice until tenders were closed, in each case; the amount paid the Indians, the expenses connected with the sales, and where the balance of these sales was deposited. Also a copy of all leases given by this government of Indian lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, since 1896; with a statement showing how such lands were leased, either by public tender or by private arrangement.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is passed I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) to the fact that his return calls for a very large amount of work on the part of the Indian Department, an amount, which it seems to me, can hardly be necessary in order to arrive at any possible point that he desires to reach. It involves a review of the work of the department for ten years, and it will take a great deal of time to prepare and consequent delay. If the hon. gentleman wants the return within a reasonable time it will be necessary for him to amend his motion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The greater part of this motion was placed on the order paper about two months before the close of the last session and no notice was taken of it at that time apparently. I believe that every part of the motion is necessary for the object I have in view.

Motion agreed to.

WATERWAY FROM COBOCONK TO GULL RIVER WATERS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House the best interests of the country would be served by the construction forthwih of a canal, or rather the opening up of the waterways from Coboconk northward to the head of the Gull river waters.

He said : This motion concerns the extension of the Trent canal system northward from the village of Coboconk in the county of Victoria and Haliburton. It is well known to the members of the House and to every intelligent man in Canada that the Trent canal starts from the Georgian bay on the west and terminates at the Bay of Quinte on the east. Prior to the last election there was some talk as to whether this canal might not run into Lake Ontario at Port Hope, but I believe the result of the election in the county of Durham decided that the canal shall run through the town of Trenton to the Bay of Quinte. The Gull river waters in the north flow into Balsam lake at Coboconk and from Balsam lake they flow both ways towards the Georgian bay and towards the Bay of Quinte, to supply the canal with water. I shall not discuss the Trent canal problem at all because I take it for granted, although the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here, that it is a foregone conclusion that the Trent canal will be pressed to a speedy completion. But inasmuch as the policy of the government is to build branch canals from the main canal—notably one from Lake Simcoe up into Newmarket—I take the liberty of placing before the House a much more important undertaking, namely this branch from Coboconk northward for about 50 or 60 miles. In fact, it would not be a canal strictly speaking; it would be the connecting of a chain of lakes. Immediately north of Coboconk there are the Mud Turtle lakes. A dam at Coboconk (there is one there now) having a lock placed in it would make it navigable from the height of land waters into the Mud Turtle waters. At the village of Norland there would be a small lock, not very high. At Elliott's falls a couple of miles further on there would be another lock. Then there would be clear navigation through Moore's lakes up to the foot of Gull lake at Moore's Falls. Onward there would be a splendid stretch of navigation all through the beautiful waters of Gull lake to the village of Minden. Here the only difficulty of any importance in the entire route would have to be overcome, but were the canal completed as far as Minden a very great service would be done the entire country. It would be an easy matter to go on further than Minden and open up to the markets of the world a great area of country to the north.

Mr. PATERSON. How far is it from Minden to Coboconk ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. About 30 miles. The Gull river issues from the Horse Shoe lake about four miles above Minden and flows past Minden, but the canal would not necessarily follow the waters of the Gull river from Horse Shoe lake as in fact that route would be practically impossible inasmuch as the fall there is very rapid and the ground rocky. Mountain lake which empties into Horse Shoe lake comes down parallel with the river, a mile or so from the village of Minden, and by connecting the river with Mountain lake by a slide for boats and barges—and this has all been reported on by the engineers of the department in 1891 and 1892 and I believe at a subsequent date also—and by placing a dam between Mountan and Horse Shoe lake, an easy communication could be afforded with the country north of Minden. One dam between the Horse Shoe lake and Mountain lake, a very narrow pass, would easily raise the water, and as the Dominion government has taken over these waters for storage purposes the same dam would serve to connect the lakes and give navigable water to the north. One dam there would give steamboat communication all through there to Mountain, Twelve-Mile, Little Boskung, Big Boskung, Buch, Maple lake, Cranberry, Pine, Eagle, and several other lakes. The one dam would raise the water perhaps fifteen but let us say thirteen feet and would give thirty to forty miles of additional navigation. There are various reasons for urging this besides the ordinary one of the tourist traffic, which is important as people who are familiar with Muskoka know. There is in that district timber, birch, maple, basswood and ash, those heavy timbers which are now of such great value in the markets of the world in abundance, but owing to the tremendous rocky ridges that lie between the waters of the Gull river and the railway which penetrates that country, owing I say to the almost impossible and impassable character of those rocky ridges, the timber cannot be hauled to the railway, and the only way to get it out would be by barges down this waterway. I have had this matter before the department both publicly and privately for a number of years and I feel that I do not need to speak on the subject any further than to draw the attention of the government to the report in the Department of Railways and Canals on this important subject.

The government has already taken over these lakes from the Ontario government for the storage of water. Now a double purpose could be served by having the storage of water in these vast basins and also giving the people living along the shores of these waters, good navigation and means of getting out their timber, which is very, very valuable to the markets of the world.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we were to build such a dam as is contemplated would it not have the effect of raising the level of the water in the lakes and killing a quantity of valuable timber along the shores?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad that my right hon. friend the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has asked that. There would be a very small portion of timber in some places which would be flooded, but that could easily be cut off before the dam would be raised. As a rule, however, the shores of these lakes are high, the immediate shore is high and the good land from which the timber would be taken, and which is adapted to farming, is back from the shore a certain distance and with the exception of a few hundred acres along the entire route, the raising of the water would not destroy any of the timber. If this timber could be got to the market and I need not tell the House how important it is that the timber should be got to the market, it would be of very great value, but if it is left standing, it will in a few years be destroyed by fire or blown down by storms as it has now reached its full growth. All we ask is that since the government has launched upon the policy of branch lines to this canal this all-important route shall be opened up so that the products of this district may be conveyed to the markets of the world. The cost will not be excessive, in fact the estimate up to Minden a number of years ago was that it would be very little more than half the estimated cost of the canal from Lake Simcoe, nine miles out to the village of Newmarket. But we would be very much pleased if the canal would be extended right along the lakes to the north so that the timber could be got off and the dealers there would have some means of getting their products to the markets of the world.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the nearest point on a railway to these upper points?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. About eighteen miles across the hills.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, for my part I am rather glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has brought this question to the attention of the House. It is a matter which requires somewhat careful consideration, and I may say that my attention was called to it some time ago. The subject is of such a character that I do not think the government could come to a conclusion upon it at the present time unless they had more information than is now available. The government, as my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has stated, have adopted the policy of building branches of the Trent Valley canal. This is a new policy and one which calls for commendation and which should be looked into with some care. I remember when I first entered the House thirty years ago, the Trent canal was looked on as a thing to be laughed at and not to be seriously considered, but we have now come to the conclusion that the building of the Trent Valley canal will be of great benefit to the people of the valley and of the people of Canada at large. We did not appreciate fully until we started into the work the value it would attain, but the building of this canal has shown what we knew before, but it has been illustrated once more, that if you afford facilities for the interchange of traffic, traffic is sure to follow and the advantages of the Trent Valley canal, although it is not yet fully completed, are already appreciable and for my part I have no reason to regret the policy we have adopted of having branches as feeders to this canal.

The only observation I have to make upon my hon friend's (Mr. Sam. Hughes') motion is to ask whether the character of the country that he has stated would be served by this canal is such as to be benefited by the building of such a work. I notice that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) stated that it would be of great advantage to tourist traffic. I believe myself it might be some advantage to tourist traffic, but the fact that my friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) brings forward the tourist traffic as the chief inducement for the construction of this work, seems to indicate that the country is not of such a character as to justify the building of such a canal as that.

I do not say that by way of throwing any objection in the way of my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes), but simply to illustrate the need of having more information than we have upon this point. So far as I am informed, the character of the country is rocky, and little adapted to agriculture. You may find here and there a small valley in which you may have one farm or a few farms, but the country is not as a whole adapted for agriculture, and my information is that this country would be better suited to lumbering than to farming. I would call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to this that as we advance in the old provinces especially, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, the forests become more and more valuable, and forest lands to-day are perhaps just as valuable as farm lands and in certain sec-

tions of the country more valuable than farm lands. I put it to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) simply for information, whether or not it is not better to preserve that country as a forest reserve to be held there with all its attendant advantages, the trade that follows upon the forest industry, the obtaining of valuable timber, the preservation of fish and game and so on, than to attempt to make an agricultural country of it. If we were to build the canal would it not invite settlement in that part of the country and tend rather to destroy the real value of that land?

I do not suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) intends to have the House pronounce at once upon the resolution he has moved; he will be quite satisfied I hope to withdraw it after having drawn the attention of the government to it and I shall for my part bring it on the first occasion possible to the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I do not propose to say anything relative to the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes) because I am not conversant with the locality to which his motion referred, but I am pleased to see in the estimates the sum of $280,000 for the Trent Valley canal. I presume that this amount is for the portion between Lake Simcoe and Georgian bay over which the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) travelled last summer. I believe that at the time he expressed himself very favourably on the desirability of improving that stretch of water known as the Severn river. I have nothing to say against the outlined branches, whether the one at Holland river or Gull lake, but the time has arrived for completion of the work and the policy of the government to that end should commend itself to every one at all conversant with the great waterway.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What is the policy of the government that commends itself to every one?

Mr. BENNETT. The expenditure of $280,000 on one portion this year which, I take it, will be on the Severn river division. As to the construction from the waterways of Lake Huron to those of Lake Ontario, I noticed in one of the morning papers a strong piece of evidence in favour of canal systems. It was the fact stated that the Erie canal carried this past season 25,000,000 bushels of grain as compared with 3,000,000 in the preceding year. The Grand Trunk Railway are to-day constructing at Midland a colossal work in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Already one American company has built on Grand Trunk property at that point an elevator with the capacity of 1¼ million bushels. A second elevator is being constructed, not by the Grand Trunk Railway, but by an independent company, with a capacity of 2½ million bushels. All this points to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway are determined that the proper system of carrying grain from the west, whether from American or Canadian ports on the upper lakes, is by way of those lakes and then by rail communication to the seaboard. In that connection the Canadian Pacific Railway are contemplating new works at Victoria Harbour, near Midland. It is said that the government propose to spend over a million dollars in improving that harbour for the accommodation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have not heard any official statement to the effect but the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway transportation interests are being centred at that portion of the lake. What is to happen? If they are to carry their grain to that end of the lake—it will not only be Canadian grain but grain from American ports as well, because to-day a large portion of the grain that goes to Midland and Depot Harbour is not from the Canadian Northwest but from Duluth I am glad to know that the government have such a large appropriation in connection with the Trent Valley canal, and now that that work is completed to the waters of Lake Simcoe, I trust that the whole construction work on the Severn river, from a point on the Georgian bay to Lake Simcoe, will be undertaken in the most hearty manner this coming season and the work hastened to an end. Whether it be by Trenton or Port Hope, I trust the work will be carried out to Lake Ontario. Let the public understand that it is not a slow system of canaling such as the Erie, but a canal system with a greater depth and carriage. On the greater portion of it, for miles and miles, it will simply mean transit as fast as on the great lakes to-day. Barges capable of carrying 20,000 bushels may, to the extent of the propelling power, whether eight or ten barges, be carried along at as high a rate of speed as is possible on the great lakes. If it be true that the Erie canal in the past season increased its trade from 3,000,000 odd bushels of grain to some 25,000,000 bushels and in addition had a very large increase in other commodities, that shows that when the Trent Valley transportation system is finished it will be a great factor in the transportation trade of this country as a competitor with both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I rise for the purpose of pointing out that I do not wish to be taken as agreeing in the view of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr.

Bennett) that the appropriation in the estimates is necessarily for the opening up of connection by way of the Severn river with Georgian bay. I think the government should make a most exhaustive survey before coming to any decision. There are large sections of people in the neighbourhood of those proposed works who think that the proper method of connection is westerly from Barrie to the Nottawasaga river and thence to Georgian bay. I have been interviewed several times regarding the advisability of a deputation coming here to see the Minister of Railways and Canals on this matter, and I have undertaken to call the attention of the government to the advisability of a thorough survey of both the contemplated routes before coming to any decision. I would not be prepared to say that the course I am now advocating—that is connection by way of Barrie with the Nottawasaga river and thence to Georgian bay—is necessarily the advisable course, although people in that locality are convinced that it is, but I do wish to impress on the government that they should come to no determination until a proper survey is made. There has been no thorough investigation, and it may well happen that whatever people may imagine, from a mere general examinaaton of the territory, the route which would be thought advisable from that general survey would not be the one that should be adopted. A direct line of communication at all events would be by the route I am suggesting, and I urge that not only this work shall be advanced rapidly—in which I cordially agree with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—but that there shall be a thorough investigation before any connection is determined upon.

Mr. BENNETT. With the indulgence of the House I would like to place on 'Hansard' this despatch which appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette.'

Buffalo, N.Y., December 1.—The shipments of grain by way of the Erie canal during the last year show a phenomenal increase over previous years. The total for the season just closed was 25,002,554 bushels, against 3,623,945 for last year. Not only is 1906 a record-breaking year for grain shipments, but other commodities carried show remarkable increases.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I will not discuss the question of the Trent canal to-day. That will come up in due course, as a sum has been placed in the estimates for it. I am sorry that it is such a small sum; I had hoped that the canal would have been pushed to completion within the next year or two. In regard to the work referred to in the motion, the First Minister has said that the government have no data. If he consults his Minister of Railway and Canals, he will ascertain that in the Department of Railways and Canals there have been on file for fifteen or sixteen years ample data to justify the construction of this canal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the character of the country?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will come to that in a moment. At the present time, with scarcely any facilities for traffic, there is a population in the district through which this canal would run of about 15,000. Until recent years these people were engaged in lumbering for eight or nine months of the year and the rest of the year in so-called farming. It is true there is a great deal of rocky country, but in almost every hundred acres there is a large area of land fit for tilling, and the greater portion of the entire district is well fitted for grazing. Now that the lumbering has been removed to the northern portions of the province, the people of this district have been forced by stern necessity to devote themselves to agriculture and stock raising, and in this they are doing extraordinarily well and making money. The First Minister misunderstood me if he supposed that I urged the tourist trade as the chief industry. I think my words were that it was only an incident; but it is a very important incident. In the little region around the Muskoka lakes upwards of $1,750,000 was brought in last year by tourists. It would need a great number of industries to bring in as much money as that. But that is only an incident. The great advantage of this canal would be in bringing out the hard wood—maple, birch, ash, elm and basswood—which grow in immense quantities in the district; and once the timber is gone, the people fall back on farming and the raising of stock. I might point out that for farming purposes this district is infinitely superior to the highlands of Scotland or the peaks of Derbyshire or many parts of Ireland. As the First Minister has suggested, it is not my intention to move this motion. My policy in this House has never been the factious one of dividing the House on questions of this kind, but the policy of educating the people and the government of the day; and in due time I have seen the fruits of that policy, not only in the case of this government but in the case of previous governments. The First Minister spoke of reforesting this district. That will not do at all. It was formerly covered with pine, but to reforest it with pine fit for market, would take a hundred and fifty years. In the Maritime provinces timber land can be readily reforested with spruce, but this region would have to go through the proper stage, as every lumberman knows, before the pine would grow to any extent. There are millions of acres in Canada not half as well adapted for farming as this district. In this district there are many valleys with splendid land. The population is much more numerous than the population

along the little canal in the neighbourhood of Newmarket. I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

THE LATE POSTMASTER AT CANNINGTON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES moved for

A copy of all correspondence concerning the retirement from office of Mr. Talbot, late postmaster at Cannington, Ontario.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a motion which was brought before the House last session, but the discussion on it continued so long that the vote on it was not reached and it was not passed. I do not intend to discuss the motion at any great length; but I will briefly state the facts of the case. Mr. Talbot was the postmaster of the village of Cannington for many years, during which he gave absolute satisfaction. No charge had been proven against him of being a political partisan or of having taken part in any political or even municipal contest, or of having neglected the business of the office. Suddenly he was dismissed from office, and the only reason that could be advanced for this action—and I presume it was the real reason—was that a gentleman of the name of Macpherson, who had been a staunch Liberal in the town, wanted the job. This Macpherson had been appointed by the government as customs officer at Gravenhurst. While he was there the Ontario government revised its list of magistrates, and finding that Mr. Macpherson was not at that time a resident of the village of Cannington, having moved to Gravenhurst to look after the customs business there, his name was dropped from the list of magistrates. Soon afterwards he returned to the village of Cannington, and very shortly after that Mr. Talbot was dismissed from the post office and Mr. Macpherson appointed in his place. Now, I would not have discussed this matter today at all, but for the fact that the Postmaster General of last year, the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), went out of his way to throw aspersions on the conduct of Mr. Talbot in connection with the office. One of the statements made by that hon. gentleman was:

The business which the former postmaster at Cannington was said to have been carrying on was that of a grocer. Different residents of the village complained of the fact that the postmaster should be, as they put it, subsidized by the government against them, and expressed suspicion that their mailable matter did not receive fair treatment in the Cannington post office when supposed to relate to their business affairs. Investigation was made by an inspector who made personal inquiries from the postmaster himself and from other persons, and reported to the department the result of such investigation.

On another occasion he said:

Mr. H. D. Talbot, formerly postmaster at Cannington, Ontario, was relieved of his office on January 12, 1906, for the reason that he was, under the name of another man, carrying on a mercantile business in the village.

On another occasion I pointed out that that officer had been conducting the affairs of his office in a satisfactory manner. The pages of 'Hansard' of last year contain all the data in this connection, showing that Mr. Talbot had nothing to do with the grocery, but had limited himself to conducting the business of the post office, and had done it in an admirable manner. The Postmaster General last year, in speaking on the subject, was new to the House, and in his remarks on that occasion he stated, speaking of myself:

The hon. gentleman has had this notice of motion on the order paper for a period of six weeks, and again and again, when he has been present, has passed it over in silence.

I wish to give an emphatic contradiction to that statement. The only occasion when this motion came up and when both the Postmaster General and the member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) were in their places, it was moved by your humble servant. On one or two occasions the member for North Ontario was not in his place, and as I wished to be fair to him, I did him the courtesy of notifying him that I proposed bringing the question up. I did not feel bound to offer any courtesy whatever to the then Postmaster General. He came into this House, a new member, and the House will bear me out in saying that he received courtesy from the members of this House such as very few new members, or old members either, usually receive. But what was his conduct? Flippant, verging on impudence, from the day he came here, to members of the House, to the leader of the opposition, and to every other member of this House who chose to ask him a question. On one occasion it will be within the memory of the House that he was most insulting to me, so much so that afterwards he came privately to me and offered an apology, which I requested him to make from his place in the House. However, that much in passing. I merely wish to say that the reason the matter was not bought up earlier by me last year was in courtesy to the member for North Ontario whose presence I desired in this House when I did so. There is no need of entering further into the discussion. The facts were all clearly stated last year, and if necessary we can go into then again. I know from past experience that the present Postmaster General, at all events, will show courtesy in his replies to members, and in his responses to motions; and I have no doubt the papers will be brought down.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). This question came before the House last year, and I gather from the debate which took place at that time that the

answer given by the then Postmaster General, the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was a courteous answer, and the statement which he made to the House was based on a report which had been asked for through the post office inspector of the district where this Cannington post office is situated. At all events, I have myself no objection to laying on the table this report and all the papers connected with it.

Motion agreed to.

LOCAL AND GENERAL TARIFFS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved for:

Return showing the local and general tariffs of each and every transportation line, railway or ship, giving in detail the rates upon each class of commodity from station to station; and also upon commodities passing though Canada, or from Canada to foreign countries, or to Great Britain and Ireland.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I ask that this question be allowed to stand. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to speak to him privately—I understand it would be almost impossible to bring down these papers.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Return showing: 1. The present indebtedness to the Dominion government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, (a) on capital account, (b) for arrears of interest.

2. The amount collected at each toll-gate belonging to the said Turnpike Trust during the year ending 31st December, 1905.

3. The names of all parties who have commuted their tolls and the amount of commutation paid in each case.

4. The amounts expended on each section or road division under the control of said trust, during the said year, ending 31st December, 1905, and the contracts given out during the year, with the name of the contractor, and the date and amount involved in each case.

5. The amount paid out during the said year at each toll-gate and check-gate for salaries of day and night keepers, and other expenditures at each of the toll-gates maintained.

6. The names of all parties holding passes for free use of the road, under the control of said trust, during the said year.

7. The expenses of the said trust during the said year, for rent, salaries of the office, giving name and remuneration of each official.

8. The actual indebtedness in detail of the said trust, outside of its bonds, due to the government of Canada.

9. The amount collected during the year 1905 from municipalities, under special agreements made, as their share, pro rata, of the bonded indebtedness of the Turnpike Trust.

He said : The object of this motion is to obtain the statements referred to in the motion. From time to time during the last three parliaments I have made motions of this kind in order to obtain information regarding the Montreal Turnpike Trust. My reason is that under the law organizing that trust the association, or corporation, is not obliged to furnish any statement of its affairs to the local government under whose laws it exists, nor to the federal government, nor to the public. It is therefore only through this House that authentic statements covering the operations of the trust for preceding years can be obtained. The trustees not being obliged to do so, make no returns to the provincial government, make no returns to the federal government, and so far as I know, they have never published any detailed statement of their affairs, though we find in the vicinity of Montreal this system of toll gates prevailing all round the city. It would be very useful information to have, because there is a common agreement among the people who have occasion to pass along the main roads leading into Montreal upon which these tolls are levied, that some change is absolutely necessary in other words, the abolition of the toll gates is desired by every body. Toll gates, as members of the House know, are considered an obsolete and antiquated institution, and they are a great inconvenience. They have been abolished everywhere around large cities, and it is high time that we should take some steps to abolish that system in Montreal, and to establish some better system, such as is found to exist around large cities on this continent where formerly toll gates were no doubt necessary.

When the roads were being made it was necessary to provide some way to keep them in order. But as I said a moment ago, that system has been abolished nearly everywhere, and travellers who come to Montreal are surprised when they go outside the city and find themselves hampered by toll gates, as they are in every direction. Farmers around Montreal are extremely desirous that these toll gates should be abolished. They constitute an inconvenience, they are an expense, and it would be greatly in the interest of the farmers and of the market gardeners and millmen who come to Montreal, sometimes several times a day with their produce, to have the toll gates abolished. It is desirable that they should be abolished, and that some better system should be devised to keep our highways in order in the vicinity of Montreal.

There is another inconvenience. I have often brought it to the notice of the House when I have had occasion to make motions of this kind and it is the extension of the city in every direction, east, west, north; the city is extending ; it is taking in outside municipalities and the existence of these toll gates becomes an obstacle to free circulation and to the opening of new roads. If a road is open which crosses one of the turnpike trust roads it is necessary for

those who go into Montreal over these side roads to pass for a certain distance over the turnpike trust road and for that small distance they are obliged to pay toll. The trust itself is, by the multiplication of the roads going into the city of Montreal, obliged to multiply its toll gates, to erect what are called check gates, in order to prevent the access of people into Montreal and to collect tolls from people going in and coming out. Those who are familiar with the circumstances of the extension of the city of Montreal at present have no hesitation in saying that from that point of view alone the abolition of the toll gates is extremely desirable. This state of affairs has been going on for more than ten years, and this government has done absolutely nothing to correct in any way what is a most unfortunate condition of affairs in Montreal. The key to the whole situation is in the hands of the Dominion government, as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows, for the reason that the Dominion government is the holder of all the bonds which exist upon the turnpike roads in Montreal. These bonds amount to some $200,000 upon which interest ought to be paid to the Dominion government. No interest has been paid for ten years and anybody who takes the trouble to look into the affairs of the trust can come to no other conclusion than that there is absolutely no hope of collecting either the interest upon the bonds or the capital. It is not recoverable. There can be no doubt about that whatever.

Mr. STOCKTON. What becomes of the tolls?

Mr. MONK. The tolls which amount to some forty odd thousand dollars are used to pay the toll gate keepers and to keep the roads in order. The traffic upon these roads has become very considerable. The roads require continual repairs. The expenses of the trust in order to carry on the administration of these roads, oblige the trust to spend every cent it collects, and I do not think I am mistaken in saying that it is under a deficit every year. There can be no doubt whatever—the fact can easily be demonstrated—that the trust is unable to meet its liabilities. The trust is incorporated and governed by legislation passed by the province. The province has very often been invited to improve that legislation, to change the existing condition of affairs and particularly to abolish the toll gates, but the answer of the province has been almost invariably that it cannot interfere with this present condition of affairs because the bonded creditor of the trust might complain, and I believe that in one instance when, under some special circumstances legislation was passed in Quebec, the Quebec government had to obtain the consent of the Dominion government. There is no doubt at all as to the situation. The key of that situation is in the hands of the federal government and there is no prospect whatever of the federal government ever being able to recover one cent of those bonds or one single cent of the interest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the trust were abolished who would look after the roads ?

Mr. MONK. I will come to that in a moment. But I was just proceeding to say that the condition of affairs was fully realized by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). Mr. Préfontaine was familiar with the condition of affairs not only in Montreal, but in the surrounding municipalities. I have correspondence from that gentleman and he quite agreed that it was high time to do something in the matter. I had called Mr. Préfontaine's attention to the necessity of the government's naming a commissioner or several commissioners in order to make sure of the facts to which I have just referred in order to ascertain in the first place that the debt was not recoverable, and in order to report to the government to that effect and to make suggestions as to the proper condition under which the Dominion government would be prepared to abandon that debt which could not be recovered. Mr. Préfontaine admitted the necessity of that preliminary step being taken. He wished, however, to include in the investigation of the commission a somewhat analogous condition of affairs existing, as I am informed, around the city of Quebec. I do not think that the Dominion government is the creditor of the turnpike trust that has control of the roads around the city of Quebec. I am not sure of it, but it was Mr. Préfontaine's intention to name a commission and to include in the work of that commission an investigation into the state of roads around the city of Quebec. Unfortunately the lamented Mr. Préfontaine died before he could give effect to what was his evident determination and it remains for us to see if the members of the government who know something of the condition of affairs existing upon the island of Montreal will take the necessary steps to bring about the desired result. My hon. friend the Postmaster Genfriend (Mr. Lemieux) although he represents a distant constituency, resides in the city of Montreal, and my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), it seems to me, might very properly take a warm interest in this matter, not only because he knows something of the conditions existing in Montreal, but because it is a question, which rightly or wrongly, greatly interests the farmers in all the surrounding districts. As many of these farmers are market gardeners they have occasion to go to Montreal often, some of them every day and some of them twice a day, and as hon. members of the House can readily

imagine it becomes a considerable burden for these men to be all the time paying toll when going to the city. It is an abnormal state of affairs also because the popular element, if I may use the expression, is not represented on the board of trustees. It is true that some of the trustees are men who have occasion to go upon the roads outside of Montreal. Some of them reside outside of Montreal, but the majority of them are named by the Dominion government because the Dominion government, under Quebec legislation passed years ago, has the right to name the majority of the trustees, being the greatest creditor and holding all the bonds upon the road. The others, two in number, if I mistake not, are named by the Quebec government. There is no election. There is no representation and the turnpike trust is not obliged to hold its meetings publicly. It is not obliged to issue a yearly financial statement showing the revenue and expenditure, or what repairs have been made on the road. I do not mean to say that anything irregular is done for want of publicity, I merely mention it to show that the system is antiquated and that the control of our highways should be modernized in Montreal as it has been elsewhere. When Mr. Préfontaine was alive I had occasion to speak with him as to what scope that commission might have. It seems to me it is the duty of the government first to ascertain how matters stand, to see that the debt is not recoverable and then say to the provincial government: We will relinquish this debt, which we cannot recover, on certain conditions and these conditions are that the best policy shall be pursued for the maintenance of the highways in the vicinity of Montreal. That information could be obtained by an investigation which would cost very little. I suggested to Mr. Préfontaine the name of Mr. Kent, now a member of the Insurance Commission, Mr. Thomas Trenholme, at present a member of the turnpike trust, Mr. Desmarteau and Mr. Lallemant, all gentlemen who understand the situation thoroughly and who have interests which cause them to use these roads, and who are political friends of the right hon. the Prime Minister. It seems to me that the time has come when the Federal government should recognize that it is no use any longer to keep this debt on their books, and that they by their action should bring about a change which the people of Montreal and vicinity have been clamouring for during many years. My right hon. friend has asked me what system I would substitute for that now in existence, and my answer is that any system would be better than the present. I have no doubt whatever that gentlemen who would examine into the matter thoroughly would be able to suggest a remedy. This is not at all a new question. Before this government came into power Mr. Richard White was chairman of the Turnpike Trust and he went into the question pretty fully with his colleagues, and the suggestion was made that the city of Montreal and the surrounding municipalities should come to a mutual arrangement as to the maintenance of these roads. I do not remember the details of that proposed arrangement but there was some idea that the city of Montreal should contribute in the neighbourhood of $30,000. I do not believe that during the last six years more than $40,000 has been actually spent on the maintenance of the roads; a very large percentage of the revenue goes to the payment of day-keepers and night-keepers at the toll gates, and now that the city of Montreal is extending you must have check gates and gate keepers for these check gates as well. If the city of Montreal contributed $30,000 or a larger sum, the question of my right hon. friend would be in great part answered. I have no special scheme to propose. Everyone agrees that the present system is bad, and it would be for men of experience to look into the matter and to report in favour of a proper system. Then, if the Federal government relinquish its debt, I have no doubt that the provincial government would at once bring in a law adopting the suggestions of this government, and thus we would have that relief which we have asked for many years, with a hope always deferred which maketh the heart sick.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) So far as the object of my hon. friend (Mr Monk) is to abolish toll gates it is an object which will have the hearty sympathy of the House generally. I can certainly offer him my warm sympathy. It was a matter of great pleasure, and I might say a matter of great pride, to me that when I was in the Nova Scotia Legislature I had the opportunity of abolishing the last toll bridge in that province, and from that day to this there has been no toll gate and no toll bridge within the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. When I came to Ottawa and when I found that if ever I could get half an hour to spare to drive in the suburbs I was held up at a gate to pay toll, I took it as an evidence that this splendid province is not as far advanced as it should be in the best elements of civilization. The same remark applies to the suburbs of Montreal. Running through the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to-day and on previous occasions there is a strong vein of error, and that error is that it is the business of the government of Canada to supply roads for the municipalities around Montreal. That is none of our business; the

roads of the country should be maintained by the municipalities, or at all events by the provincial governments. Unless there is an exceptional case such as that of a bridge between two provinces or something of that kind there is no obligation on the part of the Dominion to attend to such matters. Our only interest in this matter is the interest of a creditor; the Montreal Turnpike Trust owes the people of Canada a large sum of money. Some years ago, under representations very similar to these which my hon. friend has placed before the House to-day, the government of Canada in a fit of generosity said: We will treat the Turnpike Trust very handsomely and we will wipe off half the debt. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) now says: You had better wipe off the whole of it. I do not care to admit as emphatically as he does that an existing obligation of a couple hundred thousand dollars is no good; no treasurer ever likes to acknowledge that; he may put the amount in the suspense account but he does not like to write it off. I think this is a matter which should be dealt with by the government of the province of Quebec and the municipalities around the city of Montreal. The government could perhaps prepare some scheme for taking over the management of these roads and then approach this government and say: What terms can you make with us, this is not a very good debt, it is probably not worth one hundred cents on the dollar and we are prepared to make some arrangement with you. That would be a fair arrangement. But it appears to me that the onus of dealing with this case rests not on the Dominion of Canada but upon the municipalities in the neighbourhood of Montreal and if necessary the government of the province of Quebec. We are simply creditors. When my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), loyal to the interests of Montreal and surrounding districts, asks us to throw away a debt which is owing to the people of Canada, I am not sure that he is absolutely right. I heartly sympathize with him in the view that the present condition of affairs is unsatisfactory and that we should, if possible, try to abolish these toll gates. I can assure him that if any representation is made by the government of Quebec or the municipalities interested, with a view to that end, the government will meet them in a liberal spirit, but I do not think that the onus of dealing with this rests so largely on the government of Canada as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) seems to think. We shall be very happy to bring down the papers and if at any future time representations should be made to us, from the municipalities and the government of Quebec, my hon. friend will find this government acting in a very liberal spirit.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has invariably, since I have sat in this House, extended to me very warm sympathy, but I think we require more. What I would like to have is action. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) did not understand me to say that I claimed that the roads around Montreal should be attended to by the Dominion of Canada? Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what it means if we give away our claim.

Mr. MONK. I do not think I said anything that would lead to such a conclusion. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) cannot lose sight of the fact that the control of the Montreal Turnpike Trust is in his own hands? Why? Because he has the nomination of a majority of that board. It is he himself who to a certain extent can control the action of the board, because he names three members out of five. That is one point. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) says it is for the people around Montreal to take the initiative to move in the matter. Sir, that is what I am doing, I represent a great many of the surrounding municipalities and I am moving with the object of getting the government to look into the value of its claim and to see whether what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance a moment ago was not prepared to admit, is not a fact, that that claim cannot possibly be recovered. Supposing my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) had a report before him from a competent commission directed by him to ascertain the fact that this debt is not susceptible of recovery, then my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would be prepared, probably, to treat the question of abandoning that claim in a more categorical manner than he can do now. Every time I have moved in this question my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has stated that although the government had recovered no interest whatever on these bonds for over ten years he was not prepared to say that the bonds were worthless, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) had the report of a commissioner before him clearly establishing that these bonds are not worth anything, then of course my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would not be obliged to move in the matter to bring about that progress which he suggests himself is very necessary, he might do so. Surely the government of Canada, having ascertained that these bonds which came into its hands to a certain extent accidentally, several years ago, are not valuable, should not put them down among the assets of the Dominion. My hon. friend even might invite the Quebec government to take the matter up because unless some action is taken by this government, the Quebec government has not within the past few years, since this question has been agitated shown itself disposed to take the initiative. I have no occasion to urge that government to act, but I think that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and those ministers who are par-

ticularly charged with the interests of that part of the country might very well take some steps in the matter which would lead to a change.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) permit me to ask him whether the municipalities have made any move in connection with the taking over of these roads? St. Laurent and the other municipalities interested, whether they have passed certain resolutions with reference to the taking over of the road.

Mr. MONK. Every time I have taken action my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) has asked that question with one object, the object of having me say that I would like the municipalities to take the burden. That is the question my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) used to ask me, even before he was a member of the government. I have presented petitions here from the municipalities asking for a change and they have commended my action in asking the government, almost every year since 1896 to interfere.

Mr. FIELDING. I think in one or two instances parties interested in the municipal affairs of a small portion of the districts have made suggestions as to the terms upon which the government might dispose of its bonds. The view we took of the matter was that it was useless to deal with any particular corner of the business; unless there was some general scheme it was not worth while to take it up and I think we were not able to offer any terms; but it was because the application was not broad enough or general enough.

Mr. MONK. It is a matter that interests everybody and very few people move in it, but if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) investigated the matter as I have suggested—and this government have appointed commissions to investigate matters of less importance—the government could claim the credit of having moved in this matter and I have no doubt whatever, that the move by the government and publicity given to the report would lead the municipalities interested, which are rather numerous, to take it up and bring about a solution of this question.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this question of toll roads has been brought before parliament this afternoon——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Under the new rule the mover of a substantive motion closes the debate, so it is not in order for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robitaille) to speak now unless with the consent of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. If the Speaker permits me, I shall be pleased to continue. It seems to me that the question which has been brought before the House this afternoon is simply one of asking or compelling the Turnpike Trust Company to give reports of their receipts and their methods of attending to the macadamizing of roads. In endeavouring to look fully into this question it has been almost impossible to obtain any data as to the amount of expenditure on these roads, and it was very difficult to define any special scheme as to the question of municipal or provincial government or federal government control and legislation over these roads. This question is of importance not alone to the district surrounding the city of Montreal; I know that the rural districts around Quebec, as well as St. Johns, P.Q., St. Hyacinthe, and a few adjacent districts will be but too pleased to be able, through their deputy, to give their humble assent to the motion before the House. If by this motion we are enabled to get information and data as to the operations of the Turnpike Company, it would interest not only those who are looking after this question, but also the farmers at large and those particularly in the rural districts near the places where the turnpike roads are now in operation and the provincial government will be only too pleased to adopt any suggestion that will lead to a better system of management of these roads, owing to the difficulties that have been experienced, in connection with the opening up and building of roads for colonization purposes. Before we can go further into the question as to how these roads can be operated, we require to have a return brought down giving the particulars asked for by this motion. The question is now being studied in the provincial parliament, as to whether the government should take these franchises and as to the best system of operating the roads and improving their condition, but it is very difficult to arrive at a conclusion without having the necessary data. Furthermore if the federal government have any money interest in the Turnpike Trusts, we should be given the receipts and expenditures and the results of their operations.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P. E. I.). I ask the indulgence of the House while I draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to a telegram I have just received from Summerside:

> Summerside closing unless 'Stanley' now collecting buoys comes immediately. Confer minister. Suggest 'Minto' for buoys.

This last cold snap has formed some ice and the summer steamers are evidently not prepared to continue the service. I understand from this wire that the 'Stanley' which should be in readiness, is not on

hand. Immediately the summer steamers have to stop, the 'Stanley' should be in readiness to take up the service. The shippers of perishable goods are at a loss to know how their goods are to be shipped. Arrangements should be made by the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) with the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway for the carrying of mails and the through transportation of freight, and public notice should be given along the line that this service will be continued between Summerside and Cape Tormentine and points on the Intercolonial Railway immediately the summer boats stop. I would ask the minister to take this matter up at once and let something definite be known.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). My hon. friend has on the order paper a notice of a question. When the question was called, I said I was not in a position to give an answer because I had not a report on the matter. If he will let me have the telegram to which he refers, I will see about the matter.

VACANCY OF NICOLET.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General and Minister of Labour). I beg to make a statement to the House. At the last general election I was elected to represent the counties of Nicolet and Gaspé. I now beg to declare that I elect to sit in this House for the county of Gaspé.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect the annotated information which will enable us to compare the old tariff with the new ? I presume we will be given that before the hon. minister proposes to go into committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. The information I promised was an index showing where every item could be found.

Mr. FOSTER. In the old tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. The old tariff distributed has an index. There will be an index for the new, so that the items can be traced readily in each. The index for the new tariff corresponds with the index for the old.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I inquire what will be the business to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall take up the resolution of Mr. Fisher regarding cold storage and then the tariff resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been said to me that there are errors in the tariff, does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) know of any and shall we have the correct figures ?

Mr. FIELDING. My attention has not been called to any errors ; and in the absence of any other information, we must presume that the printed copy is correct.

RESIGNATION OF HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. gentleman give any further information as to the position of Mr. Hyman and his resignation ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only information I have is that he has gone south in very poor health. A friend of his has gone to see him and I expect some information this week.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if the items in the tariff will be taken up in the order in which they appear ?

Mr. FIELDING. Before we reach the items in the tariff, there is quite a series of resolutions of a general character. We shall then take up the items in their order, or we may take up the items concerning which there will be no debate. Or it may be necessary to reserve any item for further consideration. After dealing with the resolutions, we shall consider the best manner of dealing with the items.

COAL FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Postmaster General anything further to say regarding the Lethbridge strike ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was just about to read to the House the latest telegram I have received from the Deputy Minister of Labour:

Indianapolis, Indiana, December 1.

To Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Sherman, district president of Lethbridge union, has declared strike off and has wired men to return to work immediately. If wire goes through in time, work will be resumed at Lethbridge mines this afternoon. Am returning to Ottawa to-day.

MACKENZIE KING.

I communicated this morning by telephone with Mr. King, who is in Toronto on his way to Ottawa, and he confirmed this message that the strike is off. Therefore, there need be no fear of a coal famine in the Northwest this winter.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the International Waterways Commission ; population of the Northwest provinces as shown by the census taken in 1906.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Auditor General's Report or any part of it yet ready for distribution?

Mr. FIELDING. No. We hope within a few days to be able to bring down one volume. The others are somewhat delayed.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 4, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Joseph C. Walsh, Esq., member for the Electoral division of St. Anne, Montreal; introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

Médéric Martin, Esq., member for the Electoral division of St. Mary, Montreal.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, member for the electoral districts of Nicolet and Gaspé respectively, having declared in his place in the House that he elected to sit for the electoral district of Gaspé, thereby causing a vacancy in the electoral district of Nicolet, I have, in accordance with chapter 13, section 5 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for electoral district of Nicolet.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) respecting Patent of William A. Damen—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 9) respecting a patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 10) respecting a patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Malone and Hopkins Point Railway Company — Mr. Walsh (Huntingdon).

COLD STORAGE WAREHOUSES.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to pass an Act to encourage the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the preservation of perishable food products, by granting aid out of the public funds towards the cost of construction of such warehouses.

Mr. FOSTER.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think it is due to the House that I should give a little explanation of the object of this resolution and of the Bill which it is proposed to found upon it. First, let me allude to the fact that quite recently some remarks were made in regard to the necessity of some work of this kind in our country by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House and by myself. I was very glad indeed to see the attention of the House drawn at such an early day in the session to this very important subject, because it was to me an evidence of the interest which is taken in the subject by a very large number of people in Canada. I have had abundant evidence of that interest in my own department, and personally in my contact with people all over Canada for some little time back. Even without such evidence the subject is one which would have deserved consideration at my hands as Minister of Agriculture, and which had received a great deal of most careful and earnest consideration at my hands. In my remarks this afternoon and in the remarks, I hope, of other hon. members, we shall deal with the question in a business like way; and, from the tenor of the remarks already made on this subject in this House, and from many deputations and petitions which I have received in regard to it, I think we may say that it is a subject which is outside of party or political considerations, and which we may discuss without any party recrimination. It is a question of far too great importance to the welfare of our agricultural community to consider it in any respect a party one, and I am glad to know from many gentlemen who differ with me politically that they agree with me on this point.

For a number of years back we have been considering cold storage propositions and the providing of cold storage facilities for the transportation and conservation of our fruits and other perishable products. A good deal has been done in this connection. I have done all that I considered possible and all that the interests of the trade required and justified. As soon however as cold storage transportation was provided to a certain extent, demands were made for something of the kind embodied in these resolutions. I could not, however, up to the present see my way clear to adopt any of the schemes proposed because I did not consider that any of them were likely to be profitable to those undertaking them or be justified by the demands of the trade. I did not consider that any assistance which parliament might grant, would be likely to put any of them on a firm, paying basis, unless a much larger expenditure were incurred than parliament would be likely to agree to. And even with such large expenditure, I did not think there was any assurance that any of the schemes suggested would be commercially successful. I

have always held the view that anything we may do to help our commerce should only be done as a temporary expedient to aid commercial enterprise for the public service and should only be done at the initiatory stage, when perhaps the knowledge and experience of the public were not sufficient to induce them to patronize the efforts which private individuals, aided by the government, might make. I have always considered that the proper time for the government to act is when there is a reasonable prospect of success. Therefore, up to the present, I have not seen my way clear to ask parliament to do anything for the encouragement of local cold storage. But I think that now the time has really come when public opinion has been attracted sufficiently to this need to create an active interest in the enterprises, and that within a very short time after their initiation the demands of the public will be such as to make the ventures commercially successful, independent of further government aid. I quite understand that for two or three years the enterprises may not be successful commercially and not able to pay dividends. Therefore, I think that for the present needs of our perishable food products, it is but fair and just that the Dominion treasury should be called upon to supplement individual or corporate enterprise by government bonuses and assistance, given in such a way as to induce individuals and companies to enter into these enterprises, which otherwise they might not be willing to undertake for some years to come. I believe that the present needs of our trade in perishable food products are such that these enterprises should be begun within the next fiscal year. Under these circumstances, after discussing this question with my colleagues before the opening of this session, I thought myself justified in asking parliament to grant $100,000 for the fiscal year beginning 1st July next, for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the better transportation and handling of our perishable food products. We shall naturally have to provide the machinery under which this money may be expended and proper safeguards, so as to guarantee the accomplishment of the object aimed at. On examining our statutes I find that while in 1897 a Bill was passed authorizing the Minister of Agriculture to enter into certain engagements with regard to cold storage products, that Act did not contemplate such enterprises as I have here briefly outlined. In the interest of the enterprises and in justice to the public, the minister should be guided by the statutes as regards how this money should be expended and proper safeguards should be thrown around any contract that might be made by him, and also the conditions imposed should be just and fair and understood by parliament when voting this large sum. I therefore propose to introduce a Bill based on the resolutions I am now introducing.

The resolutions are general in their character, but before discussing them in detail I might say a few words on the results expected. Most hon. members who have interested themselves at all in this subject are aware that during the last year or two, various propositions have been submitted to the government for aid to individual enterprises. Two or three large schemes, involving the expenditure of great sums, have been proposed. Speaking from memory, I think that all these schemes—certainly two of them—require a government guarantee of the bonds to be issued by the corporation or company concerned. As the gentlemen who are putting forward these schemes have given a great deal of study and attention to the subject, I felt that their representations deserved every consideration. I had a number of interviews with one gentleman whose name, I think, it would not be indiscrete of me to mention, because I am sure that that name must come to the mind of everybody who has studied this question within the last year or two. I refer to Mr. Cochrane. I have had a great many interviews with him, and have profited—I say it frankly—by the vast fund of information which he has accumulated at the expense of a great deal of earnest and enthusiastic work and of considerable amount of his own money. I wish to say here at once that his enthusiasm, his enterprise and the work he has done, have, I believe, contributed very materially to the present general understanding of this question, which appears evident in the petitions which have been received, in this public press, and in the advance of work in this line throughout Canada generally. The scheme, which he put forward was one of a large company, with a capital—speaking from memory— of $5,000,000, whose bonds were to be guaranteed by the government to the extent of $1,000,000, and which would erect cold storage warehouses practically throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. It was a plausible scheme, an attractive scheme, and one which, at first sight, a great many people were disposed to endorse—I was myself. But, on considering and studying the question, I found there were serious objections to such a scheme in the public interest. The first was what I alluded to on a former occasion—that this and other schemes of a similar character would rather tend to monopoly in the business. It seems to me that if this business were conducted and managed by one great corporation for the whole Dominion there would be serious danger that the public interest would suffer. I believe that the farming community of Canada, have felt for a long time, and feel to-day a disinclination to encourage the building up of great corporations which might degenerate into monopoly or what we commonly call

now a trust, to the deterioration of the public interest. And especially might this be the case in an enterprise which was so intimately concerned with the private business of the farmer throughout the length and breadth of the country—and, for this purpose, I include under the word 'farmer' the fruit grower, the fishermen, and other classes whose business requires cold storage. That was my first objection. My second and perhaps equally great objection, was to the form of the assistance—a guarantee of bonds on the part of the government. Now, I grant fully that the government has, on occasion, guaranteed the bonds of corporations, notably some of the great railway companies. But I do not think that anybody has yet proposed, successfully at all events, that the government should guarantee the bonds of commercial corporations. If the government undertook to guarantee the bonds of one of these corporations, it seems to me, that it would be obliged, in justice and equity, to guarantee the bonds of other corporations of a similar character; and this would lead us we know not whither. Under these circumstances, I felt that we could not encourage that form of assistance, and that I could not recommend to my colleagues the adoption of a scheme of guaranteeing the bonds. I told this quite frankly some time ago, to those who were interested in this scheme, and to others who had applied to me on the same line on this particular question. The natural answer to me on that was: Well, what do you want? How will you help us? I asked these gentlemen over and over again, having practically refused the assistance of a guarantee of bonds, to suggest other schemes. I said, 'This scheme is impossible. Give me suggestions in some other form which will enable me to accomplish what you desire—and what I desire—in the interest of the agricultural community of Canada and other sections concerned.' I have never had any proposition from them. I have therefore felt that I must return to an effort on my own part to work out propositions which would attain the object aimed at, and properly aimed at, by these gentlemen, but without the objectionable features contained in their proposition. Having come to this conclusion, I naturally turned to our experience to see what we had done in other cases. I turned to the law of 1897 by which I was authorized to give assistance to cold storage on steamships. I found that in that case we had made an arrangement which had turned out to be successful, though some hon. gentlemen on the other side, have, at times, criticised it severely. We made an arrangement with the steamship companies that, if they would fit up their vessels with satisfactory cold storage accommodation for the carriage of our perishable food products, we would grant a sum equal to one-half the cost of that fitting out. We granted this in three equal parts—one-sixth of the cost the first year, one-sixth the next year, and one-sixth the third year. That worked out very satisfactorily. I hope my hon. friends opposite who have criticised it on other occasions will accept the result without my going into the details of how it was brought about. We succeeded in getting a large number of steamships fitted up with mechanical cold storage. And, when the project had been carried out for a few years, it was found so satisfactory and so complete, that other steamship companies were forced by competition to do the work without subvention, with the result, that for many years back we have not been obliged to give any bonus for them, and all steamships that are coming into Canada and engaging in this trade are to-day fitted up with cold storage, with cool-store holds and ventilated holds suitable for carrying our perishable food products. Some little criticism has been offered as to the character of their cooling operations; but, at the same time, the whole shipping fraternity who trade in our perishable food products to-day understand and acknowledge that, if they are to carry Canadian perishable food products they must provide the necessary cold or cool accommodation for these products and without that accommodation they do not get the trade. Now, I think that something similar to that could be undertaken in regard to these cold stores throughout the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think, possibly, I should call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) to the fact that a debate is not strictly in order on this motion. I understand that the hon. member was asked for an explanation. But I may quote the rule as follows:

> 77. If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned until such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint.

I understand that this would not preclude a brief explanation, but a debate is not in order at this stage.

Mr. FISHER. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) had a right to make an explanation on the motion to take this matter up to-morrow. Of course, as Mr. Speaker has pointed out, the rule is that the member of the government having charge of the particular motion gives notice that it will be taken up to-morrow, or on some future day; then it comes upon the orders. That has been the invariable practice, but it has not been pursued in this case.

Mr. FISHER. This motion is now on the government orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, on government notices of motion, that is the difference.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule laid down is as follows :

77. If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned until such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint.

Mr. FISHER. I bow to your ruling, which is no doubt correct. I would then defer further remarks till a future occasion when the motion can be taken up on government orders.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. We would like to hear an explanation of the essential point which the minister has not touched yet, that is, what is his scheme.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House desires it unanimously that can be done. I am merely pointing out the rule.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. We would like to have an explanation of what he is going to do.

Mr. FISHER. With the concurrence of the House, then, I will briefly outline the scheme as proposed for the encouragement of the establishment of what I may call a local cold storage building equipment. It is proposed by the Bill I shall introduce to empower the minister to enter into a contract with individuals or companies who may wish to establish cold storage at different localities in Canada, but that contract shall be entered into only for such places as, in the opinion of the minister, may fairly justify the investment, or the establishment of such an enterprise. The scale of the investment shall also be such as is justified, in the opinion of the minister, that is to say, in some place a cold storage warehouse which would cost $30,000 might be justified where one of $100,000 would not be justified. The government would not undertake to grant aid beyond a scale at which, in the opinion of the minister, the investment was justified. The contract would also indicate the conditions on which the aid would be granted. The first condition would be a control by the government of the rates which are to be charged for the accommodation to the public. The second condition would be that the temperature should be maintained at a degree necessary for the proper preservation of the articles intended to be placed in the chamber. These are the main conditions. The assistance is proposed to be given in this form : That on the completion of a building approved by the minister, a bonus of ten per cent on the investment shall immediately be paid, and that in succeeding years, during a short term, which I have not yet determined, but which I will lay before the House in a tentative manner, a term of two, or three, or four, or five years, an additional twenty per cent of the whole investment shall be paid. In other words, the arrangement will be of this character, that ten per cent is to be paid on completion of the building and its opening for work, ten per cent, possibly, at the end of the first year of operation, and ten per cent at the end of the second year of operation; or ten per cent on the completion of the building, five per cent at the end of the first year of operation, five per cent at the end of the second year, five per cent at the end of the third year and five per cent at the end of the fourth year; or ten per cent on the completion of the building, ten per cent, possibly, at the end of the first year of operation, five per cent at the end of the second and five per cent at the end of the third. The details of the terms of payment I will lay before the House, and I wish to raise a discussion upon them. However, the general principle is that a bonus within a term of years, practically of thirty per cent of the cost of the investment, shall be paid to investors for the purpose of encouraging them to undertake this business. I think I have given the main provisions of the proposed measure.

Mr. FOSTER. If it turns out profitable, do you get your return?

Mr. FISHER. That is not the intention. It is understood that the returns will go to the enterprise.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many cold storage plants does the minister suppose he would be able to assist with $100,000?

Mr. FISHER. The first payment proposed would be ten per cent; and $100,000, in the fiscal year for which this item is taken, would therefor provide for the establishment of $1,000,000 worth of cold storage in Canada.

Mr. BRODER. Is there any limit as to number?

Mr. FISHER. No limit, except the vote. I do not expect that $1,000,000 worth of investment will be made within the fiscal year, I think that $100,000 which I am asking for will provide for the outside limit. But I may tell the House frankly that I fear it is very unlikely that a sufficient number of individuals or companies will be organized and will go to work and complete their enterprise within the fiscal year for which this vote is asked, to justify the payment of $100,000 as ten per cent on the investment, which would mean that in that fiscal year companies or individuals with capital to the extent of $1,000,000 would have to erect and get ready for business could storage warehouses in Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will be the position of the cold storage plants now in operation?

Mr. FISHER. I would not expect to grant that bonus to any cold storage plant now in operation. But I am glad my hon. friend

has mentioned that point. I may say that in the judgment of the minister it would not be permissible to establish a cold storage plant under this arrangement which would come into direct competition with plants already in existence. That was a point I intended to mention, but overlooked it. Competition with existing plants would be a very serious consideration in authorizing the establishment of another plant under this system.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the minister think that this scheme which he has laid before the House, is preferable to one which was laid before him a couple of years ago, an example of which originated in my county where an organization for the preservation of butter and cheese was formed called the Halle au beurre at au fromage de la paroisse de Saint Charles de Bellechasse? A number of farmers formed a syndicate——

Mr. SPEAKER. According to the rules it is not proper to engage in a discussion of the measure at this point.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot), speaking from memory, that the present scheme would largely meet the proposal of his constituents, although my memory is that their proposal was one of a little different nature, and I consider the scheme here proposed is more useful and more effective in its application to the country at large. I feel it is necessary that every scheme of this kind being put forward should be applicable to every part of Canada equally.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if it is the policy of the department——

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Am I not to be allowed to follow up my question to the hon. minister? I would like to ask him if he thinks the course he is now propounding is preferable to the one which was laid before him under which individuals were willing to do what is now spoken of by individual initiation provided the government granted them the same amount of money which is now proposed to be given to a company.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the question that was answered. However, I think the question is irregular at this point. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. TAYLOR. Now it is discussable, is it not?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid not.

Motion (Mr. Fisher) agreed to.

INSPECTION OF CANNED FOOD PRODUCTS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the House will on to-morrow go into committee of the whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Mr. FISHER.

Resolved, That it is expedient to pass an Act to provide for the further supervision and inspection of canned food products, meats and fish, and for the appointment of inspectors for the enforcement of the Act.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Hon. W. F. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved:

That the House go into committee of ways and means for the purpose of taking up certain proposed resolutions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can you take them up without making a motion to-day that they shall be considered at a future day?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the usual practice in regard to tariff changes.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. Last evening the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) inquired as to whether there were any errors and I said that at the moment I was not aware of any. I found, however, that there were some corrections to which attention has been called and a sheet has been issued pointing out these corrections. I hope it is in the hands of hon. gentlemen. It is in the form of a memorandum from the Customs Department. I would be glad if hon. gentlemen would say whether they have it in their possession. If not, it would be well to send up to the distribution office and obtain it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not in our possession.

Mr. FIELDING. I saw one of the officers in the distribution office a few minutes ago and requested that it should be immediately distributed. However, it need not affect our present action because I am going to suggest to the committee that we do not proceed to-day with any of the schedules. The resolutions now in the hands of the committee deal with the general amendments to the Tariff Act and of course they have reference to the schedules which follow. It is not proposed to take up any of the schedules at once, because I quite realize that hon. gentlemen may desire a further opportunity to look into them and we ourselves desire an opportunity to look over certain correspondence which has come to us on the subject. But, the resolutions may be dealt with and we propose to advance them a stage to-day.

On resolution 1,

Resolved, That it is expedient to revise and consolidate the Acts and parts of Acts now in force respecting the duties of customs, and that for this purpose it is expedient to repeal the following Acts or parts thereof not heretofore repealed, viz.:—

The Customs Tariff, 1897, being chapter sixteen of the statutes of 1897; chapter thirty-

seven of the statutes of 1898, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter fifteen of the statutes of 1900, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter twenty-two of the statutes of 1901, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Act, 1897; chapter thirty-three of the statutes of 1902, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter fifteen of the statutes of 1903, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter eleven of the statutes of 1904, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; chapter eleven of the statutes of 1905, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897; and chapter nine of the statutes of 1906, intituled, An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

Mr. HAGGART. Before going any further does this repeal all the Acts and orders in council, or what Acts and orders in council remain in force now?

Mr. FIELDING. It is intended that all Acts and orders in council dealing with customs duties shall be repealed and that a measure shall be introduced based upon these resolutions covering the whole subject of customs duties.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, does this resolution repeal the clause granting a rebate of ninety-nine per cent of the duties paid on materials used in the manufacture of agricultural implements for export or will the provision for that rebate still remain in force? I understand it is done by order in council.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not intended to interfere with that. If these resolutions are found to repeal that provision it will be re-enacted.

Mr. HAGGART. It only repeals Acts? It does not repeal orders in council?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases items have been placed on the free list or items have been reduced by order in council, of course, founded on legislation, and in these cases we carry all such things into the tariff and the orders in council are repealed. This practically repeals them all.

Mr. FOSTER. We are dealing with an express number of Acts and we are simply repealing these Acts and nothing else in this item?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the Acts in relation to the customs tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is provision later on for orders in council.

Mr. FIELDING. But these orders in council were founded on Acts and it must follow that the orders in council are repealed. However, it is fully intended that these orders in council, wherever they deal with customs duties, shall be repealed and that these duties shall be set forth in the Tariff Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading).

And to provide otherwise by enacting that the following be substituted in lieu thereof :—

1. That unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) The initials 'M. ft.' represent and have the meaning of the words 'one thousand feet board measure';

(b) The initials 'n.o.p.' represent and have the meaning of the words 'not otherwise provided for';

(c) The expression 'gallon' means an imperial gallon;

(d) The expression 'ton' means two thousand pounds avoirdupois;

(e) The expression 'proof,' 'proof spirit' or 'proof spirits' when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, means spirits of a strength equal to that of pure ethyl alcohol compounded with distilled water in such proportions that the resultant mixture shall at a temperature of sixty-two degrees Fahrenheit have a specific gravity of 0·9187 as compared with that of distilled water at the same temperature;

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the same as the old Act?

Mr. FIELDING. It is substantially the same.

Mr. FOSTER. Substantially, but is there any difference?

Mr. FIELDING. The only change is with regard to the temperature which is made to conform with the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the temperature in the old Act?

Mr. FIELDING. Sixty degrees and here it is made sixty-two.

Mr. FOSTER. That would make a difference in the result.

Mr. FIELDING. The specific gravity is made to correspond so that the result is the same.

(m) The expression 'rolled iron' or 'rolled steel' means iron or steal hot rolled only.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any change in that from the old Act?

Mr. FIELDING. The item is new but it simply gives effect to the present practice.

(1) That the rates of customs duties, if any, set forth in column 1 'British Preferential Tariff' shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of the following British countries when imported direct from any British country :—

(a) The United Kingdom;

(b) The British colony of Bermuda;

(c) The British colonies commonly called the British West Indies, including the following—

The Bahamas;

Jamaica;

Turks and Caicos Islands;

The Leeward Islands (Antigua, St. Christopher-Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat and the Virgin Islands);

The Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent and St. Lucia);

Barbados;

Trinidad and Tobago;
(d) British Guiana;
(e) British India;
(f) Ceylon;
(g) Straits Settlements;
(h) New Zealand;
(i) Cape of Good Hope;
(j) Natal;
(k) Orange River;
(l) Transvaal;
(m) Southern Rhodesia;
(n) Any other British colony or possession admitted to the benefit of the British preferential tariff in Canada, in the manner hereinafter provided ;

(2) That the rates of customs duties, if any, set forth in column 2 'Intermediate Tariff' shall apply :—

(a) to goods the produce or manufacture of any British or foreign country to which the benefits of such intermediate tariff shall have been extended in the manner hereinafter provided, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country.

Mr. FOSTER. Is subclause (c) in accordance with the practice at the present time ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes ; it differs a little from the original enactment because a number of these countries have since been added to the list by order in council, but this carries into the Tariff Act all the regulations made in that respect by order in council so that it conforms with the existing practice.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the basis of the different treatment for all included from (a) up to (m) inclusive, and those mentioned in (n) ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no difference of treatment ; (n) has reference to colonies which may subsequently be admitted.

Mr. FOSTER. On what basis ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no absolute basis ; it is in the judgment of the government from time to time. For example, we admitted the West Indies, although they gave us no return because we thought it was well to encourage the West Indian trade. There is no specific basis on which colonies are to be admitted. If their tariff arrangements are fair to Canada we would have the right to admit them. New South Wales being a low tariff colony, it was at one time admitted to the benefits of the Preferential Tariff but when she became part of the Australian Commonwealth under a higher tariff the benefits were withdrawn. There is no absolute rule in the matter except the rule of what is advantageous to Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. How is Newfoundland affected by this Act ?

Mr. FIELDING. Newfoundland is not entitled to the preferential tariff, but her fish products are admitted free by a special clause.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, there is no principle laid on which you admit the countries mentioned from (a) to (m) on specific conditions, which if they fulfil entitles them to come in under the preferential tariff. It is simply a question of favour, or opinion of the council ; is that it ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to express it exactly in that way. It is a question of whether or not the tariff of the country is deemed to be one which encourages Canadian trade, or, as in the case of the British West Indies, where, even though they did not happen to give us any special tariff treatment, nevertheless it was thought desirable to cultivate better trade with them. There is no arrangement which works automatically ; it is a matter which is left to the judgment and discretion of the Governor in Council—which may be the same thing in a different form.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is.

Mr. PATERSON. There is an arrangement with New Zealand, Cape of Good Hope, Natal, the Transvaal and Orange River, but with the West Indies there was not an arrangement. It was thought of interest to Canada to develop the West Indian trade and the preference was given voluntarily to the West Indies.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it with reference to Jamaica ?

Mr. FIELDING. Jamaica gives us no preference.

Mr. FOSTER. How about Southern Rhodesia ?

Mr. FIELDING. The South African colonies including Southern Rhodesia give us some preference.

Mr. FOSTER. What concessions do they give us ?

Mr. FIELDING. It varies; in some cases it is about ten per cent of the duty (not ten per cent of the value) and in some cases as high as twenty-five per cent of the duty. It is a not flat rate, it varies.

Mr. FOSTER. What would be the arrangement of their general duty?

Mr. FIELDING. It is rather a low tariff on the whole in South Africa.

Mr. DANIEL. Is Labrador on the same list as Newfoundland?

Mr. FIELDING. That portion of Labrador which belongs to Newfoundland would come in as a part of it. Of course, a part of Labrador is Canadian and another part is debatable land.

(2) That the rates of customs duties, if any, set forth in column 2 'Intermediate Tariff' shall apply:—

(a) to goods the produce or manufacture of any British or foreign country to which the

benefits of such intermediate tariff shall have been extended in the manner hereinafter provided, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably we had better have some explanation of that now. The minister treated it the other day in a very general way, and, as it is rather an important resolution—because upon it will be founded the tariff which is to be one of the essential parts of the whole scheme, and which will form a basis of negotiation with other countries—perhaps the minister can give us a little more in detail what view the ministry have of it, how they think it will be advantageous, and how they expect to use it. I think we cannot have too much light on that. It is a radical departure, and I do not think the House understands it.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course it is an important departure. I doubt if I can explain it more clearly or more fully than I attempted to do on the occasion of the budget debate. As I then stated, it is not intended that this tariff shall be at once applied to any country. It is to be made the basis of negotiation with countries with which we may desire to have better trade relations, or which may be willing to give us better terms. The greatest difficulty in the matter, as I pointed out to the House, is the complications which might arise through favoured nation treaties. I have no doubt, from what has already occurred, that we could make at a very early day some arrangement whereby the advantages of this tariff can be given to certain countries in return for advantages which they may give to Canada ; but, as the effect of allowing any one country to come in under that tariff would be that we would be obliged to give automatically the same advantages to a number of other countries enjoying favoured nation treaties, it is not considered that we should rush into the matter in that way. We shall have to wait patiently. It might be that we would make arrangements with several countries to be brought in at the same time, and, if they happened to be countries whose trade was important to us, we need not attach much importance to the fact that some minor countries might also come in automatically under the favoured nation clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it really the case that you cannot make any application of this intermediate tariff at all until you get rid of the favoured nation clauses in existing treaties?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I should go so far as that, because some of the favoured nation treaties are with countries whose trade is not of very great importance to us one way or the other, and if we had to admit their productions to the benefits of the intermediate tariff, nobody would be very much hurt. But there are other countries, large manufacturing countries, whose trade is considerable, and we would have to move cautiously before admitting any of these. What I think might happen is that if we could effectively bring on negotiations, and we made arrangements with one country, we might say, this looks all right, but we cannot admit it at once ; we will wait to see if we cannot make arrangements with two or three countries and bring them all in together.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister in mind any country to which the intermediate tariff might be applied without the danger to which I have just alluded, that is, the danger of bringing in other countries under the favoured nation clause?

Mr. FIELDING. No, because if we admitted any foreign country at once to the benefits of the intermediate tariff, we would be obliged to admit several other countries under favoured nation treaties. Therefore, it is not the intention to put the intermediate tariff into force at once. It could not be made to apply at once to any country for the reason which the hon. gentleman has stated.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us the names of the countries that would be in a position to demand favoured nation treatment?

Mr. FIELDING. We have the list, but I am afraid I haven't it at hand. As the discussion proceeds I will get it. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Customs can remember it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think I could give it from memory.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather have it exact. I think this clause is so important that we ought to have all this information before we pass it.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite right.

Mr. FOSTER. It is evidently so important that the minister himself has not now any clear idea, or any idea, of putting this schedule into force. They would like to, and yet they dare not. They say there are so many countries with capabilities of trade that would be let in if they made arrangements with any one country, that they now shiver on the brink and will not have it go into force now, or do not know whether they would or not. Mine is a legitimate criticism on that point. I have stated it a little strongly, because I want to bring the subject out into the full light. If the condition of things is such that a ministry, at the present stage, face to face with the possibilities of their tariff, do not know where it should be applied, fear to apply it, will not apply it because they do not know all the consequences that would ensue, is that not a pretty strong argument for not allow-

ing any ministry to undertake so important and far-reaching a piece of legislation as that, merely as a Committee of the Whole of this House, at any time they chose to do it? And is it not a pretty strong reason why no such thing as that should be done unless parliament should have the revision of it? After all, the ministry is supposed to be the concrete wisdom of one side of the House, but I dare say there are many sitting on the benches opposite who would not quite subscribe to the idea that all the wisdom of the party was concentrated in the government. But in a matter affecting the trade and commerce of every section of the country, from which representatives of the people come who are delegated by that particular section to look after its interests, is it not going a pretty long way to give into the hands of a committee of the House the power to revolutionize the whole tariff of the country at their sweet will? They might do it well; they might do it from a very conclusive basis of knowledge, but they might be mistaken in their premises, and might do great harm. Well, they say, we are responsible. That is quite true, but with all the responsibility which a government has to parliament, there are yet, under our laws, very great restrictions on the action of a government without the consent of parliament. I think this is a legitimate criticism, and I do not want to make any but a fair criticism. Therefore, I think we ought to have the names of all those countries, and give some attention to this clause before we adopt it, and in adopting it put into the hands of council the power to act when they please. I am willing to give ministers fair powers and to hold them responsible, but there are evidently some which we would not, as a parliament, willingly entrust to anybody.

Mr. FIELDING. We shall have the list of countries in a moment, but in the meantime I must take exception to the description of what is asked for in this resolution as being the power to revolutionize the tariff. What really does it mean? I open a list of the duties, and at the first page I open I strike the article perfumery. The duty under the general tariff is 35 per cent. We are askng power by this summary proceeding to reduce the duty of hair oil 2½ per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. There are other articles.

Mr. FIELDING. Every other article is in proportion. All the power we are asking is to reduce the duty to the extent of 2½ per cent or perhaps 5 per cent. We take power to make a slight reduction in duties in order that we may be in a position to negotiate, when the proper time comes, with a foreign country and get better terms from that country and have a better opportunity to send into it the products of Canada. My hon. friend cannot be serious when he calls such a power revolutionary. If we were asking power to make any tariff we might please, then his criticism would be just. But inasmuch as the extent of the power is limited, inasmuch as we merely have the discretion to take a small percentage off the rates of duty, I fail to see what ground there is for calling our proposal revolutionary. What do we hope to accomplish? We are setting before foreign countries the maximum of the concessions we are willing to make—some in all probability we shall never make. I have no expectation that the United States will offer such terms as will lead us to give them the benefit of the tariff. It would not be very revolutionary if we did. If we had to reduce the duties 2½ per cent or so on any article that would not be revolutionary. But the condition of public opinion in the United States is such to-day that they are not likely to offer us any such concessions as will enable us to give them the benefit of our reduced tariff. There are, however, European countries which might be willing to do so, and if by opening negotiations, we can get them to give us some concessions which will afford better encouragement to Canadian products, what is there revolutionary in our taking the power to make concessions to the extent of 2½ per cent or 5 per cent?

Mr. SPROULE. Supposing any country were to offer you concessions on certain articles, could you give in return an equivalent to what is offered or would you have to reduce your whole tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a very proper question. The resolution contemplates that the benefit of the reduction may be given in whole or in part. Suppose a foreign country would say, we cannot afford to give you all you would like, but we will give you half a dozen things to which you attach importance—suppose for instance they would admit animals and their products, bacon, cheese and butter, and a few of the other things of importance—it would be wise for us to make an arrangement with them even though we did not get concessions on the whole list of articles. If some country would say: We will reduce the duties on your agricultural products if you will do the same on something else, why should we not have that power?

Mr. HAGGART. Under this clause you have the power of making arrangements with any British possession without incurring the danger of coming under the most favoured nation clause.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you had any negotiations with the imperial government with reference to getting rid of that clause?

Mr. FIELDING. We quite realize that if we should ask the imperial government to denounce all these treaties, that would be raising a question of very considerable embarrassment to the mother country and possibly not of great importance to us. If we could make satisfactory arrangement with three or four important countries to receive our products on favoured terms, we would not care if that brought in minor countries. It would not matter much if we had to give these minor the benefit of our reduced tariff even though we received no concession in return. But if we were to ask the imperial authorities to denounce all the treaties, we would be raising a troublesome question. The treaties apply, not to the colonies only, but to the empire; and unless we had very grave reasons, we should not ask the mother country to revise all its treaties with foreign nations.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, the British government has a treaty with nearly every country in the world in which there is a most favoured nation clause. True, they are not all binding on Canada, but nearly the whole of them are. If you should make arrangements with one or two countries, you will be virtually making arrangements with nearly every country in the world.

Mr. FIELDING. That is largely but not wholly correct. There is a long list of countries, some of which are not of vital importance in our trade. On the other hand some of the most important countries are not included in the favoured list. There is no favoured nation treaty with the United States or Germany, and these are two of the greatest producing and shipping countries in the world.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there no favoured nation treaty with Germany?

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respects Canada. The German treaty was denounced, and no new treaty made since applies to Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought the part denounced was the part in which the colonies were equally interested with Great Britain in the treaties.

Mr. FIELDING. The treaty was denounced and a new treaty made with Great Britain—I think a temporary treaty—from which Canada was purposly excluded. There are favoured nation treaties with the Argentine Republic, Austria, Hungary, Bolivia. It would not hurt us very much if we had to admit the products of Bolivia. Columbia, of which the same might be said. Corea, Denmark. The latter is an important country and we would have to consider whether we should give Denmark the benefit. France, with which we have a treaty to-day. Liberia—if we had to include Liberia, I do not think any one would suffer very much. Morocco, Muscat, Persia, Salvador, Spain and Sweden. We have Spain in the list but there has always been some doubt as to the precise condition of Spain. It is not absolutely certain that Spain is a most favoured country. Sweden, Congo, Venezuela, and recently Japan. Hon. gentlemen will see that while this is a large list, many of the countries are not of much importance as regards our trade. If we could make friendly arrangements for example with Austria or Hungary, Denmark and France—we have an arrangement with France now but it is very limited indeed—Sweden—if we could make arrangements with a few countries of importance like these, and not have the arrangements go into operation until a date to be agreed upon, then it would follow automatically that all the other countries would come in, but their trade would not be important and we would not regret much if they had to come in. We prefer to try, when we give the lower tariff to important countries, to get some satisfactory concession for Canada in return. As to the minor countries, even if we get no great concessions from them, it would not affect our trade one way or the other.

Mr. PATERSON. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has pointed out, this does not require a regular treaty negotiated by the imperial parliament. This is merely a case of parliament giving discretion to the government of the day to make what might be called legislative arrangements, with any power or county that might desire to trade with us. And it is quite in accordance with British traditions, I think, that parliament should give the government such power. It is true, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said that parliament should jealously guard its powers, and especially its control of taxation. But we are not asking for general powers to determine upon what conditions we shall make a treaty with any other country; we are merely asking parliament to empower us to act within certain defined bounds. The intermediate tariff fixes the rates upon all the articles of the tariff, as it is not known what country a tariff might be arranged. Parliament knows in advance, and fixes, the rate of taxation. It may not know what concessions we shall have in return for this intermediate tariff from any other country, but the rate so far as Canadian duty is concerned is fixed. And the arrangement is merely a legislative one. Parliament sits within a few months, at the most, of the making of any arrangement, and it can approve or disapprove as it pleases.

Mr. SPROULE. Even though the arrangement be a legislative one, it might be for a definite time?

Mr. PATERSON. No, parliament would be able to decide as to the wisdom or unwisdom of extending this intermediate tariff to any country on the terms we may have. Parliament simply empowers the government to fix duties within certain limits, retaining the right of taxation in its own hands.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it not make provision as to how long the arrangement will last?

Mr. PATERSON. It would have to be a legislative Act. We shall have, under this Act, power to put these duties into effect. The matter would have to be brought into effect on the part of the other countries to the arrangement by legislative Act which would secure to us what had been agreed upon. But parliament would still have the same power over the legislation on this side, and so would the parliamentary authority of the other country retain power so far as their concessions are concerned. If a change were made on either side, that would terminate the arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART. How would parliament proceed to annul such an arrangement?

Mr. FIELDING. Just as parliament would proceed with regard to our British preferential tariff being applied to any particular place. We have no binding arrangement with the mother country or with any colony concerning the British preferential tariff. It suits us in our wisdom—right or wrong—to authorize the products of the mother country to come in under certain rates. We extend the same to New Zealand, because New Zealand gives us some small preference. There is no agreement in the nature of a treaty. New Zealand can withdraw her preference, as we can withdraw ours—there is no arrangement for the future. That is all we contemplate as respects to the new tariff. We do not ask parliament to give us power to make an arrangement for a term of years. If such an arrangement were sought, it would have to be by treaty through the imperial authorities and we should have to lay it before parliament and ask its approval.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that in a certain important respect, this differs from our British preferential tariff. I understood from the Minister of Finance in his budget speech that this intermediate tariff was to be extended to countries that gave a certain preference to Canada—that is, in these cases we were to get something in return for the preference which we thus give. I suppose that what we are to get in return would be subject to negotiation and agreement. Therefore, the illustration of the British preference in the answer to the hon. gentleman from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) would not be apt.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the principle is the same. It is the doing of things by mere legislation which shall have effect so long as it is mutually agreeable. The moment the other parties do not like the arrangement they simply withdraw it and that ends it. I think the principle is the same in both cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, you can make a treaty or arrangement with a country which will be subject to denunciation upon notice.

Mr. FIELDING. That would have to be approved.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some treaties do not require any legislative action, while others do. Those which touch the customs duties of a country always do require legislative action, because the tariff must be modified in any country by the appropriate legislature. Will this concession be given without any consideration to Canada, and is that element to be wanting? I cannot yet understand—and I am not very sure that the Finance Minister understands—what is really the government's idea upon this subject. Take an illustration. At the the present time, as I understand it, there is no favoured nation treaty with Germany. There is no favoured nation treaty with Belgium. I am right in that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The tariff of Belgium as against Canada is about one-eighth of the tariff of Canada against Belgium, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING. Their's is very low.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Now, does the government propose, being unhampered in any respect, to apply this intermediate tariff to Belgium because Belgium gives us a very much lower tariff than we impose upon Belgian products? Or have you any idea of the principle upon which you propose to proceed in such a case—which I mention merely for the purpose of illustration so that I may understand what the government may mean to do?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not precisely the point raised by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). What we may do with Belgium, as what we may do with any other country, is a question for the future.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just a word, to make myself understood, if I may. The point I was debating was this: The hon. member for South Lanark, asked whether this was to be a matter of agreement. Does it necessarily involve considerations of tariff concession on one side and on the other? If you do propose to make it a matter of agreement, I am not sure that you can get rid of that agreement in quite so easy a manner as the Minister of Finance has suggested. That is the question that my hon. friend from South Lanark raised as I un-

derstand it. And that is one aspect of the question. On the other hand, if you do not propose to make this a matter of agreement and consideration, which I would understand to be the case from the reference made by the Minister of Finance to the British preference—that is the ground they have taken, for in that case we demand no consideration, we have asked nothing in return—if you choose to take that aspect of the situation, then it would seem to me that you would, in the ordinary course, apply this intermediate tariff without agreement, because no agreement is necessary or demanded. You would not apply this tariff to those countries outside the British empire—or inside the British empire, for that matter, if they do not come within the British preference—which are giving to Canada as good a treatment or better treatment than that which Canada is giving to them in respect to tariff matters. I am simply asking for the principle, if there has been any principle throughout, upon which the government propose to put in force this intermediate tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. It is well to understand what we mean when we speak of an agreement. When we speak of an agreement in international affairs I would suppose that my hon. friend meant some formal document.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Treaty or convention.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it is not contemplated that there shall be any convention, or treaty, or any such agreement; but of course two parties can come to an understanding to do something mutually without their being what you may call an agreement. We have to-day an agreement in that restrictive sense, and not in the broader sense, with the South African colonies. They approached us to have our preference. We discussed the matter and said, All right, we will give you a preference. There was an agreement between us to that extent. But it is not a continuing agreement, it is not a binding agreement, there is no bargain in it. They give us their preference to-day and we give them our preference. There was an agreement, two minds had to meet to bring it about, but there is no binding agreement, for they can take their preference away to-morrow and we can take ours away to-morrow. That is precisely the position of affairs with regard to what might happen under this intermediate tariff. Of course there is the difficulty, my hon. friend has already spoken of it, the difficulty about favoured nations. That means that we cannot at once proceed, we admit that, we have to delay perhaps until we can make negotiations with two or three countries. Take this illustration. Suppose the consul of one of the continental nations comes here to-morrow and says, 'I am in a position to say that my government will reduce the duty on agricultural produce, or on animals and their products, or on half a dozen things you attach importance to; we will do that if you will reduce the duty on half a dozen things that we attach importance to. I am authorized by my government to do this, if you will do that. We do not ask for any treaties, we do not ask for any bargains; we will do it because it suits us if you will do that.' The suggestion suits our mutual interests, and so the thing may be done. There will be an agreement in the sense that two minds come together to reach a common purpose, but there will be no binding agreement for twenty-four hours, and there is no need of a treaty.

Mr. HAGGART. It is clear what the hon. gentleman purposes to do. Instead of doing the thing by treaty he proposes to do it by reciprocal legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. That is it.

Mr. HAGGART. But here is the question that I want answered. We impose by tariff 30 per cent on an article coming into this country. By reciprocal legislation we place in the tariff a duty on that article coming from a certain country, at 20 per cent. The Finance Minister says that will only exist as long as we choose. But how can this House, except with the consent of the government, reduce the duty on any article?

Mr. FIELDING. If we do not get this legislation it could not; this legislation will give the government power to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. Then it is left entirely in the power of the Governor General and his advisers as to how long this may continue?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. HAGGART. This House cannot move an amendment for the purpose of altering or reducing the duties, that is entirely in the power of the Governor General and his advisers.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend does not seem to know that the Governor General and his advisers have power of that kind, for they exercised it when my hon. friend sat in the cabinet; they had power to transfer articles from one class to another, to reduce the duty on an article, and the power to transfer it to the free list. That was a greater power than we are asking for here.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman does not seem to catch the point. He says it is at the option of this House at any time to reduce or alter the duty. It is at the option of this House with the consent of the Governor General.

Mr. PATERSON No.

Mr. HAGGART. Can you reduce the duty on an item in the tariff without getting his consent?

Mr. PATERSON. If this House were to pass a resolution expressing regret that the government maintained this legislation, what would be the effect? The government would be in the judgment of the House. If the action of the government was not approved by the House, what would the government do? Dare they go contrary to the expressed will of the majority of the House?

Mr. HAGGART. It is the same as in signing a treaty or any other legislation; the only remedy you have is to find fault with the government by motion of the House for entering into that arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the matter is a little more important than the Finance Minister would like us to believe by his hair oil illustration. I do not know why he lit upon that. But I do not think it comports with the gravity of the subject. Now might not the Finance Minister just as well make the confession at once that they have not the slightest idea of how, or when, or where they are going to put that intermediate tariff into effect?

Mr. FIELDING. If it will do my hon. friend any good I will admit that at this moment we have not any idea of the particular country or the particular date at which we shall avail ourselves of this legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. Or whether you can do it advantageously or not.

Mr. FIELDING. We know we can do it, but for the embarrassment of the favoured nation clause, that is the only trouble ; and if we could get three or four countries negotiating together about the same time, and bring them in at the same time, we might not care about the favoured nation clause.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is the obstacle in the way that prevents you from doing it. But I think the question is wider than that. Suppose you put this intermediate tariff into operation, and a country comes to you, a trading country which has a much smaller tariff against Canadian goods than Canada has upon goods coming from that country; suppose, for instance, that Belgium would come here with a tariff of five or four per cent and show that her tariff, so far as it applied to articles coming from Canada, is even lower than our tariff upon articles coming from Belgium; suppose she comes under that clause and says, put us on the intermediate tariff. Now here is a country which treats you fairly; they allow you to go into their country with goods from Canada at an almost nominal tariff, and on their goods coming into Canada you put a comparatively high tariff. In what way could the ministry refuse to let them in under the intermediate tariff by virtue of what they have already done with reference to the products that go from Canada under their tariff? Would it be included in this plan?

Mr. PATERSON. Supposing Belgium might agree to lower her tariff in something that benefited us, what would be the hon. gentleman's idea then?

Mr. FOSTER. But what I want to get at is the idea of the government. If the government would say to me : No, we do not propose under this intermediate tariff to give to any country, no matter how favourable entrance that country now offers to Canadian goods, compared with goods from every other country, the benefit of the intermediate tariff unless they go still further in regard to the diminution of duties upon certain products that Canada may have to export to them, that would clear up one side of the difficulty. But the government have declared that they have no rule, no principle. They will come together and talk over the question : Would it be a good thing to do this ? They talked it over in reference to the West Indies. The West Indies made no reduction. The West Indies, in fact, raised the tariff against Canada on certain articles and yet they said : We will admit the West Indies to the preferential tariff. Is the government going to go on the same basis—the basis of its own will—in the matter ? In the case of Belgium is it going to say : There is Belgium which gives us wide entrance into her country at an almost infinitesimal tariff while we charge a pretty high tariff against her ; are we going, considering that she gives us a pretty good quid pro quo, to give her the advantage of our intermediate tariff without asking for any further advantage in Belgium ? If it can be done, as in the case of the West Indian islands it was done without a quid pro quo, it is pertinent to ask the question as to what they intend to do in reference to these things.

There is another point. The hon. minister has read a list of the countries that come under the most favoured nation treaties. Some of them are unimportant as far as the trade of Canada is concerned. I quite agree that it would make very little difference whether they were admitted or not, but others are very important and there are two great countries at least, the United States of America and Germany, which are very strong competitors in trade and one of which is lying right alongside of our border—the strongest competitor for the trade of Canada in certain lines that there is to-day in the world, the strongest competitor against Great Britain to whom we give a preferential tariff. Now, if that intermediate tariff were applied to the United States of America, as

this government want the power to do by order in council without reference to this parliament at all, does the hon. minister mean to say that it would not have two very important effects upon this country? It would have two far-reaching effects which would very well carry the name and title of revolutionary in respect to the change that it would make in trade. It acts in two ways. The government take credit to themselves and we are willing to give them to the greatest extent their due, for strengthening, if anything, the British preference, but the very moment they let a country like the United States of America into this country under the intermediate tariff with from 2½ to 5 per cent of an advantage over what they have now, with $1 a ton, in a great many staple articles in which they are, facile princeps, the greatest manufacturers in the world, lying right at our door, almost where you any morning might wire an order and have the goods shipped whilst in the other case they have to cross the ocean and take a long time—if, I say the intermediate tariff might be applied to the United States of America the effect would be revolutionary in this country. You would immediately have all our manufactures, our manufactures of iron particularly, in competition with the United States, the greatest competitor and rival in the world, by giving to the United States a dollar a ton in a great many instances and from 2½ to 5 per cent upon large ranges of products in other cases. Do you mean to say that that would not affect our great manufacturing industries? I think it would very vitally affect them. To-day 2½, or 5 per cent, or a dollar a ton takes pretty nearly all of the actual profits that may be made upon quick business and quick turn-overs and the competition is very keen. That is one side of it. The manufacturers in Canada, in reference to a wide range of goods, would have no certainty at all when they came to consider the question of extension of their business, as to whether they should put more capital into their business, the business, which now, under the general tariff they are just carrying on, enabling them to meet their profit and keep their business in operation, if they are haunted by the fear that at any day council may issue an order by which it would place the United States of America under the intermediate tariff with a reduction in the line of duties from $1 a ton down to 2½ or 5 per cent. The hon. Minister of Finance may think that is a trivial reduction. He takes credit to himself for making a reduction of 2½ per cent on agricultural implements. It is trivial,. Why, that is only one-half of 5 per cent. It is only 2½ per cent; it is nothing; it is trivial; it is not revolutionary. But, you go to the farmers of the country and crow your loftiest because you have made a reduction of 2½ per cent on agricultural implements. You are taking the great basic industries of the United States and you are charging them, under the intermediate tariff, $1 a ton, or from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent less for entrance into this country which you will find is a very considerable reduction. So I ask in reference to that stability for which we all argue, in so far as we can have it, are you going to make the industries of this country any more stable by holding over them this intermediate tariff which you may apply to any country in the world and particularly to their great competitor in five minutes' time?

Well, now, the other thing you are going to do is this: You take credit—and I say keep all of it you rightly ought to have—for strengthening the British preference; yet, at any day of the year you may pass an order in council by which you will shave off from 2½ to 5 per cent of that preference and in many cases more than that. Do you mean to say that it is going to act as an element of stability as regards the desire of the British manufacturers to cultivate trade with Canada? They look over the preference and they say: With the preference we have we can carry on a trade, but the United States of America, our great competitor, may at any moment come in and our preference will be cut by that much. Is it any use for us, under this condition of instability which rests only upon the fiat of the government, to seriously go into the matter of cultivating trade relations with Canada? We can do it on the tariff we have there now—the preferential tariff—but we cannot do it if we are going to have a cut of 2½ or greater per cent in favour of our greatest competitor. Will not that have a very bad effect? It affects our own industries, it affects the British preference and it does point towards instability and uncertainty than which nothing is more deleterious in the employment of capital in our stated and basic industries where, when you get your capital in you cannot take it out and put it in your pocket the next morning, and where, when it is there, it must be swamped or get its profit, and if it cannot get its profit it is lost or is represented by iron, wood and scrap and nothing else. So, I say it is more important than it seems to be at the first moment. Then, they say, this is not a treaty. It is not a treaty. It is not even a convention—but it is an agreement. This government goes to the United States and says: Can't we get some sort of reciprocal relations under our intermediate tariff; we are authorized by parliament to give you a line into our country under certain duties. Then the United States government says: We are willing to make a proposition to you on the line of your intermediate duties, but how long will

that arrangement last; is it for a year or a term of years? And the government of Canada has to say: It may not last five minutes: we do it by order in council and we are at liberty to revoke it by order in council. How far are you going to get in any arrangement with a great manufacturing country like the United States unless you can show more stability than that? The Minister of Finance has told us that after all parliament has it in its own hands. My hon. friend knows that is not the case. During recess the government goes to work and does a thing and the government brings to parliament what it has done and says: We want this ratified. The freedom of the supporters of the government is taken away. We are bound by what the government has done; they are put in the position that they either have to support the government or prove revolutionary and kick up a bobbery within their own party. Cases of that kind will occur—may be with both governments—men are dragooned into supporting a thing simply because the government says: We have done it, don't go back on us, if we can't carry this out we will have to go to the country. So I say, there are a good many considerations to be taken account of with reference to this matter which is not at all so unimportant as it would seem at first sight. I think it is a very grave innovation and grave consequences may follow. I reiterate the idea that it makes for instability and uncertainty and will be rather a menace than otherwise in that it puts it in the power of the government at any time by order in council to make most sweeping arrangements involving all the range of articles in which we trade on the ostensible basis that it is only an order in council and can be done away with at any time. But when it is once done it becomes an act of the government and an appeal is made to the party to stand by the government whether the members of the party agree with it or whether they do not. In such things as these we ought to keep within parliament all the power that can possibly be kept within parliament, giving nothing out more than is necessary for the reasonable elastic action that all good governments—and I suppose all bad governments—must have and be held responsible for as to the way in which they use it.

Mr. FIELDING. The principle involved in this tariff is a very simple and I think a very good one. If I were to judge my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) by his remarks I should be obliged to put him down as an opponent of this intermediate tariff, but I shall not do so because I venture to believe that upon careful consideration he would not feel at liberty to array himself in opposition to that principle. That principle is that this government so far as it can—that is all any of us can do in this world; we are hampered by the favoured nation treaties, and because we cannot accomplish everything we desire it is no reason why we should not accomplish things that are within our reach—the principle is that so far as we can we shall hold out to foreign countries an inducement to give us better conditions than they would otherwise give. The principle is that we shall establish a discrimination between our treatment of countries which shut us out of their markets to a large extent and our treatment of countries which are willing to become buyers of the products of Canada. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) set himself against that principle? It might be implied from his remarks that he would. I shall give him time to reconsider. I do not believe that on reflection he will venture to set himself against such a sound principle. If the principle is unsound; if it is not wise that we should endeavour so far as we can to make that distinction between countries which will buy from us and our treatment of countries which do not want to buy from us, then my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should move to strike out the intermediate tariff. If he is prepared to take that responsibility that is his business; I hope and believe he will not do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The principle which the Finance Minister has just announced would clearly include Belgium.

Mr. FIELDING. The position of Belgium has to be considered. Belgium has a low tariff; whether or not we should admit Belgium to the privileges of this tariff is a question to be considered later on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not dissent from that; I am simply stating that the principle which the Finance Minister has just laid down would clearly include Belgium.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps so. I do not wish to make any admission which would prejudice us in our relations with Belgium. There is force in the argument, but we must reserve all the rights we have in negotiating on the part of Canada in order to do the best we can for Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What the minister said in the previous sentence would not necessarily include Belgium, because he spoke of a country which treated us, in consideration of this tariff, better than it otherwise would.

Mr. FIELDING. We granted this privilege to Great Britain which gives us no preference, we granted it to the West Indies which give us no preference. It is open to us to say if we wish, that for reasons which make for the advancement of Canada in our judgment, we will give this intermediate tariff to any foreign country where we think it would be advantageous. That might include Belgium. It is a question whether, all things considered, we regard it as advantageous to Canada. I want to guard myself; my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) would not wish that in

referring to our relations with any country we should commit ourselves to any definite line of policy. Therefore, I say that the principle of this intermediate tariff is that in so far as we can do so we shall try to treat a foreign nation which buys from us better than a foreign nation which refuses to buy from us. Now, it is no answer to say : you cannot do it ; you have the favoured nation trouble to meet. We admit that. But that is no reason why we should not make the effort. If we cannot accomplish all that we desire in that direction let us by all means accomplish that which experience may show is within our reach. So much then for the principle of this tariff. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) quoted me as saying that I regarded these reductions as 'trivial.' He had to coin a word. I did not say they were trivial, but I did say they were not revolutionary. There is a wide range between these two words in their meaning. I said it was not revolutionary to apply this intermediate tariff to any given article. Let me give an illustration. I open the book and I find here an article paying a duty of 35 per cent under the general tariff. We have the power to-day to admit that very article under the British preference at about one-third off. If we have 35 per cent under the general tariff and if we have 22½ per cent under the British preference, it cannot be a very revolutionary project to say that when that article comes from some foreign country it may be admitted at the rate of 30 per cent, when we are already admitting the same article from Great Britain at 22½.

We may propose a rate of 35 per cent in the general tariff and a preference rate of 22½ per cent to Great Britain, but if we propose to admit another country at 30 per cent it is a revolutionary proposal, according to my hon. friend. I submit that it is not a serious argument at all. There would be nothing revolutionary in such a proposal. What we propose is to take power to reduce the rate of the general tariff in certain cases when we think it would be to the advantage of Canada to do so. Then, my hon. friend points out that if we should give to a foreign country the benefits of this intermediate tariff, we would thereby reduce the British preference. That is true; we have to acknowledge that; but how otherwise are you to deal with the intermediate tariff? Do hon. gentlemen want us to reduce the duties to Great Britain ? They will not say that. Their criticism is rather that our duties to Great Britain are too low now, and that we could not in justice to our own industries reduce them still further. We would have either to do that or go to the other extreme and increase the duties to foreign countries. That would raise the whole question as to whether we should have a high tariff. On that question we differ from many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, although I believe many of them agree with us in favouring a moderate tariff ; and I believe it would not be wise on our part, for the sake of making a reduction to some foreign country, to increase the scale of the general tariff. We may be right or we may be wrong, but we think the sentiment of the country would be against that. If the principle of an intermediate tariff is a good one, and we attempt by that means to increase our trade with countries from which we wish to buy and who wish to buy from us, we would to some extent reduce the British preference ; but while it would not be as large as it now is, it would still be a very substantial preference, and one which we think the British manufacturers and merchants would appreciate. There remains one other question which the hon. gentleman talked of. He argued about the dreadful things that would happen if this intermediate tariff were applied to the United States—that would be a tremendous revolution. Yes, it would be a tremendous revolution in the United States ; it would be the greatest economic revolution that had ever occurred in that country, if they were to bring their tariff down to a rate that would make it possible for us to give them the benefit of this intermediate tariff. It is utterly preposterous to talk of the United States doing that. I do not admit that it would be a tremendous disaster for Canada; but it would be a tremendous change of their tariff. Every one of us knows that the trend of sentiment in the United States is such that when either the republican party or the democratic party talk of tariff reform, their ideas still hold them to a pretty high tariff. Every one of us knows that there is no probability of the United States making any such revolutionary change in their fiscal policy as to enable us to give them the benefits of the intermediate tariff. So we may leave the United States out of the discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. What rule would the government lay down as to the reduction that would be necessary before they would admit the United States to the benefits of the intermediate tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. I may say frankly to my hon. friend that as I have never dreamed that the thing would happen, I have never given it a moment's thought.

Mr. FOSTER. Yet the minister takes this absolute power to himself, that if the United States makes a reduction of any kind, and this government thinks, it would be an advantage to Canada, they might let them in under the intermediate tariff. They have that power; that is what I quarrel with—the power to do whatever you please or think is right in so great a matter. You may if you please give to the United States the whole benefit of the intermediate tariff without the United States

bringing their tariff down 10 per cent or 1 per cent below what it is now when it is double of ours. But if the minister will lay it down as a principle that they will not give the benefit of the intermediate tariff to any country whose tariff does not approach or come down to the level of the tariff of this country, that would grade off a good deal of the difficulty that might otherwise arise.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend understates his own case; I want to state it more strongly for him. He says that if the United States would reduce their tariff 10 per cent we might give them the benefit of the intermediate tariff. I admit further that we could do it if they reduced their tariff 1 per cent. I frankly say that we take the power to give the benefits of the intermediate tariff to any foreign country which gives concessions to Canada which in the judgment of the government are of advantage to Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of law you could do it if they did not reduce their tariff, or even if they raised it.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. A very distinguished statesman once said that the Governor in Council in Canada is a great institution. Well, the Governor in Council under our system has to be from time to time granted certain powers and responsibilities. You do not give it the power of taxation; that is a power which the Commons of Canada jealously guards for itself. You do not give it the power to do anything at its own sweet will; whatever it does must be done subject to special conditions. All that the government ask power to do is not to increase, but to reduce the tariff. We have that power to-day under the old tariff—by order in council either to reduce duties or to place articles on the free list, and the hon. gentleman never took exception to it. This is no new principle; it is merely the extension of the principle that has existed in Canada for generations.

Mr. HAGGART. You have no power at present to make a special arrangement with a particular foreign country to give it advantages over other countries.

Mr. FIELDING. We are asking that power now.

Mr. HAGGART. You have not that power yet. There never was such a power given to any government in the world before. In France and certain other countries there is a maximum and a minimum tariff. A minimum tariff goes into force on certain conditions being performed by other countries. There can be no possible objection to that, as Parliament maintains control of the arrangement and knows the grounds and reasons on which it is made. But we have nothing of this kind here. You give the power to the government to enter into this arrangement with a foreign country on any conditions they like.

Mr. PATERSON. But we are not compelled to do it. There are certain articles on which we might get a reduction of duty and there are others on which they would desire a reduction on our part. If we did our duty properly we would see that they did not get an advantage greater than what they gave us. Then when parliament meets, the House will have the opportunity to pass judgment on what we did.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose they condemn it, how does that alter the arrangement?

Mr. PATERSON. If the government does not repeal it, parliament will substitute another government.

Mr. FOSTER. That brings up all policies—not only this one, but all policies.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly. What more control does parliament want? Suppose we were approached by the consul of a foreign government and he were to say to us: We can give you a special rate on certain products, if in return you will give us special rates on certain others of our products. Should we not be able to take advantage of that offer and seize the opportunity just when it is ripe, or shall we have, before we can conclude any arrangement, to submit it to parliament, institute a treaty making arrangement, and have our ministers sitting on the question with the British ambassadors, as was done by the late government. And what was the result of all their efforts? It was the French treaty we now have. Could any one imagine anything less advantageous to Canada than that French treaty which was sanctioned by parliament. There never was a more one-sided treaty. We give France reduced rates on French goods and they gave us reduced duties on certain Canadian goods. But they coupled with their reductions the condition that the goods must be sent in a vessel sailing directly from a Canadian port to a French port. Their concession was thus made absolutely nugatory, whereas their goods get the benefit of the reduction no matter in what way they come into this country. How could we make a worse bargain than that? And we are not at liberty, without a solemn denunciation of this treaty, to change it. Whereas under our resolutions, if we made a bargain like that, parliament could cancel it at the first opportunity.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says it can be revoked by parliament which is perfectly true. But in what position shall we be? The Governor General, on the advice of his council, makes an arrangement with a foreign country, by which each one gets reciprocal advantages. No matter how this parliament may condemn such an arrangement, it would never revoke it. Have

you ever known of a case in which any government or parliament in a British country exercised the right to revoke such legislation? There is the difficulty. Once reciprocal legislation is passed, it is just as solemn an arrangement as if there were a treaty arrangement between two countries.

Mr. PATERSON. No, because the understanding is altogether different.

Mr. HAGGART. The proceedings are by negotiation just as solemn as in the case of a treaty and no parliament would revoke it. What position would the opposition be in? The only remedy they would have would be a motion to find fault with the government for having entered into such an arrangement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They could strike out the clause.

Mr. HAGGART. How could they?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell you.

Mr. HAGGART. When the tariff Act comes up, the opposition may move for a reduction, but when the tariff Act is once on the statue-book, I doubt if we have the power in opposition to move an amendment to make a reduction on any item.

Mr. PATERSON. For years the government, of which my hon. friend was a member, had on the statute-book in the tariff a list of items on which the duties were to be reduced, provided the American government made a reciprocal reduction of duties. Suppose the American government had accepted that and congress had passed legislation putting in their tariff the rates of duty that we mentioned in our tariff, this would be reciprocal legislation, and these articles would become subject to the duties named. But, suppose that next year, congress should review its action and raise the duties on these articles, would it be a breach of faith on the part of the Canadian government to increase their duties on these articles?

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly not.

MR. R. L. BORDEN. I am not very sure yet of any principle upon which the Minister of Finance or the government intend to proceed in this matter. I thought at one time, from what the hon. minister said in his budget speech and from his language this afternoon, that this new tariff was only to be extended to countries which would give us better treatment than that which they extended to the world in general. But the Minister of Finance disabused my mind of that when he said that, so far as the United States was concerned, it was a mere matter of their reducing their tariff, not to us especially, but to the whole world. That is as I understood his remarks. And it was rather refreshing to have the Minister of Finance inform the House and the country that it was preposterous for us to expect that we could get satisfactory reciprocal trade relations with the United States, considering the promises that he and his friends made to the country for ten or fifteen years, that the only thing necessary in order to accomplish this end was to put them in power. I do not think that such language as that of the Minister of Finance this afternoon was ever heard from the lips of any liberal speaker in those days. Now, the Minister of Finance says that it is very desirable to have tariff stability. But when we ask him about this intermediate tariff, we cannot find out whether these arrangements are to be permanent or temporary. And, the hon. gentleman, with his customary prudence, has so framed his language that it will apply either to permanent or temporary arrangements.

Mr. FIELDING. Any arrangement we make will have to be temporary, and could be changed by either party to it at any moment, just as could the conditions of the preferential tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the hon. minister, in his budget speech to refer to treaties and conventions, and these would not be temporary.

Mr. FIELDING. If a treaty is made, the treaty itself will set forth the terms of its duration. But we are speaking here of what the government may do under these clauses. Certainly, no binding arrangement could be made by the government under these clauses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall not delay the House at the moment by endeavouring to find in the budget speech the words of the minister to which I refer, but I certainly understood that under this power, permanent arrangements were contemplatead, provided they could be made with countries whose trade was to us important.

Mr. FIELDING. Only by treaty and through the usual channels. And such treaty would have to be submitted to parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I admit all that. But what I say is that the minister used language comprehensive enough to cover either a fixed arrangement under a treaty, or a temporary arrangement under reciprocal legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. Not by this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know why not. For, you could make a treaty or convention one of the terms of which would be that the intermediate tariff would apply, and so you could make this operative in that way instead of by reciprocal legislation. And the Minister of Finance is not

more definite when we ask him as to the terms. We ask him: Will you make this applicable to any country that now gives to Canada better terms than Canada gives to it. He suggests that question when he speaks of the case of the United States to which he referred, but when an illustration is given of the case of Belgium, he says he does not know what he will do. His language includes apparently the case of a foreign country that gives us terms no better than it gives to the world in general. He uses language which will include every one of these varied aspects, but does not give us any principle by which the government will be guided in applying the tariff. The hon. gentleman spoke very strongly in favour of tariff stability. Does this tend to tariff stability? If you are to enter into an arrangement of a temporary character such as we spoke of, one which we may be compelled to alter next day, next month, next year, by reason of the action of a foreign government, will that tend to the tariff stability which he lauded so much as an essential element of our policy? Then, I suppose if we are to have tariff stability, we ought to have it with respect to the British preference as well as anything else. The hon. gentleman has claimed great credit in respect of the British preference, and has sopken of the lower preference which would result from the intermediate tariff. Does he know what changes he will make in the British preference by this new intermediate tariff which he proposes? Take for instance, item 394, cast iron pipe. This intermediate tariff would take off just 50 per cent of the British preference. In item 377 and in item 398 it has the same effect it takes off 50 per cent of the preference. In item 403 and in item 436 it takes off 25 per cent. In item 439 it takes off 40 per cent and in item 441, 33⅓ per cent. I am referred to item 230 by an hon. friend beside me, and I find that in that case the British preference will be entirely wiped out.

Mr. PATERSON. That is under the French treaty made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), We are governed by that now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That French treaty cannot apply for example, to Belgium, Germany or any of the other countries that have been mentioned. I am not talking of the French treaty but of the intermediate tariff, and I have shown that the British tariff will be reduced in some cases by 25 per cent, in some cases 33⅓ per cent, in some cases 40 per cent, in some cases 50 per cent, and in one case at least by 100 per cent. Does it conduce to stability to have a tariff of this kind which may be brought into existence at any time, by order in council? I do not think it will promote confidence in our tariff stability either here or in the British Islands. The object of tariff stability is that we may know what industries we may undertake under conditions which will remain for some time to come. But the condition here is that the government, at any day, without calling parliament together, and merely by order in council, may change the trade relations of this country. The British exporter who now has a preference in this country, has to face the contingency that the government may reduce his preference at any time. I venture to think that this intermediate tariff does not seem to be based on any very definite principle. We have no information which gives us the slightest idea as to the principle upon which the government will seek to apply it. All we know is that my hon. friend declares that it must be absolutely left to the discretion of this government to bring that into force or not, as the government may see fit. No man in this country, after reading or hearing the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance upon the budget, or after reading or hearing the remarks which he has made to-day, can come to any conclusion as to what principle will guide this government in bringing that intermediate tariff into operation.

Mr. FIELDING. The principle of this resolution, as I stated at the beginning—and I desire now to repeat it so that if my hon. friend is as strongly opposed to it as his speech might imply, we should have him on record against it—the principle of this resolution is that we shall have power to discriminate between a country which wants to buy our goods and a country which refuses to buy our goods—that is the principle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They only do that by tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. By tariff, there is no other way. There are countries which set up a high tariff and shut us out, there are other countries which adopt a lower tariff and buy goods from us. We desire to make a distinction between the two. That is the principle, and if my hon. friend wants to oppose that, I cannot quarrel with him as to his right to do so. But I think it is a proper distinction, and one which the country will approve, and will only regret that we are not making the distinction still broader. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that when people come to think it over they will set themselves against that principle. But if he wants to know what are the precise conditions under which we will apply this principle, I cannot tell him exactly, because various nations may have different ideas as to the terms and conditions upon which they would meet us. The nations of the world do not produce all things alike. I can imagine that the Italian authorities might come to us and

say : Give us a reduction upon half a dozen articles that Italy produces, a reduction upon fruits, upon olive oil, for instance, things which sunny Italy produces in profusion, and in return we will give you a concession upon things which you can send us, your apples, your bacon, your cheese, your butter, for instance. An arrangement like that might be made with Italy, but if we come to some of the northern countries of Europe they will say to us : We are not worrying over the duties on fruits and olive oil, give us something different. The conditions of the different countries vary. The question is, will it be to the advantage of Canada to make arrangements of this kind ? That is the principle. But my hon. friend insists that we must know in advance what terms and conditions we are going to get from any country, I frankly admit that we cannot know that in advance, because all countries are not alike. The conditions under which one country would be willing to give us concessions in return for similar concessions on our part, might be widely different in another country. There are two principles in the matter. The first principle is that of discriminating, so far as we have the power, between a country which wants to buy from us and a country that does not, and that is the vital principle of this resolution. On the other side the principle is that the arrangement should be such as, in the judgment of the government—and that means the government subject to the review of this House—offers advantages which, on the whole, are for the benefit of Canada. I do not think it is possible to give my hon. friend any more detailed statement of the principle upon which this resolution is to be applied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did the Finance Minister depart from the method which he suggested in his speech of 1904, and repeated in his speech of 1905 ? The hon. minister will remember well what he then proposed, and it was certainly a different method from that which he proposes to-day. He said :

We have to-day practically a maximum and a minimum tariff, if I may so describe it, and then we have the British preference below that again. It would be well that in the revision that may take place we should adopt that principle as it now exists and deal with it more in detail. I think it would be well for us to have a maximum general tariff and a minimum general tariff, and the British preference below that as we have it to-day. The maximum tariff would only be applied to those countries which pursue, if I may so call it, a hostile policy. I do not mean to say that they have any hostility to us, but simply that in the carrying out of their own affairs they adopt a trade policy which discourages trade with us. In that case, they cannot complain if we have a maximum tariff, and though we should guard against having an extreme tariff, we would be justified in saying that this tariff should be materially higher than the tariff which we are prepared to extend to other countries which are willing to trade with us on fair and reasonable terms.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance emphasized that. Then he went on in his speech, and I venture to bring it to-day before the House because he thought it worth while, not only to use this language in 1904, but to quote it in his speech of 1905.

The minimum general tariff, which would correspond to the general tariff to-day, would apply to such countries as do not legislate commercially in a spirit of hostility to us—perhaps that is not happily expressed—let me say, to countries that adopt more moderate tariff views, low tariff countries.

Undoubtedly under that principle so announced by the Minister of Finance, Belgium for example would be included. The Minister of Finance says that under his intermediate tariff of to-day he does not know whether Belgium would be included or not. Then he continues :

Of course, where there are favoured nation treaties in existence they have to be considered, but the principal nations which to-day adopt a high tariff policy have not any favoured nation arrangement, and therefore I think our hands will be free in that respect. So we would have a maximum tariff, as we have the German surtax to-day, to apply to such countries as do not manifest a disposition to trade with us.

Well, the principle to-day seems to be that we shall apply our general tariff to countries that do not manifest a disposition to trade with us. He continues as follows :

We should have a minimum general tariff to apply to countries that are disposed to trade with us, and then below that we would have the British preferential tariff to apply to the mother country and to such colonies of the empire as it may be expedient to extend the benefit of that tariff to. I think, Sir, that on this line, guarding carefully against extortionate duties, but also making a distinction between the countries which wish to trade with us and the countries that do not wish to trade with us, we can devise a tariff which will be in all its details fairly satisfactory to the country.

I am quoting so far from the budget speech of the hon. gentleman delivered in 1904. After repeating that in 1905, he went on as follows:

That, Sir, was the statement which I made a year ago, and which the House and the country, it is not too much to say, have accepted.

The House and the country have accepted it.

I do not need to enlarge upon it to-day, but merely to say that the lines he then indicated we should endeavour to follow in the revision of the tariff as now proposed.

I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will be disposed to admit that his

method as disclosed in the tariff presented this year is essentially different from that which he then propounded, and I would like to inquire what are the reasons which led him to abandon the method which he then laid down, and which he said had been accepted by the House and the country, and to adopt the method presented to us to-day.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot admit anything of the kind. The tariff we are bringing down to-day is substantially a tariff on the lines indicated then, that was that there should be a maximum and a minimum tariff. To-day we say for convenience that we shall have a general tariff, an intermediate tariff, and the British preference. We do not use the words 'maximum' and 'minimum' but we adopt precisely the same principle that was proposed then. We have the general tariff which can be brought into operation at once, and applied to countries that do not give us fair play; then we have the intermediate tariff, which it is intended to apply to countries which deal with us on more liberal terms. Then we have the British preference. They are practically and substantially the very same tariffs as those in reference to which my hon. friend has quoted. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. Because we do not use the term 'maximum' or 'minimum' I really do not see any great difference. The only difference is that we postpone the operation of the intermediate tariff for reasons we have explained so that we may bring them into operation at a later date. That is all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It appears to me that the logic which the hon. Minister of Finance has just used is more extraordinary than I ever heard him use in this House before, and that is saying a good deal. His proposal, as I have read it, was that there should be a British preference. He adheres to that. Perhaps there is no distinction between the two tariffs in that regard. What he proposed a year ago, and two years ago, as well was that there should be a general tariff, a low tariff, which would practically correspond, I suppose, to the intermediate tariff which he is presenting to us, and that this should be applicable to all countries trading with us on fair terms, and that above that there should be a higher tariff which would be applied by order in council, I suppose,—he was not very definite as to that—to those countries which were not disposed to trade with us. What he now brings forward is that higher tariff applicable to all countries outside of the empire and a lower tariff which is not applicable to any country at all, which may never be applicable to any country at all, as to the application of which he has not given us any very definite idea and which can only be brought into force by order in council. My hon. friend says that these two schemes are one and the very same thing. He says that it makes not the slightest difference, that in one case the intermediate tariff is applicable by its terms to all countries in the world and that in the other case the intermediate tariff may never be applicable to any country at all. He declares that the difference is of trifling importance, it is of such trifling importance that we might as a matter of fact consider the two tariff schemes as exactly the same in their conception and execution.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say anything of the kind, but of course, if my hon. friend interprets it that way I can only regret that I have failed to make myself clear to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman does not regret it more than I do.

Mr. AMES. May I ask the hon. minister a question on the line of what he said a few moments ago? May it not be possible, in fact is it not highly probable, that a reduction of duties such as is intended from the general to the intermediate tariff might result in an increased importation of certain articles and in an increased revenue derived from the importation of those articles? Now, that increased revenue is nothing more or less than increased taxation and if the Governor in Council is to take upon himself power to enact tariff legislation which will impose increased taxation on the country is he not doing what only parliament has a right to do?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend suggest that a reduction of duties means an increase of taxation?

Mr. AMES. It might be so.

Mr. FIELDING. Very good. Well, if it is an increase of taxation—and I am not quite sure that I differ widely from my hon. friend—I say it is a power which the Governor in Council has to-day and it is a wise power.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. minister if in the event of Germany allowing our products to go into that country upon the same terms as they allowed the products of the United States to go into that country, the government would feel at liberty to extend to Germany the benefit of the intermediate tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. The government would undoubtedly have the power to do so under this legislation. Whether they would do so or not would be a matter of proper inquiry at the moment.

Mr. KEMP. I dare say they have the power, but I would like to know if they would feel justified in doing that?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not going to have any views now as to matters which may arise a year or two hence.

On subsections 3 and 4,

(3) That the rates of custom duties, if any, set forth in column 3 'General Tariff' shall apply to all goods not entitled to admission under the intermediate tariff or under the British preferential tariff aforesaid.

(4) That proof of origin, as prescribed by the Minister of Customs, shall be furnished with the bill of entry at the custom house for goods admitted to entry under any of the tariffs in schedule A; and that the decision of the Minister of Customs shall be final as to the tariff or surtax applicable in any case to imported goods by reason of their origin :

Provided, that goods for which entry is claimed under the intermediate tariff shall be bona fide the produce or manufacture of a country which has been admitted to the benefits of such intermediate tariff;

Provided further that every manufactured article to be admitted under the British preferential tariff shall be bona fide the manufacture of a British country entitled to the benefits of such British preferential tariff, and that a substantial portion of the value of the manufactured article has been produced by labour in one or more of such countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that made more definite?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a re-enactment of the existing words, but as I stated to the House, it will be provided by regulation that the 25 per cent of British labour shall be defined in a better way.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the 25 per cent of labour include ? Does it include packing?

Mr. FIELDING. The point of difficulty was that it was contended that it also included the profit of the merchant. We thought that was objectionable and we struck it out, but I think it would include packing. It has hitherto been held, by a forced construction, to include profit. We struck off the profit but the packing would be included.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is fairly worth consideration as to whether this is labour put upon the article. Here you have a half manufactured material coming from Germany to Great Britain and labour is put upon it. It is completed in Great Britain and you allow packing and extra charges like that to figure as the increment of labour put upon the material itself. It does not seem that it is. The labour that goes into the finishing and completion of the article has fairly to be taken into account, but when you finish it then comes the matter of marketing it and to market it of course you have to put it into its appropriate package. Why should the packing be taken as part of the labour added to the manufacturing or completion of the article itself? I think it is well worth taking into consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. In the case of an article partially manufactured in Germany and partially manufactured in England, in order to come in under the preference, the last stage must be completed in England and the goods must be shipped from England. If the last stage took place in Germany it could not come in.

Mr. FOSTER. But it does not seem that the packing of the article has anything to do with the manufacturing of the article at all. For instance, you go to work and out of pig iron you make a manufactured article. When you have it finished and the plough is turned out, that plough is your manufactured article. Then comes the question of marketing, transport, and the like of that. Why should the making of the box you put it in be included in the labour employed in the manufacture of the plough ? That is a sort of extraneous thing which might be quite large in amount and which is certainly not part of the manufactured article.

Mr. PATERSON. We can consider that. As far as the administration of the department is concerned, it has to be made ready for export. That is what we have to be governed by.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I desire to say that on the next government day we shall continue the consideration of the resolutions, but it is not contemplated to proceed with the schedules until, say Tuesday next.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 5, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees as follows :

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Haggart,
Aylesworth,	Hall,
Barker,	Lancaster,
Belcourt,	Lapointe,

Bennett,
Bergeron,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Bristol,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Laurence,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
Monk,
Northrup,
Porter,
Pringle,
Rivet,
Sifton,
Stockton,
Tisdale,
Ward.—46.

No. 2.—OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Bergeron,
Bureau,
Clarke,
Ethier,
Gervais,
Guthrie,
Hughes (Victoria),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Logan,
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Taylor.—15.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

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

Messieurs

Adamson,
Alcorn,
Ames,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
McLaren,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York, S.),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paquet,
Parent,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Walsh (Montreal, Ste. Anne),
Ward,
Watson,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len'x & Addin.),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—197.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Avery,
Aylesworth,
Béland,
Bennett,
Black,
Hunt,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,

Bole,
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Bruneau
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Chisholm, (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Crocket,,
Cyr,
Daniel,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Elson,
Either,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York, S.),
McCool,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queen's P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Monk,
Morin,
Parent,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sloan,
Talbot,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Worthington.—82.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Black,
Blain,
Bourbonnais,
Brabazon,
Brown,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Clements,
Copp,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hughes (Victoria),
Knowles,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lavergne (Drum & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McIntyre (Perth),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Morin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Staples,
Stewart,
Thompson,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, Ste. Anne),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Adding.),
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew).—51.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 6.—JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

(Members to act on the part of the Commons.)

Messieurs

Bergeron,
Bristol,
Cyr,
Dyment,
Gervais,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria)
Johnston,
Lavergne (Drummond Arthabaska),
Logan,
Maclean (York, South)
Macpherson,
McColl,
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Smith (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Verville.—24.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Adamson,
Alcorn,
Ames,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Bordon (Sir Frederick),
Bristol,
Carney,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Cockshutt,
Costigan,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McColl,
McCraney,
McLean, (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Marshall,
Monk,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Tayior,
Walsh (Montreal, Ste. Anne),
Zimmerman.—77.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Adamson,
Ames,
Archambault,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.)

Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Cash,
Clarke,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Conmee,
Copp,
Costigan,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Forget,
Fortier
Foster,
Fowler,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, S.),
McCarthy (Calgary),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marshall,
Mayrand,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Osler,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Power,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Verville,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington)
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—129.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 9.—AGRICULTURAL AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Bergeron,
Black,
Blain,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCarthy (Calgary),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clarke,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Elson,
Ethier,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hunt,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctot,
Laurence,
Lavergne
(Drummond & Arth.),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Seagram,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
Watson,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew).—130

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

No. 10.—JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

(Members to act on the part of the Commons.)

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Bergeron,
Bourassa,
Bristol,
Brodeur,
Calvert,
Foster,
Grant,
Knowles,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Monk,
Pardee,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Stockton.—15.

QUESTIONS.

TRENT CANAL—GOVERNMENT WATER-POWERS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. What water-powers are still possessed by the government of Canada along the route of the Trent canal, or tributary waters ?
2. What water-powers have been leased or disposed of ?
3. What are the terms in each case ?
4. Is there disputed jurisdiction, or disputed ownership, between the government of Canada and Ontario, in relation to any of these ?
5. If so, what are they ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) : 1 2 and 3. The information would be too voluminous in the form of a question, but there is no objection to granting it as a return to the House.
4. No.

MR. NARCISSE CAMPBELL.

Mr. MEIGS asked :

1. Will the Minister of Railways kindly say why the Railway Commission has delayed for two years in dealing with the case of Narcisse Campbell, of Stanbridge township, in the county of Missisquoi, who has applied for a farm crossing, after receiving the judgment of the court with regard to the cost involved ?
2. Is it to be expected that all such applications will be subject to similar delay ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals): 1. Application was made to the Board of Railway Commissioners by Narcisse Campbell, of Stanbridge township, on the 5th of August, 1904, for an underground crossing, and the board's engineer on the 20th of September, 1904, reported against the granting of such crossing. It appears from the papers that the Central Vermont Railway Company have made a level crossing on the applicant's farm. This matter has been the subject of negotiations between the Hon. M. E. Bernier, deputy chief commissioner of the board, and the parties interested, and in Mr. Bernier's absence the board thinks it would be well to have the matter stand over a day or two. Mr. Bernier is expected back in the city at an early day.
2. All applications of this character coming before the board are dealt with as promptly as the circumstances will permit.

DREDGING PICTOU HARBOUR AND BAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Was any dredging done in or about Pictou harbour and on Pictou bay during last season, and where ?
2. For what purposes was dredging done, what area, and what depth of water was obtained ?
3. What dredge was doing the work, and when was the work commenced and ended ?
4. Is the work completed, or is it the intention of the government to continue said work, and to what extent ?

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

1. Yes, at Intercolonial Railway slip, Intercolonial coal piers slips, market wharf slip and old pier, and on the outer bar.
2 and 3. Dredge 'Cape Breton' removed 9,870 yards at Intercolonial Railway slip, 19th May to 6th June, on an area of 368 feet by 80 feet and 25 feet deep. Same dredge worked at Intercolonial coal piers slip, 7th to 11th June, increasing depth of water to 20 feet on a width of 80 feet, removing 2,520 yards. Same dredge worked at Market wharf slip and old pier, 12th to 19th June, on an area 200 feet long, 80 feet wide and 20 feet in depth, removing 6,720 yards. Dredge 'St. Lawrence,' 28th July to 7th August, removed 5,950 yards, completing work begun by dredge 'Cape Breton' at Intercolonial Railway slip. Dredge 'Fielding', 6th September to 1st December, worked and dredged on outer bar of harbour about 200 feet wide, 1,500 feet long, giving 25 feet depth and removing 60,100 yards.
4. Work is not complete on the outer bar and consideration of its completion will be had when the dredging programme is arranged for next season.

CUSTOMS VALUATION, HARVESTERS—McCORMICK & DEERING.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the customs valuation of McCormick & Deering self-binding harvesters, 6 feet cut, respectively, upon which customs duties were calculated in the years 1895, 1900, 1905 and 1906 ?
2. What was the average duty collected on each such machine during each of the foregoing years ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Before answering this question, I wish to make a brief explanation. Under the Customs Act, we are not allowed to divulge the entries made by any particular firm for very obvious reasons. This question has reference to the values of an article entered by an individual firm. The valuation however which is inquired for is one that is fixed under a clause in the Customs Act, by virtue of which in the case of articles imported here and manufactured or sold under peculiar circumstances, the Governor in Council may fix the rate at which they may be entered for duty. We had hesitated in the department whether we should ask the hon. gentleman not to press this question, but I think a line might be drawn, and that we would not violate the Act in any case where the Governor in Council has fixed an amount, as that does not definitely reveal the invoice value, and could therefore answer the ques-

tion as the hon. gentleman puts it. The duties do in a measure give an indication to competitors as regards prices but do not reveal the invoice value. I make this explanation in case some members might ask for the particulars of an individual entry, which we would not be at liberty to give. The reply is as follows :

1. The Customs valuation of McCormick & Deering self-binding harvesters, 6 feet cut, was fixed in the years 1895, 1900, 1905, and 1906 as follows :

		Imported at one time.
1895—In quantities of	1 to 25.	$100 00
" "	26 to 50.	97 50
" "	51 to 75.	95 00
" "	76 to 125.	92 50
" "	126 & over.	90 00
1900—For all quantities..		102 00
1905— " "		97 00
1906— " "		97 00

2. The rate of duty collected on these harvesters during the years mentioned was 20 per cent on the above valuation, averaging in 1900, $20.40 ; 1905, $19.40 ; 1906, $19.40 each.

Taking the average value at $95, the duty collcted in 1895 would be $19 each. The quantities entered at the several valuations fixed in 1905 are not separately compiled, however, in the statistical returns of the Customs Department.

EXPENDITURE ON CANALS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the total expenditure, including all sums chargeable to income and capital, on the several canals named in pages 39 to 42, of the estimates, 1907-8, for the years ending 30th June, 1906 ?

2. What was the total revenue received from such canals for said year ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The total expenditure, including all sums chargeable to income and capital, on the several canals named in pages 39 to 42, of the estimates of 1907-1908, for the years ending June 30, 1906, are :

Capital	$1,552,121 21
Income..	324,222 51
Total..	$1,876,343 72

2. The total revenue received from such canals for said year was, $108,067.76.

VOLUME OF NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What steps have been taken by the government for the purpose of accurately determining the quantity of water passing over Niagara Falls on the Canadian side, and the American side, respectively, of the international boundary line ?

2. What steps have been taken by the government or by the Canadian members of the International Waterways Commission, for the purpose of furnishing evidence as to the proportion of water on the Canadian side, and American side, respectively, to the said commission ?

3. Is the government aware that an accurate determination of this question is of the highest possible importance, as affecting the deliberations and conclusions of the said commission?

4. Has the government any information of what proportion of the water of the Niagara river at Niagara Falls belongs to Canada, and what proportion to the United States, if the present franchises are not increased ? If so, what are the respective proportions ?

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

1. 2 and 4. The quantities of water which pass over Niagara Falls, on the Canadian and American sides of the international boundary line, respectively, cannot be accurately determined by measurements. These quantities have been variously estimated by competent hydraulic engineers who have looked into the question.

No special evidence in that respect was considered necessary by the International Waterways Commission who adopted the figures of the United States Army report of 1900 as being accurate enough for the purpose of determining the use of the surplus water available for power purposes, after providing for the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Falls.

3. The government is aware that it would be of the highest importance to accurately determine the respective quantities of water on both sides of the boundary line, if it were possible.

IMPORTATIONS OF SUGAR.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. From what countries does Canada import raw sugar, and the quantities from each country ?

2. What degree, by the polariscope, is the best granulated sugar imported into Canada, and what would be the duty per hundred pounds on this article ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. During the past fiscal year Canada imported the following quantities of raw sugar, not above No. 16 Dutch Standard in colour (including melado, sugar concrete, &c.,) from the undermentioned countries, viz. :

	Pounds.
Great Britain	297,480
British Africa..	10,807,896
British Guiana..	96,655,257
B. E. Indies..	305,535
B. W. Indies..	220,126,593
Fiji Islands..	13,095,152
Hong Kong..	12,116
Argentina..	153,958
Belgium..	17,675,648

	Pounds.
Cent. American States..	1,395,700
China..	3,223
Dutch East Indies.. ..	24,847,946
Mexico..	1,541,375
Peru..	3,451,092
United States..	477,249
Total..	390,846,220

2. Imported granulated sugar has tested as high as 99·4° by polariscope. The duty on this grade of sugar per hundred pounds under the present tariff resolutions would be $1.24½ general tariff. ·83 cents British preferential tariff.

IMPORTATIONS FROM UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

What is the value of goods imported into Canada from the United Kingdom, (a) direct to Canadian ports; (b) through United States ports, during the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, giving the amount for each of the above years by both modes of importation ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

IMPORTS INTO CANADA.

Fiscal Years.	Imports from United Kingdom through United States Ports.	Imports from United Kingdom direct to Canadian Ports.	Total Imports from United Kingdom direct and indirect.
	$	$	$
1904.....	12,685,878	49,275,031	61,960,909
1905.....	12,399,326	48,139,485	60,538,811
1906.....	13,283,428	56,033,722	69,317,150

EMPLOYMENT OF J. A. M. PATRICK.

Mr. BARR asked :

Is J. A. M. Patrick, of Yorkton, province of Saskatchewan, an agent or sub-agent of the government, or does he hold any position under the government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. J. A. M. Patrick, of Yorkton, province of Saskatchewan, is not an agent or sub-agent of the Department of the Interior, nor does he hold any position in connection with the Department of the Interior.

REBATES ON AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What amount by way of rebates on agricultural implements, exported from Canada, have been paid for the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1905 and 1906, to each firm so exporting ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The following is a statement of rebates on agricultural implements exported from Canada during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1905 and 1906, showing the amount paid to each firm exporting:

Name of Firm.	Rebate for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1905.	Rebate for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1906.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Cockshutt Plough Co.....	5,688 51	.....
Frost & Wood Co.....	790 27	.....
J. Fleury & Sons.....	52 60	.....
International Harvester Co	527 76	790 57
Massey-Harris Co., Ltd...	89,559 43	83,153 59
David Maxwell & Sons....	1,315 68	.....
Noxon Co., Ltd.....	2,499 27	2,532 47
Verity Plough Co.....	6,796 77	5,691 24
Total.....	107,230 29	92,167 87

GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO MONTREAL.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. How many bushels of grain have been received at Montreal from points on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, in unbroken bulk up to date, in the season of navigation of 1906 ?

2. How many bushels have been received at Montreal, which were transhipped at Kingston, also at Prescott ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). That answer will be given to the hon. gentleman in a few days. It takes some time to prepare.

IMPORTATIONS OF TIMBER AND LUMBER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What quantities of the following different kinds of timber or lumber have been imported into Canada during the past fiscal year free of duty : Georgia or southern pine, pitch pine, maple, oak, birch, cypress, sycamore, pine, fir cedar ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The following importations of lumber and timber, as undermentioned, were admitted free of duty during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1906, viz. :

Pitch pine planks and boards, 22,576,299 ft. B. M.

Oak planks and boards, 32,852,223 ft. B. M.

Sycamore planks and boards, 24,951 ft. B. M.

Boards, planks, deals and clapboards of various woods, not classified, 52,724 ft. B. M.

Timber hewn, squared or sided or creosoted, of various woods, not classified. Value, $189,418.

EMPLOYMENT OF TUG IN RUSTICO HARBOUR.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Did the government employ a tug in either of the years 1904, 1905, 1906, in Rustico harbour, Prince Edward Island ?
2. If so, who was the owner and contractor ?
3. What was the nature of the service performed, and the amounts paid for such services, and to whom paid ?

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

1. Yes, in fall of 1904.
2. Tugs were rented from Mr. Wm. Moffatt.
3. Tugs were employed in giving assistance for entering and leaving the harbour and improving depth of water over bars. Total amount paid in 1904, $1,608.60. Paid to Wm. Moffatt.

IMMIGRATION IN 1905.

Mr. CHRISTIE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What number of immigrants arrived in Canada during the season of navigation just closed ?
2. How many of these located in Quebec and the eastern provinces ?
3. How many in Ontario ?
4. How many in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, respectively ?
5. What special effort is the Department of the Interior putting forth towards locating immigrants in Ontario ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. From April 25th to November 30th, there arrived via ocean ports, 104,086 immigrants; and from the United States, 33,420 immigrants; making a total immigration of 137,506.
2. The number destined to Quebec, 22,-242. The number destined to the eastern provinces, 4,051. Total, 26,293.
3. The number destined to Ontario, 37,-188.
4. The number destined to Manitoba, 26,-394. The number destined to Saskatchewan, 17,581. The number destined to Alberta, 17,157. The number destined to British Columbia, 12,541. Total, 73,673.

There were 60 who went to the Yukon, and 292 whose destination was not stated.

5. The Department of the Interior is making known through its agents and by advertising, the demand that exists for farm labourers and domestic servants in Ontario.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. WHITE asked :

1. Is the honourable the Postmaster General of Canada correctly reported in the 'Globe' of the 19th November, as stating at Montreal as follows: 'The Georgian Bay Ship Canal, from Georgian bay to Montreal, is a thing of the near future ?'
2. If correctly reported, is such statement to be regarded as an official utterance, made on behalf of the government ?
3. What is the total amount expended to date on the survey ?
4. When is it expected that a report of the survey will be presented to parliament ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.
2. In making such a statement the Postmaster General was simply voicing his personal views, but the project is one which commends itself to his judgment.
3. Expenditure to date, $558,507.73.
4. Report, plans, &c., expected to be ready by end of January next.

PAPER USED FOR POSTAL CARDS.

Mr. A. MARTIN—by Mr. Lefurgey—asked :

1. Has the attention of the Postmaster General been directed to the quality of the paper used in the manufacture of postal cards and stamps in Canada ?
2. Have complaints been made to the department, or its officials, alleging that the quality is inferior ?
3. If so, does his department propose to remedy any grievance that may exist in this particular, and furnish a stamp and card not open to the objection suggested ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. One or two such complaints (December, 1905, and February, 1906), were made as to the brittleness of the stamp paper, but none with reference to that used for post cards.
2. Covered by reply to No. 1.
3. If such a contingency arose, instant attention would be given it with a view to remedy, as happened in regard to the cases referred to, prompt and careful inquiry was instituted and the complainants were asked to furnish some reasonable evidence of the defect alleged, so that further examination might be made, but they failed to do so.

RIFLE USED BY MOUNTED POLICE.

On the Question :

1. Has the Ross rifle been given to the mounted police for use ?
2. Is it true that the mounted police had to abandon the Ross rifle, and resume the use of the Lee-Enfield ?—Mr. Bergeron.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to explain that this question as printed is not the question as I wrote it. As I first put the question, I wrote 'Lee-Metford Rifle,' instead of 'Lee-Enfield.' The question having appeared with this error, I wrote it again mentioning the 'Lee-Metford,' and once more the printed question appears with this error. I do not see any use in putting the

question again, and I would like to know from the Minister of Militia why these words have been changed from the way I wrote them, changed twice.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). You had better write more legibly.

Mr. BERGERON. But the error occurred not once, but twice.

MAIL CARRIAGE FROM CAPE TORMENTINE TO SUMMERSIDE.

Mr. A. MARTIN—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked :

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails to and from the winter boats at Cape Tormentine during the winter season 1905-6 to Summerside ?
2. What was the service to be performed ?
3. Was the contract let by tender ? If so, who were the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?
4. Has the contract terminated ? If so, is it the intention of the department to call for new tenders ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Harper Allen was employed last winter for the transfer of the mails at Cape Tormentine. His duties were to transfer the mails between the station and the steamer, and to take charge of the same during the time they had to lie over at Cape Tormentine. On account of the temporary nature of this service, the duration of the same depending entirely on the season, it was not considered advantageous that tenders should be invited for any permanent arrangement. Mr. Allen was paid at the rate of seventy-five cents per day, and was employed for twenty-two days during the winter of 1905-6.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL—WIDENING OF CHANNEL AT CAP ST. CHARLES.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Have the pilots between Montreal and Quebec asked the government to widen the channel of the St. Lawrence river at Cap Charles from 300 to 500, or 600 feet at least, on account of the dangers of navigation at that point ?
2. Has anything been done during the present season at Cap Charles to widen or deepen the channel at Cap Charles, or remove the boulders at said place in the channel ?
3. Why was there no dredge working in the channel at Cap Charles during the present season ?
4. Is it a fact that the SS. 'Victorian' grounded at Cap Charles ?
5. Was the grounding of the SS. 'Victorian' due to the narrowness of the channed at said point ?
6. What was the nature of the injuries received by the SS. 'Victorian' at the time of said accident ?
7. Was the SS. Victorian' repaired in Canada ? If so, how long was she detained by such repairs ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes, together with various other recommendations, all of which have been carefully considered.
2. No. There are no boulders in the ship channel at that place.
3. The dredging is being done according to a programme, arranged after consulting the Shipping Federation of Canada. This programme has in view, first, the completion of the 30 foot channel where there is no tide available, from Montreal to Batiscan, and then the work below Batiscan, including Cap Charles, where by passing at high tide, there is already a depth of more than thirty feet, the intention of the department being to do the work most immediately required first.
4. Yes, outside of the dredged channel.
5. No. The 'Victorian' went aground in a fog when the buoys showing the limits of the channel could not be seen.
6. The 'Victorian' went aground outside of the dredged channel, at high tide, where the bottom and currents are as bad as at any place on the river, and the damages to the bottom were considerable; two of the holds filling with water.
7. Only temporary repairs were made in Canada and the ship sailed to Great Britain for permanent repairs.

Mr. MONK. The question is asked how long the ship was detained by the repairs.

Mr. BRODEUR. Only temporary repairs were made in Canada. That information is not under our control.

PURCHASE OF DREDGE 'GALVESTON.'

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Where was the dredge 'Galveston' purchased, at what date, from whom, and at what price ?
2. What was the cost of transferring the dredge to the St. Lawrence ?
3. Has the dredge given perfect satisfaction during the present season ?
4. Has the government received any written reports on the working of the said dredge ?
5. By whom was the dredge 'Galveston' valued on behalf of the government before it was purchased ?
6. By whom was the purchase actually made, and in how many instalments was the purchase price paid, and to whose order were the cheques issued made payable ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The dredge 'Galveston,' lying at New Orleans, was purchased from Ottawa, on the 9th April, 1906; the price being £30,000 or $146,000 with interest to date of payment.
2. The cost of fitting out, stores, repairs, wages, &c., from the date of purchase to July 1st, when the vessel arrived at Quebec, was $10,942.14 and insurance amounting to $4,574.17.

3. Yes. The members of the Shipping Federation of Canada with the presidents of the boards of trade of Montreal and Quebec, inspected the work of the dredge and expressed their very great satisfaction with the vessel and her work.

4. A report on the dredge and her work will be published in the annual report of the St. Lawrence Ship Channel.

5. Mr. F. W. Cowie, superintending engineer of the St. Lawrence Ship Channel.

6. The purchase was made by the minister on authority of order in council, and the purchase price paid after verification of title to Messrs. H. E. Moss & Co., of Liverpool, England, in one instalment, the cheque being made payable to the order of His Lordship, the High Commissioner, who has forwarded Messrs. Moss & Co's receipt. Interest was also paid, as agreed, from the date of purchase to the date of payment, in the same manner.

Mr. MONK. I would like my hon. friend to notice that he has not answered the first part of the question regarding the person from whom the dredge was purchased nor as to the cost of transfer.

Mr. BRODEUR. The dredge was purchased from H. E. Moss & Co.

Mr. MONK. The question as to the cause of transferring is not answered.

Mr. BRODEUR. Transferring the ship to——

Mr. MONK. From New Orleans to Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is included in the sum of $10,942.14 and the sum of $4,574.17.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL—IMPROVEMENTS AT CAP A LA ROCHE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What work has been done during the present season in the ship channel of the St. Lawrence at the place known as Cap à la Roche ?

2. Has any dredging been done at said place during the present season ?

3. Have any of the boulders in the channel at said place been removed during the present season ?

4. Has the channel been widened at said place during the present season ?

5. If so, what width has been added, and over what length of the channel ?

6. What dredge, if any, has been at work at Cap à la Roche during the present season ?

7. What is the depth of the ship channel at low water at said Cap à la Roche ?

8. How wide is the channel for ships at said place ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. 159,000 cubic yards of shale have been dredged.

2. Yes.

3. There are no boulders in the channel.

4. Yes.

5. The widening was commenced, increasing to 100 feet over a length of channel of 1,020 feet.

6. Dredge 'Lafontaine' or 'No. 5.'

7. 27½ feet at ordinary low tide or 25½ feet at the lowest tide ever observed.

8. The minimum width is 300 feet.

J. A. M. PATRICK, YORKTON.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I call attention to the answer that was given to No. 16 by the Minister of the Interior. He said he did not know whether Mr. Patrick was in the employ of the Department of the Interior or not, but he did not say whether he was in the employ of any other department.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is not known that he is in the employ of any department, and until specific inquiries are made it cannot be known whether he is in the employ of the government.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). From the use of the words 'agent or sub-agent,' I supposed that the hon. gentleman imagined that Mr. Patrick was connected with the lands branch of the Interior Department, because those are titles of officials in that department.

NEW APPOINTMENT OF MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington) moved for:

1. Copy of the evidence taken at the investigation promised by the Minister of the Interior at the last session of parliament into the conduct of W. T. R. Preston, commissioner of immigration in England; together with copies of all letters, documents and papers in any way relating thereto.

2. Copy of the report of the party or parties who held the investigation which was promised by the Hon. Mr. Oliver, Minister of the Interior, when the matter of the dismissal of Mr. W. T. R. Preston was under discussion at the last session of parliament ?

3. Of all correspondence between W. T. R. Preston and any member of the government, or any department thereof, with reference to his present appointment.

4. And showing what government position W. T. R. Preston now holds, what his duties are, what salary he gets, what living and travelling expenses he is allowed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that during last session we had a very lengthy debate and a very long investigation before two committees of this House in reference to Mr. Preston's connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company and in reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company itself. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) moved a resolution on the 3rd of July asking for the removal of Mr. Preston from his position as commissioner of immigration in Eng-

land. I am not sure but that motion would have been carried had it not been for the promise made by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) because I know one of the strongest supporters of the government, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that he felt inclined to vote for the amendment although he had not been a member of either of the committees or had an opportunity of hearing the evidence that was there given, but from what he could hear, from what he had read in the papers and from what he had heard in the debate he felt strongly inclined to vote for the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. The hon. Minister of the Interior, in answer to that, made a promise. I perhaps might read a few words from the speech of the hon. member for South Wellington. He said:

I would now ask the Minister of the Interior whether, by his statement in this House to-night, he intended to convey an assurance, not merely an off-hand statement but an assurance, that he would investigate this matter and deal with it in the near future.

The hon. minister, in answer to that, said:

I think I have already made that statement to the House when the estimates of the Interior Department were under discussion, and I meant to convey the same idea to-night.

It is not necessary that I should go into a lengthy discussion of this matter, although there is plenty of material, but in view of Mr. Preston being advanced not only in position but in salary, I think we ought to have laid on the table of this House the report of the minister, or of those who investigated this matter, and we ought to have the evidence as well in order to know why Mr. Preston was advanced from being commissioner of immigration to be our commercial agent in the east. It does seem to me, from all I heard during the investigation, that he did not deserve very much at the hands of the government or at the hands of the people of this country. His usefulness as commissioner of immigration had gone. He had apparently quarrelled with his whole staff. We had before the committee last session Mr. Jury who occupies a position under this government at $2,000 a year in the city of Liverpool. Mr. Jury stated that he had known Mr. Preston for twenty years as a stumper in this country, that he was a stumper under Mr. Preston, that Mr. Preston was the organizer and from what he knew of him then and from what he learned since he went to England he was prepared to say that he would not believe him under oath. That does seem to be very strange. If Mr. Preston cannot be believed under oath he was not fit to be an officer of this government at all, and if Mr. Jury was guilty of such a slander then Mr. Jury ought to be summarily dismissed. Perhaps this was what is called a departmental investigation and was not made by a regular commission. I am quite aware that the Minister of the Interior went to England last year, and I think the Prime Minister has already told us he went there for the purpose of investigating immigration matters. The Minister of the Interior no doubt knows the particulars and he ought to lay the evidence together with his report on the table of the House. There is a story in circulation that Mr. Preston—who, the Prime Minister told us is a bold man—did make the statement that he would not work under the present Minister of the Interior for $10,000 a year. I am told that when the Minister of the Interior heard that he used some pretty strong language.

Mr. BENNETT. The air was blue.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Yes; I do not purpose to take up the time of the House more; I hope the information I have asked for will be laid on the table.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is no objection to the adoption of the motion. I would just like to say, in order that there may be no misunderstanding when the papers come down, that the investigation was held as promised. It was a personal investigation and a verbal report was made, as to which there are no papers to bring down.

APPLICATION FOR LANDS IN SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin) moved for:

A copy of all documents relating to the application of R. C. McCracken for the northeast quarter, section 36, township 35, range 16, west of the second meridian, province of Saskatchewan; also Mr. McCann, for the northwest quarter of the same section.

He said: I asked for this return in order that I may obtain information in reference to this matter. These two gentlemen, Mr. McCracken and Mr. McCann were residents of my riding before they went to the Northwest, and so far as I can learn from them the facts of the case are as follows: During last spring they went to the province of Saskatchewan and there they met one Patrick, who represented to them that he was an official of the government, and that he was authorized to locate land in that part of the country, and he showed them some lots which he stated belonged to the land department. My informants also tell me that Patrick stated that he had telegraphed to the department and had been informed that the lands were still under the control of the department. They then paid him the money and supposing they had secured their homesteads they procured supplies from the east at considerable expense and commenced to work the land. So far as I can gather—

I am speaking now from letters which they wrote back to their father—the land office sent back their money to them and informed them they could not get the land. In view of the trouble and expense and delay they were put to, this was a great inconvenience and loss to these young men. I wrote to Ottawa concerning the matter but my letter was not answered for a considerable time. Of course the Minister of the Interior was not in Ottawa then, but at all events, I wrote to his deputy and I got no reply until I had written a second letter. Then I was informed that the east half of section 36 had been disposed of; that the other half-section was still in the department but that another man had a prior right to it. It does seem to me extraordinary that these young men should be put to all this trouble, especially in view of the fact that the department admitted some months afterwards that one half-section of this land was still at their disposal. I believe it is very often the case that bogus claims are put against land in the west; that a certain amount of juggling goes on in many of these land offices, and I suspect that this is a case in point. If Patrick had no authority to take the money from these young men and was not an officer of the land office he should be sent to jail. I do not know any of the particulars of the matter, except that we have the young men's statement that they paid the money to the land office, and that it was returned to them. Therefore it must have gone from Patrick to the land office, and if this land was not at the disposal of the government they should have been notified immediately and if Patrick had no right to take the money he should be punished. I submit that these two young men have a real grievance, and I hope the minister will look into it, and, if injustice has been done to them, will see that they are compensated. I notice that this letter to me states:

It is suggested that the young men on whose behalf you write should communicate with the local agent at Yorkton, who will assist them so far as he can in finding a suitable homestead, provided they have not already acquired land.

They were very much in love with the land in question, and I am not aware whether they have taken up other land, but for the trouble and inconvenience they have been put to I think they sholuld be compensated.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Marine Department and the provincial government of British Columbia, or any member thereof, concerning the building of a road or trail along the coast line of Vancouver Island, for the purpose of lending assistance to distressed mariners.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

For a copy of all papers, circulars, instructions, or other correspondence, sent out by the Department of the Interior, or any officer thereof, relative to immigration; and all correspondence or papers, &c., relative thereto from agents abroad during the year 1906, with special reference to question No. 2, on the order paper of December 3rd, 1906.—Mr. Lefurgey.

For a copy of all correspondence and papers in connection with the investigation into the provisioning of the government steamer 'Kestril,' during the year 1905, and a copy of the report of the investigators.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams or documents of any description, relating to, (a) the appointment of Mr. F. W. Aylmer to the position of resident engineer of the Dominion Public Works at Winnipeg; and (b) his resignation of said position, together with all letters, telegrams, &c., interchanged between Mr. Aylmer and any official of the Public Works Department, in this connection.—Mr. Ames.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity, before the Orders of the Day, of calling public attention and the attention of the House to certain statements materially affecting the administration of Justice and the respect which the people in this country should and I think do pay to that administration of Justice; on that account it seems to me that these statements should not be allowed to go wholly uncontradicted. Some few days ago there appeared in the various newspapers of the country a telegraphic despatch to the effect that a man who was at one time a member of this House had publicly stated in the province of British Columbia that the vacant judgeship which existed in the Supreme Court of that province was for sale—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, is debate to be allowed on this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER. I was about to call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Aylesworth) to the fact that when a matter of urgent public importance is to be brought to the attention of the House the new rules require the following procedure:

The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter. He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who if he thinks it in order reads it out, and asks whether the member has the leave of the House. If objection is taken, the Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places and if more than twenty members rise accordingly, the Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

This is the rule which was adopted last session and now governs the practice of the House.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of discussing the subject. I was merely stating to the House, in order that every person who heard me might know to what I was referring, the circumstances of the publication I was alluding to. I intend making no comments on the matter beyond stating—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, others might wish to make comments if the matter is introduced.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to conclude, I have simply to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it will be necessary to follow the practice of the House as laid down in the rule

THE RESIGNATION OF THE HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called I would like to inquire whether the government have any further announcement to make with regard to the resignation of the Minister of Public Works which was placed in the hands of the Prime Minister at the commencement of the session, as he informed us, and also to inquire whether anything further has been communicated to you, Sir, by Mr. Hyman with respect to the resignation of his seat as a member for the city of London. I think the matter is of a little more than usual moment, for the reason——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For the reason and that is why I ask the question, that the Prime Minister told us that he would make a further announcement later on.

Mr. SPEAKER I may say to the House that I have received no further communication from the hon. member for London beyond the one I mentioned to the House on a prevous occasion. Meantime, not having heard anything further from him, I have written to him calling his attention to the nature of the tendered resignation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may add that I have had no further communication from Mr. Hyman. I have written to him, but have not yet received a reply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has any action been taken upon his resignation as a minister?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No action more than I have stated already. I have asked Mr. Hyman to reconsider his determination and have sent a letter to him, but have received no answer yet.

THE FRENCH HANSARD.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would call the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, or whomsoever is concerned—as the committees are not yet struck, and I cannot apply to the Committee of the Debates—to the fact that the French Hansard is about ten days late. There is good deal of feeling in the country, especially among the papers, on the subject, as it is useless now to publish——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is transgressing the rule I have laid down.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. D. REID. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs if he intends bringing down a return to the order which I obtained last session for a statement of the rebates granted by the government during a certain period.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Yes. I think the hon. member probably refers to that motion for a return, which I asked to be modified and which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) qualified somewhat.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might ask whether it would be possible to have laid on the table a statement of the returns ordered last session. It would be a great convenience.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will you, Mr. Speaker, take a note of that?

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to ask the minister who has charge of the Public Works Department, whoever he may be, if he will be prepared to-morrow to give us a little information as to the ventilation of this chamber. It seems to be worse than ever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has charge of the Department of Public Works just now.

INDUSTRIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) respecting industrial and co-operative societies. He said: I explained last year, when I introduced this measure, the nature and the object of the legislation sought for, and I gave the House some statistics regarding the process of the work of co-operation in the different countries of Europe. These statis-

tics are somewhat lengthy. I had compiled them with care, and I do not think it is necessary that I should go over them again. Any hon. member who wishes to see the extraordinary results obtained by co-operation in the countries where that system has been regularly and legally established, can refer to the 'Hansard' of last session. If he does, he will be surprised at the great results which have been reached in a very short space of time. With the nature and object of co-operation in general, I presume members of this House are already familiar. Speaking generally, its object is to allow people of limited means, labouring men and agriculturists principally, to combine their individual efforts for the obtaining of results which, as a general rule, are only within the reach of capitalists or men who have at their command considerable funds. Perhaps I might give the House the definition of co-operation as I find it in the dictionary of political economy of Mr. Leon Say, an eminent French economist—the edition of 1891 :

> Co-operation, considered from a democratic standpoint and particularly with regard to labouring classes, is considered as a new form of association, having for its object to create and utilize small savings, to suppress intermediaries and to appropriate, collectively in the first instance and then individually, the benefits obtained in common. It is a rational system, theoretically, it does not constitute an innovation ; it only tends to agglomerate small resources and employ them by various means, in the same manner as larger industrial, commercial and financial corporations.

There is this difference to be noticed in connection with this definition of the French economist. In large corporations capital predominates by its vote, whereas in co-operative associations each one interested has but one vote. Even when he has placed in the association but a small capital, he has the same influence upon its direction as one who has put in it larger funds.

Different kinds of co-operative societies have manifested themselves in the different countries of Europe where that system prevails. There is co-operation for the purchase of supplies in large quantities for cash at low prices and retailing them to the members of the association at a small profit. There is the system of co-operation whose principal object is the lending of small sums to people who happen to be in need and who are able to furnish security that they will reimburse the amount advanced. There is co-operation for industrial production which enables labouring men, experienced in some particular art or industry to combine their efforts in order to produce in common a large and merchantable quantity of the things in whose production they are skilled. There are co-operative societies for the purchase of land and buildings.

All these forms of co-operation have been put in action in Europe with very satisfactory results in every instance. I cited last year the remarkable example of the association of the Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale, a band of some eighteen or twenty labouring men in England, who in 1844 founded a co-operative society by contributing to its capital some few shillings each. There were but twenty-eight labourers in the original society. In 1878 the volume of business transacted by it amounted to £298,888 sterling and the profits reached the sum of £40,679 sterling. That society was a distributive one for the purchase of the necessaries of life. It exists to-day in England and has had a very large development indeed. It not only purchases but manufactures and imports and own vessels, and the ramifications of that society has attained very large proportions indeed. Among labourers, the principal object of this co-operation is the purchase of the necessaries of life, the purchase of the tools they use. By combining a small amount of capital and by the credit of the society, they are enabled to get these things at a low cost and on favourable terms, and the results are excellent in every instance. With regard to agriculture, agricultural societies of a co-operative nature flourish, not only on the continent of Europe, but have been established within the past few years in England and have given excellent results. These combinations have in view a large multiplicity of objects. For instance, the obtaining of favourable terms for the transportation of agricultural produce, for the obtaining of concessions with regard to freight, for the making of favourable arrangements with shipping agents and steamship and railway companies, for the purchase of agricultural tools and implements, for the purchase of fertilizers and in fact these combinations of co-operative efforts embrace everything connected with agriculture. I may mention to the House that in England, up to within a very few years, co-operation has principally had for its object the purchase of the necessaries of life. Amongst the different nations of Europe it has taken varying forms. In England it took that form as it originally had it under the equitable pioneers of Rochdale.

The members of this House who will take the trouble to consult the very able works of Mr. Pratt upon the 'Transformation of Agriculture' in England and the still more recent work, issued, I think within a few weeks, or months, upon the 'Transition of Agriculture in England,' will see that the agricultural class in England is becoming conscious that they are being over-run by co-operative corporations upon the continent that had undertaken to furnish in England and did indeed furnish, at lower prices than it could be obtained for in England, agricultural produce. The English

agriculturists have followed that example and have organized co-operative societies in every part of England, and particularly in the vicinity of great cities, for the furnishing of dairy products, milk, butter and eggs, and also for the furnishing to the large cities of agricultural produce generally, and have in that way been able to compete successfully with the foreign invaders of their market.

I would like to call the attention of the House especially to this point. Mr. Pratt remarks that they have not yet in England established, at least on a general basis, co-operative societies of a banking nature to furnish agriculturists and labouring men, in case of necessity, with small loans for the purpose of carrying out agricultural and other enterprises, and he deplores the absence of these small banking associations of a co-operative nature in England, organizations such as exist in Germany on a very large scale and particularly in Italy. I mention this because one of the objections I have had in view in introducing this measure is to give to co-operative effort in Canada the direction of loan or banking operations in Canada on a small scale. It is considered by those who have written lately on the subject that co-operation, to be useful to the fullest degree, must combine all its varying forms, not only societies for the purchase of necessities, for production, but also societies having for their object the loaning and advancing of small amounts beyond the scope of the larger banks. I may mention also here that under the Bill which I have presented to the House loans can only be made in the case of co-operative societies to duly qualified members of the societies themselves. I mention this because, in conversation with a banker in Montreal, he said to me that this particular feature, the fact that the loans could be made only to members in good standing of the society itself, largely removed any objection which the banking association might have to this Bill.

Among the immediate effects of legislation encouraging especially co-operative societies, I would like to point out to the House what has been found in practice. The experience of European countries that have adopted and encouraged that form of association is that it tends to stop combines by associations getting together for the purchase of articles on the lowest possible terms. It has been found invariably that the tendency is to prevent combines. In the next place it prevents usury in countries where they have the small banking institutions, the 'caisses rurales' as they are called, in France, Germany, Italy, and Austria, because people who require small sums of money and who could not possibly reach the larger banks, can, if they are really capable of refunding the amount, easily obtain accommodation on reasonable terms from these small banking institutions.

Another feature of this legislation, judging from the results in the countries to which I have referred, will be to improve the mentality, the mental condition of the people in regard to business habits and thrift. In Hungary, in Italy, in Switzerland, in other countries in Europe, where it was desirable to educate the people to habits of saving and thrift it has been found that the establishment of these institutions has been of great use indeed.

I gave statistics last year in regard to countries where this legislation has been already in operation. These statistics have relation to England and to Germany, where, perhaps more than anywhere else, excepting in Italy, the results have been most satisfactory. In Italy, it is not an exaggeration to say that the establishment of the rural banks and the co-operative system has completely revolutionized the country and improved in a marked degree the condition of the agricultural classes and of the labouring classes in large cities.

In France, the form of co-operation which has been principally resorted to, has been among the agricultural class and amongst agricultural societies, for the purchase of agricultural implements and fertilizers, and for the forwarding of agricultural produce, largely to England. It is in that way that the garden produce of France has, to a very large extent, at least during a certain time, superseded the produce of the market gardeners of England itself.

The co-operative movement was a little late in establishing itself in Belgium, but its development there has been very considerable indeed and attended with the same results as in the other countries of Europe.

In this country, Mr. Speaker, it will be a mistake to think that no efforts tending to co-operation have been made. There are, as I have found out since last session, a certain number of co-operative societies doing good work in different parts of the country and there is even legislation in four of the provinces upon the subject of co-operation. I shall give the statutes of these four provinces. In Ontario co-operation has been legalized under R.S.O., 1897, at chap. 202; in Manitoba, in the revised statutes of that province of 1902, chap. 36; in British Columbia, the revised statutes of British Columbia, 1897, chap 17. In our own province of Quebec a statute was enacted in 1906, chap. 3, of the statutes of 1906. It will be evident to any member who looks at that legislation that although legalized in the four provinces, I have just mentioned the legislation differs; in each province it is different as regards the organization and control and winding up of these organizations. I am not familiar with the legislation of the three other provinces, but in the province of Quebec the section of the statutes which has reference to the objects of these co-operative societes does not specifically mention banking as one of the fea-

tures of the association. I will read the section of our own provincial statute of Quebec, of 1906, in so far as it concerns the object of the society. It is section 5 of chapter 33, VI Edward VII :

> The society has for its object the study, the protection and the defence of the economic interests of the labouring classes. In order to attain this end the society may purchase, in order to resell to its associates only, the necessities of life, or what is necessary for the work of a specific industry, may open credits and make loans, establish for the associates labour in common, or permit them to carry on the operations of production, and to sell the products of such operations, either collectively or individually.

I think it is plain, at least so I understand it, that it would not come within the purview of provincial legislation specially to authorize co-operative societies to do the business of banking, because that is an object which comes within the purview of our own legislature, and banking is one of the most important features of co-operation. I doubt if any province, even under a roundabout system of legislation, could authorize co-operative societies to do banking, yet it is banking which they must do, though banking on a small scale, with small loans, small deposits, everything indeed on a diminutive scale; and still it is banking, and I submit must be authorized by our own legislature. Our own legislature has jurisdiction in respect to co-operative societies as regards that feature of banking. The object of co-operative societies being to encourage combined effort among agriculturists, agriculture comes also under the purview of our legislature just as it does jointly under the purview of the provincial legislature. In regard to the labouring classes, we have considered that the Dominion parliament can legislate in regard to labour under the general clause which edicts that it can legislate in regard to the peace, order, good government and general welfare of the country. It is evident to members of the House that it would be very desirable to have uniform legislation upon this subject, outside of the specific reasons I have just given the House. It is necessary, if you want to encourage a general national movement throughout the country in regard to co-operation, that legislation should emanate, not from the provincial legislature, but from the Dominion legislature itself, that any movement by the government to encourage co-operation or to furnish statistics to advance the cause, must be made under Dominion legislation. It is in this respect somewhat like the subject of temperance and Sunday observance, which come under the purview of this parliament when it is a question of enacting a law for the general good of Canada, and to be applied throughout the country.

Mr. MONK.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the legislation which we find in Europe regarding co-operation differs of course in various countries. It has been found necessary to enact certain legislation in some countries which it was impossible to enact in others. Keeping that fact in view, it has seemed to me that the best form of legislation we could adopt in this country is very much the same as they have in England. In a few words I may tell the House the general tendency of the law which I have submitted for your consideration. In the first place, it must be necessary, I think, to provide a means of organizing these societies, which would be simple and inexpensive. I have done that by providing that the members, twelve in number at least, who intend to associate under a co-operative system, must make regulations, they must establish a constitution for themselves which will indicate the objects of the co-operative society, and its mode of transacting business. A notice in due form is deposited with the postmaster of the locality where the society has its chief place of business, and a duplicate is sent to the Minister of Labour, because it has seemed to me that the proper supervision of these societies should come under the control of the Department of Labour. It is principally to help the working classes that the law is made, it is to help the poor, and it seemed to me for these and other reasons that it might well be placed under the control of the Department of Labour. If the society has banking for its object, it is subject to special rules and special sections of the Act, in order to ensure that banking may be carried on in a proper manner and under proper supervision. The capital is not withdrawable in these societies. It can be increased, it can be diminished by the accession of new members or the withdrawal of members, but in no case can it be decreased below the amount of the original capital at the time of the foundation and of the deposit of the notice. In the case of a banking co-operative association there is a special provision for the establishment of a reserve in order to provide for the payment of debts. There is a provision which is not in the English Act, but which it seemed to me necessary to introduce here, which forbids in the case of a banking co-operative society, the withdrawal of one of the associates, unless he has in the first place paid all his dues, and unless that banking association has a reserve, the percentage of which I leave for the determination of the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us which section of his Bill that is ?

Mr. FIELDING. Section 6, subsection (b).

Mr. MONK. In most of the countries of Europe the associate of a co-operative society has an unlimited liability, and whether he withdraws or not he remains liable. Now, these co-operative societies under that stringent regulation work very well. There has never been a cent lost by any of these societies, yet it seemed to me that in this country that feature would absoluely preclude its becoming a very popular institution. In this country we have the idea that when a man has withdrawn from a society he should cease to be responsible. I have endeavoured to cover that difficulty by providing that he may withdraw if the society has a regularly established reserve, in the case of a banking association, because it seems fair that a man who has been an associate and has contributed regularly to building up that reserve, should be able to withdraw and be relieved of further liability.

That was a serious difficulty, but it means to me that unless we provide for the withdrawal of capital, even in the case of a banking association—'banking association' is rather a high term, but it is the only one applicable to this case—people will be very little tempted to establish banking associations and yet they are absolutely necessary when banking is one of the objects of the society. The Bill provides for semestrial statements which must be published and must be maintained in the head office of the association so that the public can readily have access to them. All amendments to the constitution of the association, when regularly adopted by the association, must be sanctioned after they have been examined by the Department of Labour. A yearly audit is provided for and an annual official return by the association to the minister. The publicity of the annual report is also assured by the Bill. A very large control is assured to the minister by the terms of the Bill. He may obtain, besides, the yearly reports, whenever he deems it proper to obtain them. The books may be inspected by the member of the association and the minister himself can obtain access to the books. Upon a demand made to the minister an inspection of the books may also be obtained if that inspection is refused by the officers of the association. Under the circumstances which are indicated in section 17, the minister can cancel the charter if he considers that undue use of it has been made by the association. Minors may become members of the association at an age which I have left in blank for the determination of the House and they have certain powers in order to the disposal of their shares in the association which may be exercised as indicated in the section having reference to minors. The powers of investment of the association are limited and are pointed out in section 22. Disputes may arise among the members of the association and it is useful to provide for the settlement of these disputes without extensive litigation. That is provided for by a section of the Bill which hon. members can read. The society may amalgamate with other societies under conditions which are pointed out in the Bill. In the case of insolvency it has been found necessary to provide special rules as to the liability of associates. I will not take up the time of the House by going into that at present, but there are special rules provided in one of the sections as to the liability of associates when one of those associations has gone into insolvency—a very rare contingency, I may say, because in the co-operative societies of continental Europe and England, I find no instance whatever of the insolvency of these associations, but I have provided rules in one of the sections by which members who have ceased to form part of the association still remain liable under certain limitations which are indicated in the section. The department in control of these associations is given considerable power and latitude under the terms of the Bill and there is a section which provides that the Department of Labour may make regulations as regards the application of this legislation which gives them power in respect to the control of these associations.

These are, Mr. Speaker, the principal features of the Bill. When I presented that Bill last year the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did not seem to be averse to legislation of this kind. While saying that the House should proceed cautiously he admitted the use of the associations, but he pointed out that we already have in this country a general law regulating the establishment of penny banks. Penny banks are very useful in their way, particularly for the young, but it must be mentioned to the members of the House that the object of this law extends considerably beyond the scope of penny banks. It has for its object to enable the poorer classes of the people to combine in order to be able to do what, as a general rule, is only open to capitalists. I may say to the House that the movement in favour of penny banks has ceased in England and that on the contrary the movement in favour of co-operation is increasing every day. In this country, under the law which was introduced and passed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, we have only one penny bank, the one which is established in the city of Toronto. Athough it has done fairly well it must be evident to the House that it does not meet at all the requirements which this legislation has in view. It was mentioned that possibly this legislation might interfere with our regular banks. In regard to that I would say to the House that in no country where co-operation exists at the present time has it been found to interfere in any way with the larger banking institutions. It is, on the contrary, by educating the peo-

ple and accustoming them to habits of thrift and economy, favouring the movement of larger banking institutions and so to speak filling up a gap in the banking system of all countries where only large banks are found. In Italy and in Germany where these co-operative banks exist almost everywhere there has been no complaint whatever from the larger banking institutions that they have interfered with their work. I think that under these circumstances the objection is not well founded. It has been said that perhaps the country is not ready for this legislation. I do not think that that argument either is well founded because the country is developing rapidly and we have large labouring classes who, with our farming classes require the institutions of this kind. The condition appears to me to be very much the same as the condition existing in Europe when co-operation was first established there, and I do not think the objection is well founded.

I may say in support of this legislation that it has been subjected to examination by some of our commercial institutions, and I would like to read to the House—it is very short—the report made by a committee of La Chambre du Commerce de Montréal, which made a special study of this legislation and referred the examination of this Bill to a sub-committee composed of business men. This is the report made on November 27 last :

Your committee, after having taken into consideration the Bill relating to co-operative societies and having heard a statement made by Mr. A. Desjardins, of Lévis, concerning co-operative credit societies, and after having made an inspection of the documents presented to them by Mr. Desjardins and others has arrived at the following conclusion : Your committee believes that a movement of this kind would be of great use in encouraging the spirit of initiative among the labouring and agricultural classes, in facilitating a large number of operations of people of limited means and in developing the habit of economy.

Considering that the experience of a large number of countries have already justified the efficacy of this legislation especially during the last quarter of a century ; particularly in Italy where the operation of Luzzattis popular banks has been successful ; in Germany where the rural banks of the Raiffensen type have been very useful, and in England and in other European countries. Considering that the legislature of Quebec has just recognized the principle of this legislation by a recent statute of 1906 (6 Edward VII., chap. 33), and that the establishment at Lévis as an experiment under the authority of this law has shown the advantages that might be derived from a generalization of popular banks and institutions of credit ; considering that it would be useful and even necessary to complete this provincial statute by a federal law not only to extend the benefits of co-operation to the whole of Canada but to complete the exercise of legislative power that might be found wanting in the provincial parliament in order to give these societies the necessary development ; your committee deems it its duty to recommend this Bill to the council of the Chamber of Commerce and to the House of Commons, and to express a desire that there should be federal legislation affirming the principle of the organization of agricultural, industrial and banking co-operative societies for the purpose of production, of distribution, of credit, and of providing the necessary measures in order to attain this end.

The whole respectfully submitted.

Signed A. DESJARDINS,
President of the committee.
D. MASSON,
L. J. LORANGER,
FORTUNATE BOURBONNIERE,
Secretary.

There are some of these institutions already in existence and they seem to operate to the advantage of the people. We hear every day of serious conflicts between capital and labour, the origin of which conflict is to be found in the dissatisfaction of those who are not favoured with capital and who have only their labour to depend on. The object of this Bill is to favour the establishment of institutions which will go a great way to allay that dissatisfaction. I think it is more profitable for us to have legislation of this kind which would satisfy the labouring and working classes than to be obliged to resort to legislation of a more communistic tendency. The House is aware that some of the legislatures of Europe are seized with legislation of a far more radical tendency than this. There is a Bill about to be considered by the legislature of France, and which is promoted by Mr. Paul Doumer, by which the state in the first place is made a participant in the benefits to be derived from all public concessions and from all contracts given by the state, and by which the working men are also enabled to participate in the profits of these concessions and undertakings. Mr. Doumer's Bill, indeed, goes further and it stipulates that in all private contracts the workingmen shall have a share in the clear profits arising out of these enterprises, and the measure says that unless a contrary stipulation is made the law will divide the profits on all private works and undertakings between the proprietor or the contractor and the employees. It is proposed that a moderate rate of interest should be allowed on the capital involved and then there is to be a division of the profits between the contractor or the proprietor and the employees engaged on the work. That proposed legislation goes very far in the direction of socialism and it has been very severely criticised in France. The legislation which I now propose is of a far less advanced character and it merely assures the possibility of co-operation among the poorer classes for legitimate objects. I hope the House will give the Bill that favourable consideration which it seems to me it is entitled to.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I agree with my hon. friend (Mr.

Monk) that there is nothing very radical and nothing very dangerous in a measure of this character. The hon. gentleman has already suggested that it might be well to refer the Bill to a special committee. Last year the Bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, but at so late a stage of the session that it was not reached. I gladly assent to the suggestion that we should send this Bill to a committee for consideration, though we may not be ready to-day to name that committee. The success of co-operative institutions is so well known that what my hon. frend (Mr. Monk) has said in that respect is beyond controversy. I fancy that but for the banking feature of this Bill there would be no necessity to come to the parliament of Canada at all, because our provincial legislatures could provide for all the means of co-operation that are needed. If there is any danger in the Bill at all it is with respect to the banking feature of it, and that should be carefully examined and surrounded by proper safeguards. I admit that the penny bank to which the hon. gentleman has referred is not broad enough to meet the purposes indicated in this Bill. On the other hand, I do not believe that a Bill of this kind is as necessary in this country as in the countries from which he has taken his examples. Our Canadian banking system has been developed very widely. There was a time when a bank was an institution in a big city doing business only in large transactions, but to-day every little village in the country with a population of only a few hundred people has a branch bank and sometimes three or four branch banks.

These bank agencies handle not only large transactions when the business calls for them, but very small transactions. A man having a very small note of hand, if he is respectable, can go into a bank agency and have it discounted. So that in that way we have at present banking facilities within the reach of the poor man. But there may be calls which cannot be reached through the ordinary banks and which might be reached by such a society as the hon. gentleman's Bill provides for. There are two striking features of the system. One is that the association, so far as it is allowed to do a banking business, is to be confined in its operations to the electoral district within which it is situated. That would localize it. The next feature is that it can only do a banking business with its own members, receiving deposits from them and lending money to them. In both of these ways its operations are restricted within a very small sphere, and to that extent the danger of giving it banking powers is minimized. The special committee to which this Bill is to be referred will have to exercise great care to see that the banking associations provided for by it are surrounded with every safeguard, because it is the money of the poor man that they deal with, and I am sure that the hon. member will be glad to have these safeguards provided. I am quite willing to have the Bill referred to a special committee, and the names of the members of the committee can be arranged after consultation with my hon. friend.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. As Minister of Labour I heartily favour the legislation introduced by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I may say that last session, after the hon. member had brought this question before the House, the Department of Labour, then represented by my hon. friend the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) took the means of making known throughout the country the features of this legislation, through the columns of the 'Labour Gazette' and as a result the Department of Labour has since received many letters commending the project. Before the opening of the session I had occasion to speak to my hon. friend about this question, and I think I told him that the Department of Labour would co-operate with him in regard to any legislation on the subject that would meet the approval of the House. When the question is studied carefully by the special committee to which the Bill is to be referred, the measure as it comes from that committee will, I am sure, meet with the approval of both sides of the House and of the community in general. I may say that by the labour element of the country this legislation is viewed with much favour. I may say also that the originator of these co-operative societies, Mr. Desjardins, has given in the province of Quebec, notably in the city of Montreal and in the city of Quebec, before our socio-economic associations and our boards of trade, several lectures which have had the effect of making this legislation very popular; and we must congratulate him. He will be to this country what Mr. Luzzatti has been to Italy, the means of propagating habits of economy and saving among the poor people.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend withdraw the names of the special committee until we can consult with regard to them, and they can be submitted later?

Mr. MONK. No objection.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT—COMPENSATION FOR LANDS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln) moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: I apprehend that it will not be necessary for me to say much in moving the second reading of this Bill. It is a Bill which last session passed this House unanimously, and I believe would have been on the statute book now but that the Senate in some way overlooked it. It was introduced into the other House, but

was never moved to a second reading or discussed. The matter is very simple, and I could perhaps well satisfy the House that the second reading should pass by merely referring to what took place in this House last session when the Bill was read the second time. Up to 1903 the law was what I am now attempting to make it ; but in that year, when the general Railway Act was revised, by some slip or other the law was left in the condition in which it now is if my amendment does not pass, under which, in case of proceedings for the expropriation of land for railway purposes, if the owner and the company cannot agree, nobody but the railway company itself can invoke the court to facilitate the proceedings, to have arbitrators appointed and the matter decided, and to have the owner of the land paid his money. Until 1903 either party could move, which is as it ought to be ; but by some slip in the legislation of 1903, it was provided that the application could only be made at the instance of the company. As soon as this was pointed out to the House last session, and an amendment was moved by me in exactly the same words as this amendment, the then Minister of Justice, the present chief Justice of the Supreme Court, conceded that the Bill ought to pass, and said he had intended himself to move such an amendment. The Bill passed through this House and went to the Senate. Under these circumstances I have no doubt that the House would consider it idle for me to discuss the Bill any further ; and as it is in exactly the same language as the Bill which passed the House last session and which was admitted to be a proper amendment for the protection of land owners, I trust that the Prime Minister will allow it to pass.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here. Is the Bill the same as that of last session ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Exactly.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time considered in committee and reported.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.—AMENDMENT LEVEL CROSSINGS.

On the Order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 4) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). I am ready and anxious to go on with this Bill but do not care to press it in the absence of the Minister of Railways. It is the Level Crossing Bill which passed this House last session but which the Senate rejected.

Order allowed to stand.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. LANCASTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates. He said : This Bill I introduced last session. It then provided for other matters besides British citizenship, but the provision requiring British citizenship had the unanimous approval of the House. The other matters covered by the Bill created more or less discussion and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) thought it was better to refer the Bill to a special committee. It did go before a special committee, but I am sorry to say it did not come back before the House prorogued. That is unfortunately often the result of sending public Bills to special committees; and while I am not casting blame on any one in particular it is unfortunate that when a Bill, the principle of which is adopted on the second reading, is sent to a special committee because of some matters of detail, the committee frequently does not report before the House prorogues. As the Bill now stands it provides solely that mates and masters on Canadian vessels must be British citizens. The law in the adjoining republic distinctly requires that similar officers on vessels owned in the United States be American citizens. We should have a similar law here to protect our own masters and mates and not leave them in the position, that while they are debarred from employment on American vessels, American citizens may be officers of Canadian owned vessels. Last year I moved to strike out certain words of the statute, and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) thought my amendment had the effect of requiring British subjects to be three years residents of Canada as well as British subjects. That was not my intention. That is why I am asking by this Bill that the words 'or for persons domiciled in Canada for three years' be struck out from the present law. Section 4 of Chap. 43 of 57-58 Victoria substitutes another section for section 3 of the original Act and provides :

Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years—and so on.

I propose to strike out the words 'or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years.' So that no one can qualify unless he is first of all a British subject, and if he be a British subject it is not necessary that he should be domiciled in Canada for any length of time.

In case any doubt should exist as to the law being as I have described it in the United States, let me quote a letter written by two United States local inspectors, which I have from the Department of Commerce and Labour at the office of the local inspector in Buffalo. This letter is addressed to Mr. W. D. Graham, Secretary of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates, and the last paragraph of it reads as follows :

In reply to your second question, an Act of Congress, approved May the 28th, 1896, provides that, after the first day of January, 1897, no person shall be qualified to hold a license, as a commander or watch officer of a merchant vessel of the United States, who is not a native born citizen or whose naturalization as a citizen shall not have been fully completed.

It certainly is the duty of this parliament to protect British subjects and be in a position to say to the American authorities: So long as you leave that law in your statute-book, we will see in Canada that no one can get employment as officer on Canadian owned vessels unless he becomes a British subject. To show the necessity for this, let me read the following resolution passed unanimously at the annual meeting of the Grand Council of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates, held in Toronto in February last:

Captain McMaugh moved, seconded by Capt. Towers, that it is the wish of the Grand Council of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates that Mr. Lancaster, M.P., be asked to re-introduce in parliament the Bill of the masters and mates, amending the law in certain matters, and which was introduced by him at the last two sessions of parliament, and that the representatives of subordinate councils request their Commons members to support the Bill.

This shows that the people specially interested are alive to the situation and wish the Bill I have introduced to become law. But I do not wish to be understood as saying that that is the only reason why it should pass. The principle of the Bill is a national one. I care not whether it be a question of masters or mates or of any other calling, our people are entitled to be protected to this extent. Whether you call it reciprocity or protection, you should not hesitate to vote for this measure. And we ought on principle to vote for this Bill because reciprocity is required in order to even up with the United States who insist, as I say with all their large commerce and all their greater power, that no Canadian shall obtain an American certificate until he becomes an American subject and foreswears King Edward and his successors. In the proper meaning of the word 'protection' this is the protection that is required for every Canadian. To-day it may be masters and mates, to-morrow it may be some other calling or walk in life and the principle is a sound one. A man who is not concerned or interested directly in the employment of people upon vessels in those inland waters, still must recognize that whether he be a master or mate of a vessel or has any other calling or walk in life, a Canadian should be protected as this Bill seeks to protect him. That is all that the Bill calls for this session, the other matters that created a good deal of proper criticism last session, as some of us could not see eye to eye in regard to certain features of the Bill such as the minor qualification of wheelsmen, &c., not being asked for by this Bill, this session, and I hope that the government will see the reasonableness of passing this legislation and that the Bill will therefore pass its second and third reading and eventually go to the Senate and become the law of the country.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) information as to the number of foreigners who held certificates as masters and mates in Canada for last season or even the season before so that we may judge how many people would be affected by it?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I have not such information as would give the exact figures, to give such accurate information as I would require to answer the question. This trouble is on the increase; there may not be very many in one particular year, but if this law is allowed to stand one can see that the matter will gradually increase and there will be a tendency for the Canadian to go to Buffalo, Port Huron or somewhere else to live when we want him to remain in Canada and to remain a British subject.

Mr. L. G McCARTHY I am entirely in accord with the principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill. The reason I asked the question is to point out to the hon. gentleman that a difficulty might arise in the coming season of navigation if this Bill was put into force and the number of certificated masters and mates who would be ruled out would be large; then, it would not be possible to supply their places in such a short time, six months. I was going to suggest that if any such difficulty as that arose that contingency ought to be provided for, but not having the information I have no suggestion to make except to call my hon. friend's attention to it, and knowing that he has the matter in charge and has devoted a good deal of time and attention to it in the last few years I feel that that is quite sufficient. The masters and mates in the district I have the honour to represent in this House have for the past few years complained of what the hon. gentleman is driving at by this Bill. They have felt that men can come to Canada from the United States and become masters and mates of vessels without becoming British subjects, and by a much simpler and easier method than that by which Canadians can go to the United States and become masters and mates there. A man there has to foreswear his allegiance to his country before he gets a certificate to become a master or mate. I, therefore, say that I, representing the people whom I do, am in favour of this Bill, and I would hope that the department having charge of this matter would see that it is made equally as hard for any American or any foreigner to become a master or mate on a Canadian vessel as it is for a Canadian

to become a master or mate on an American vessel.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). I do not think I quite accept the theory advanced by my good friend from Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and my good friend from North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) that it is a good thing for us as Canadans to do this because the Americans do it. If it is a proper system for the Americans in order to build up their own American nationality it is not for that reason necessarily a right thing for us to do. If this is going to advance in any way the Canadian spirit in our country I accept the thing thoroughly, but the idea of advancing the theory that we must do this because other people do it against us is, in my opinion, picayune politics.

I accept thoroughly the theory that we should have British subjects or Canadian subjects on our boats, not because the Americans do that, but because it is a good thing to build up a good, strong, patriotic spirit in our country. I am tired of hearing in this House hon. members advance the theory that because the American system is on a certain line, although that system may be thoroughly erroneous and wrong, we as Canadians must follow in line. I would rather work on the principle that it is a good thing to build up our nationality, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) will withdraw the reason advanced, that because the Americans do it, we should do it, it would appeal to me much more strongly. Representing as I do a sea-board constituency and a seaport we have these little difficulties with us. But it is not because our people go over to the American side for positions at all. We welcome every American who comes into our country, be he a master or mate, but I would insist that every one of them should be obliged to accept Canadian nationality and Canadian citizenship as a sine qua non to obtaining a certificate as master or mate.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). I think my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macpherson) rather misrepresented the argument presented by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) who is promoting this Bill.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I had no intention of doing so.

Mr. STOCKTON. I would not for a moment insinuate that my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) would intentionally do anything of the kind. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) in moving this takes the position that where we authorize a man to be a master or mate in our merchant marine he shall be a British subject. He also adduced the argument that in consequence of the present condition of affairs between this country and the United States, Canadian citizens were foreswearing their allegiance to this country and becoming American citizens so that they could not only command Canadian vessels but also American vessels. That was the position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), and I say that this is a state of affairs that we should attempt to stop in this country. I believe in the principle of the Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster); I believe we should protect our own people, especially when that protection has a tendency to prevent our own people from becoming subjects of another country. Why should we throw wide open our doors when our neighbours to the south of us shut their doors against our people, unless our people foreswear their allegiance and become citizens of the neighbouring republic.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro). Mr. Speaker, I have taken a little interest in this matter and I am inclined to think that the grievance of which my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr Lancaster) complains is rather imaginary than real. An investigation was held into this matter last year and the committee examined a number of witnesses. I was present at the investigation and, if I recollect rightly, it was only shown that there was one captain operating in the inland lakes who was an American subject; they were only able to find one single instance in which this Bill was required in the trade on the inland lakes. That is my recollection of the evidence I heard at the investigation.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) asked his department to make a report on this, but we never got the report. We delayed from time to time and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) asked his officers there at the last meeting to make a special report, going back ten years on this very matter, and that report was never brought in. It was stated by some persons that they only knew of one during one year. But it is not correct to say that there was only one, because I know of a dozen myself. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was going to be able to bring down the statistics for ten years and we have not got them.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I presume that my hon. friend, when promoting this Bill, called all the witnesses he could find.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not call any.

Mr. SINCLAIR. At all events, witnesses were examined during the investigation last year, and after cross examination were only able to show one instance.

Mr. TISDALE. But my hon. friend who brings in this Bill states positively that he offered no witnesses at all, and some gentleman who happened to be there made mention of one case.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If I recollect aright, it was the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) who examined the witnesses.

Mr. LANCASTER. No. The vessel owners asked to be heard before the committee.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was pointing out that for every one American trading in the waters of Canada, there are twenty or thirty, or perhaps a hundred, Canadians trading in ships belonging to the United States.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that there are Canadians having charge of American ships ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. In my own constituency I know numbers of them, men who had put in their first papers in the United States and were ready to take charge of American vessels. I understand that the law in the United States prohibits Canadians from taking charge of American vessels.

Mr. STOCKTON. Is it not a fact that if a Canadian citizen goes to the United States under these circumstances to take charge of an American vessel, he is making a false statement, or sailing under false colours?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The practice in the United States, as I understand it, is that those captains who apply for charge of American vessels are required to put in their first papers and declare their intention of becoming American citizens, then they are ready to take charge of American vessels, and they do take charge of them, and continue for a number of years in charge of them, without going any further.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is only with the consent of the House that this debate can go on any further.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does the hon. gentleman not know that, according to the statute law of the United States, only an American citizen can command an American vessel ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am quite aware that such is the statute law, but there must be a regulation in the United States that enables men who declare their intention of becoming American citizens to take charge of American vessels, and I know that they are doing it. I know that in the constituency from which I come, there are a number of men who have never taken out their final papers, and yet who have been for years managing schooners sailing out of Gloucester in the American trade. It is a common thing along the coast of Nova Scotia and I have no doubt along the coast of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. These cases exist, and it might not be in the interest of Canadian seamen to push this matter too far. I do not know what the circumstances are on the great lakes; but I know that there are practically no American captains operating along the sea coast of the maritime provinces. The grievance does not exist there, and the only effect this would have would be to create friction, where Canadian seamen are operating in American vessels. If my hon. friend has a grievance on the great lakes, I would like him to consider whether it would not be better to amend this Bill and confine its operation to inland waters, excluding altogether the sea coast. It would be in the interest of the maritime provinces, at all events.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what I am doing, I am not interfering with section 2, which relates to his part of the country, at all. I am limiting it to trading on the inland waters of Canada.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is more than that.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If the hon. member for Niagara is right, and his Bill only relates to the inland waters, I do not wish to offer any opposition to it. I do not want it to relate to the maritime provinces or to the coasting law.

Mr. BRODEUR. As my hon. friend has explained, he introduced last year a Bill having the same purpose as the one now before the House. He also stated that his Bill last year had some provisions which are not found in the Bill now engaging the consideration of the House. Therefore we need only discuss that feature of the Bill concerning the domicile of those who present themselves for examination as masters and mates. Last year when this Bill was referred to a committee, an investigation took place regarding the different features of the Bill, and particularly that part of it incorporated in the present Bill. Several witnesses were examined, and it was decided, if I recollect aright, by the committee that we should have an investigation made by the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in order to find out the number of persons who would be affected by this legislation, and the number of persons who were domiciled in Canada, but who were working on American vessels. Several witnesses were examined on different features of the Bill, and my hon. friend, if I remember right, also brought some witnesses. I may be mistaken, but I think he brought forward a captain who was examined, or at least a captain was examined at the request of my hon. friend. But it does not make much difference, because the evidence is at hand. A great deal of evidence was taken before this committee, but unfortunately the report has not yet been brought down. My hon. friend seems to cast upon me the responsibility for not bringing down this report, but I think he is just as responsible as I

am and perhaps more so. He will remember that the committee got a report from officers of the department, and this report was put before the committee. But my hon. friend did not press the question. At all events, we have both perhaps been a little negligent in that respect. But several witnesses were examined, especially on this important point. How many masters and mates had passed examination under this law in the last ten years, and how many men were working on American vessels who were at the same time residing in Canada. That was also one of the features of the Bill.

It was feared by some people that if we were to pass legislation of this kind there would probably arise some feeling as between ourselves and our neighbours to the the south of us and that it would perhaps bring about retaliation against those who were living in Canada but who were working on American vessels. These people, according to the legislation of the United States, I understand, are remaining in Canada, and although I have not the figures just now, I am informed that the number of persons who were living in Canada though working on American vessels was very large, while the number of those who had passed their examinations under our law was very small. I do not know whether the figures which have been given by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) are absolutely correct or not, but I think that the number was very small. Under these circumstances was it worth while to raise difficulties when there were no difficulties? Was it worth while to say to our American friends: We are not going to allow any of your citizens to come up here. What was the law? The law was very wide. It simply permitted British subjects to come into Canada and pass their examination. Besides it was provided that those who had been domiciled in this country for three years had the right to pass their examination. Those three years simply meant that after a man has been living here for three years he is supposed to take out his papers and become naturalized. I think that is the limit of the law. I may be mistaken in that respect but my recollection is that it requires a residence of three years for a person to become naturalized. Well then it is to be supposed that when a man has been three years he is going to become a British subject. Then, was it worth while to raise all that question and to expose perhaps a large number of men—I do not remember exactly the number, but a very large number of men who were living in this country and working on American bottoms to interference and inconvenience? The result might be that the law would be enforced against these Canadians and that they would be obliged to go and reside in the United States. That would be a most serious thing for a large number of people in this country. I do not say that the principle which is embodied in the Bill of my hon. friend is not a good principle. I do not want to be regarded as saying anything of that kind, but I simply ask whether we are not putting in jeopardy a large number of men who are now living in our country. As I said, the matter was referred to a committee and that committee made an investigation. Now, I would make a suggestion to my hon. friend. First, I suggest that this Bill be allowed to stand for some time in order that the Dominion Marine Association who are taking a great deal of interest in it should be consulted. I think they have a perfect right to be consulted. They are the people most interested.

Mr. LANCASTER. They are interested against the Bill. They want to be able to hire every one they can get.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose there would be no harm in appraising them of the principle of this Bill. The matter has not been referred to them and I think it would be only fair that we should know the views of these men in regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be better to refer it to the special committee before whom these men could go and also refer the evidence taken last year to the same committee?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I was going to suggest—that we should take the investigation made last year and that this Bill should be referred to the same committee. I think all the members of the committee are still members of the House. I propose that the Bill should be referred to this committee, that they put on record the report which they are going to make and then it will take just a few days to bring back the investigation which was made last year with the report which is going to be put in. That is the suggestion that I was going to make when my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) called my attention to it. I think it can be done in a very short time. I do not say that the principle of the Bill is not a good one. It is only a question whether it would be opportune to pass this legislation in view of the facts that have been mentioned. However, I will have no objection to the second reading of the Bill with the understanding that the Bill be referred to this committee in order that we may report the investigation which was made last year.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under the new rules I believe I have the right to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the hon. gentleman makes his reply, if there is any other member who desires to speak, I would ask him to do it now.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to vote and will vote for the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) for the very reason that the hon. member for Na-

naimo gives. It is objectionable but as a matter of retaliation—

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson)—

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The hon. member for Vancouver.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) did not say that.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—as a measure of retaliation I will vote for it in order that we may have in our hands a weapon to use in negotiations. It seems to me that the time for such legislation as this in both the United States and Canada has long ago passed, that it is a relic of at least 100 years ago, that it is a disgrace and a shame to our civilization that a man living on this side of the river should not be allowed to go across the river to work or that a man living on the other side of the river should not be allowed to come across to work. I vote for this, therefore, simply as a matter of retaliation in the hope and expectation that some day this government may enter into negotiations with the United States to do away with all this legislation on both sides of the line. Why should a new industry that is about to be established on this side of the line and which requires skilled labour be crippled and handicapped because it is prevented from bringing in from the other side one who is able to help to carry on the business and make it successful? We are a young and growing country, we have many new industries being established, there is room for many more, and in many lines we have not enough skilled labour. Many of these industries find it very difficult to establish and build themselves up for that reason. If the government were to approach the government of the United States I see no reason why some arrangement might not be made by which this sort of legislation shall be wiped off the statute books of both countries. I do not think that the labour unions of this country would object. There are and have been as many Canadians seeking employment across the river as there are Americans seeking employment on this side. Our Alien Labour law was placed upon the statute book as a matter of retaliation and not as a matter of principle and this proposal is of a similar character as I understand it. As I understand it there are a great many more Canadians seeking employment in the United States as masters and mates than there are Americans seeking employment in Canada. Surely something should be done to abolish this kind of legislation altogether. I understand that at the present time there is a very close community between the labour element on this side of the line to the labour element on the other side. If a strike occurs on this side they go across to the other side to get a man to organize and arrange that strike and when it is about to be settled they go across the line to get a man to settle it. I think the fraternal feeling is such that there would be no objection to the abolition of such legislation as this on both sides of the line. I trust that something of this kind will be done in the near future.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I am in sympathy with the principle of this Bill, but at the same time there are other things to be considered. I understood the promoter of the Bill to say that it was confined entirely to inland waters and if that is so I have no objection to it, but I see it also refers to the 'coasting trade,' which I presume would include the coasting trade on the Atlantic sea-board.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). No.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill refers not only to inland waters but also to coasting voyages.

Mr. TISDALE. That means coasting voyages on the inland waters. One section refers to a seagoing captain or mate and the other refers to inland master mariners. We have coasting on the lakes as well as on the sea coast and the two pursuits are easily distinguishable in the Act. The Bill as amended this session only refers to an inland captain or mate.

Mr. DANIEL. Did I understand the minister to say the Bill referred to the Atlantic coasting trade?

Mr. LANCASTER. He said it but I did not.

Mr. DANIEL. If it does refer to the Atlantic coasting trade I object to it because of the difficulty that frequently arises at present in manning vessels on the Atlantic coast. Seafaring as a pursuit is not followed so ardently as in the days of the sailing vessels. I have been informed by those in the business that such a Bill as this would be injurious to the Atlantic coasting trade if applied to it. If the Bill is confined to inland waters I have nothing to say.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have suggested that the Bill should be referred to a special committee because of the allegation made that Canadian mariners were not allowed to do on the American side what the Americans can do on the Canadian side. The evidence as to that would be obtained before a committee and it is information which we must have before we can arrive at a definite conclusion. If the information was brought out last year it should be submitted to the House, and the minister is wrong in saying that it is no more his duty to produce that evidence than it is the duty of a private member. If the government have the information they are responsible for producing it. That information is of such a valuable character that

we should be in possession of it, and the fact that the committee did not deal with it last year is no reason why it should not be available to us this year.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). If this Bill is intended to prevent American citizens to hold Canadian certificates and who live on the American side, coming over to the Canadian side and taking Canadian vessels, I certainly am in favour of it. I stated last year that I knew several Americans who had both American and Canadian masters papers, but who live on the American side and hold positions on Canadian steamers. I know for a fact that Canadians cannot live on the Canadian side and take positions on American steamers; they are compelled to live on the American side and take out naturalization papers. I know also that American pilots are piloting between Montreal and Prescott. It is most unfair that they should have this privilege unless there is reciprocity. I trust that some action will be taken which will protect our Canadian citizens in this matter and hence I am in sympathy with the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the Minister of Marine thinks the principle of the Bill is a good principle then he should assist us in passing the Bill instead of raising objections against it. The Minister of Marine says that the principle of the Bill is a good one, but he tries to avoid applying that principle because the vessel owners of this country are not in favour of it. I do not want any quarrel with Canadian vessel owners, but I would point out that these gentlemen are protected in their industry and they ought to be men enough to say that Canadian citizens and British subjects are good enough for them. The Canadian vessel owners ought not to ask this government to allow them to employ American citizens when Canadians are not allowed to be employed by American vessel owners under similar conditions. If the Minister of Marine helps us to pass this Bill I believe that five years from now the Canadian vessel owners will thank him for pointing out the right course to them, instead of encouraging them in their present attitude. I think it is a most cowardly thing—and I use the word with all due respect—that Canadian vessel owners should demand from this government absolute freedom in the employment of masters and mates, and that they should ask to be placed in the position to hold over their Canadian employees the threat: The government allows us to employ United States citizens, we can get plenty of them to man our Canadian vessels; we are sufficiently protected in our business but we do not care anything about protection for the Canadians we employ. This Bill embodies a larger principle than the Minister of Marine thinks. Did the minister ever hear of the Bill introduced last session in the British House of Commons by Lord Muskerry, which provides that British subjects only shall serve as masters and mates of British ships or as pilots in British waters.

If we want an example, I think we had better take one from the British legislation of last session, which was passing at the time I introduced this Bill. The difference between the British House of Commons and the Canadian House of Commons, is that in the British House a measure was introduced and passed, whereas the Canadian House, after allowing the Bill to be introduced and approving of it, allowed it to be slaughtered in committee. Now, it is admitted on both sides of this House that if a principle is a good one, it should be applied. I cannot understand the sense of any hon. gentleman admitting that the principle of a measure is a good one, and then raising barriers against the application of that principle. I do not wish to say anything disrespectful of the action of any one in regard to this matter but the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has sought to put on me some responsibility, so that I must make a personal explanation. He says that I am more responsible than he was for the special committee not reporting. I have only to say that day after day the vessel owners were allowed to take up the time of the committee discussing what ought to be the qualifications of a mate on a little tug-boat, how improper it would be to pass this Bill because it might affect a tug of very small capacity, and how they ought to be allowed to employ minor mates who were not British subjects. The very last time the committee met the minister directed his departmental officers who were there to make a return giving the statistics he wanted for the last eight or ten years. The committee adjourned until those statistics could be obtained, and it never met again. I could not as an ordinary member of this House insist on the committee meeting. The chairman—and I do not blame him—was to be informed by the officers of the minister's own department when those statistics were ready for us to consider, and when he was so informed he was to call the committee together. I apprehend that he was never so informed, and that for that reason he did not call the committee together.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). I may say that the hon. gentleman was very largely responsible for the inability of the committee to report, because his Bill of last session was very badly drafted. It presumed to cover a larger field than the present Bill does, and to this extent I think he was responsible for the inability of the committee to report to this House on many sections of the Bill which he chose to introduce.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman, who was chairman of the committee, says I was responsible, because my Bill dealt with other matters than those the present Bill is dealing with. Well, the committee had to do to a great extent what the chairman suggested. These special committees generally sit one or two hours at a time, and they spend a great deal of time disputing about the chairman's directions as to what should be done. When we reached the section containing this great principle that these men should be British subjects, particularly in view of the law existing in the United States, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at the instance of the vessel owners who were there, said he would get statistics from the department; but those statistics were never brought in, and the officers of the hon. gentleman's own department, I repeat, were to blame, if any one, for that committee not having reported. In this House we consent very carelessly sometimes to send Bills to special committees, for by the time the committee is ready to report, the government has taken all the days on which the matter can be dealt with, and it is never dealt with. I do not see the necessity of referring this Bill to a special committee to do what we could better do now in ten minutes, adding a clause, if necessary, to meet the suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe, that the Bill should not go into operation for twelve months or nine months, so that it will not interfere with existing contracts and will allow the small number of men to whom it applies to complete their present employment. With a clause of that kind, it seems to me that this Bill ought to pass, and it will be trifling with the principle of Canadian citizenship to send it to a special committee to do what we can better do here to-day. Though it is admitted that the principle of the Bill is a good one, yet it is suggested that because the vessel owners of the country do not think the number of men affected are sufficient to call for remedial legislation, therefore it ought not to pass. What is all this retaliation hinted at by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? What hon. gentleman in this House is so afraid of the United States as to refuse to do justice in this matter from a fear that they will hit us back? If we want to get fair play at their hands, I think the best course is not to go on our knees to them and tell them that we are afraid of them, but to tell them that the Dominion parliament can pass laws to protect our own people and that we are going to do it so long as it is necessary—to say to them: You play fair with us, and we will do the same with you. For a minister of the Crown to admit that the principle of the Bill is good and that Canadian citizenship ought to be protected in this respect, and then to turn round and say that if we insist on our rights in this matter the United States will do another and a greater wrong to us, is assuming a position which I do not think this House ought to adopt. I do not think the Prime Minister will say that that is a reason why this Bill ought not to pass. I think he will agree with me that the principle of it having been accepted, and its application being limited to the district which it most affects, and it not being objected to by those who might be supposed to object to it, there is no excuse for any Canadian who has a particle of manhood or of respect for his country to ask that the Bill should be delayed any longer. My hon. friend from Lunenburg suggests that I should have the third reading to-day. I cannot unerstand why he wants that; I should think we had better have the second reading first. If the hon. gentleman will stand up and say that he approves of the principle of this Bill, and will use his influence, which is not small, with the Minister of Marine, to induce him to withdraw from the position he takes, that this Bill should be referred to a special committee, it will have a better chance of passing the House.

Let me draw the attention of the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the fact that the rules of the House are changed and that after the first four weeks Thursdays are taken for government business. Consequently, public Bills will not be reached, and if motions and other matters take up Mondays and Wednesdays, as they generally do at that period, there will be no chance of this Bill being reached at all. If the minister still insists on its going to a special committee, he should give us the assurance that no matter how late the committee may report, when it does report the Bill will be made a government order and not be prevented from passing because the government will have taken every day of the session for public business. If I cannot have this assurance, I shall feel obliged to divide the House on the motion to send it to a special committee.

Mr. BRODEUR moved:

That the Bill be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Bennett, Bickerdike, Brodeur, Clarke, Aylesworth, Lancaster, Lefurgey, Macdonell, Macpherson, L. G. McCarthy, A. K. Maclean, Pardee and Stockton.

He said: I have no intention to delay in any way the passing of the Bill, if the committee report favourably. Last year I gave the same assurance, but my hon. friend did not seem to be in a hurry to have the Bill passed because he never asked me to have the committee called. I am not going to quarrel with him on that point, but I can assure him that the government will not make any objection to the consideration of the Bill when it comes back from the committee and we are anxious that the committee should report as speedily as possible.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman says that the government will make no objection to the passing of the Bill, but the committee may not report until it is too late in the session to have it called as the government may have taken all the days. Will the right hon. the First Minister not supplement what the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) has said by saying he will make the Bill a government order?

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In reply to the blandishments of my hon. friend, I assure him that if the Bill comes back from the committee he will have an opportunity of bringing it before the House. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am ready to go on with my Bill. It is a very important one and I could make a good deal of progress with it between now and six o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is ready to go on with his Bill, but his Bill is not ready to go on with as it is not printed in both languages. To-morrow it will be the first Order of the Day. I shall have no objection to my hon. friend going on with it then.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 6, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has appointed Messieurs Aylesworth, Bergeron, Bourassa, Bristol, Brodeur, Calvert, Foster, Grant, Knowles, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Monk, Pardee, Smith (Nanaimo), Stockton, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the library.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messieurs Bergeron, Bristol, Cyr, Dyment, Gervais, Henderson, Hughes (Victoria), Johnston, Lavergne (Drummond & Arthabaska), Logan, Maclean (South York), Macpherson, McColl, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Oliver, Pardee, Parmelee, Roche (Marquette), Ross (Yale-Cariboo), Smith (Oxford), Smith (Wentworth), Taylor, Tisdale, Verville, will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900, AMENDMENT—COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. A. CLAUDE MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved the first reading of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL. The Bill is divided into two portions. The first portion re-introduces the compulsory voting clause which has more than once been the subject of debate in this House. The second section of the Bill requires all employers of labour to permit their employees to have sufficient time on polling day during which to cast their votes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

WINTER SERVICE—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What provision has been made for winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and what boats are to be placed on the service, and when ?

2. Is a steamer, and which, to be placed on the route between Summerside, Prince Edard Island, and Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, and is everything in readiness for that service ?

3. Is the boat presumably to be placed on the Summerside-Cape Tormentine route to remain there for full winter service, in order to demonstrate fully that route, or is she to be withdrawn at discretion of the officers of the boat ?

4. Have through rates for freight been arranged between points on Prince Edward Island Railway, via Summerside winter steamers, and to points on Intercolonial Railway, so that shippers will not be subjected to three short hauls ? If not, why not ?

5. Was it not stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last session that either the steamer 'Montcalm' or the steamer 'Lady Grey' would be put in commission for winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and is it the intention of the government to use either of these boats for this service ? If not, why not ?

6. If not to be used for the Prince Edward Island service, what disposition is to be made of the steamers 'Montcalm' and 'Lady Grey'?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The 'Minto' will be placed on the route between Charlottetown and Pictou when the steam navigation boats cease running. The 'Stanley' will be placed immediately the steam navigation boats cease running on the route between Tormentine and Summerside, and will remain there as long as the captain considers it is safe for the vessel to do so. Both boats will then go on the route between Georgetown and Pictou.

2. Answered by number 1.

3. Answered by number 1.

4. Through rates arranged as in previous years.

5. It was stated that expert opinion would be obtained as to the suitability of the 'Montcalm' for the Prince Edward Island service. After serious consideration and on investigation it was found that the depth of water at Pictou was not sufficient for that vessel. It was therefore thought inadvisable to place the vessel on the route. The 'Lady Grey' was designed, especially for the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Father Point. She is not fitted for passenger service in Northumberland Strait.

6. This matter is under consideration, but the 'Montcalm' and 'Lady Grey' will probably be used for the service for which they were designed as recommended by the Royal Commission on transportation, vide their report for 1905, under the 'Winter Navigation'.

POSTAL EXPRESS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

What is the nature of the postal express legislation referred to in the speech delivered by the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) on Friday, November 30, 1906?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The postal express legislation referred to in the speech delivered by the member for South Grey, on Friday, 30th November, 1906, foreshadowed an arrangement for the transmission and delivery of post parcels C. O. D. It is contemplated that the post office should be the means by which parcels could be despatched and collections of any charges thereon made by the department on some definite scale. The details have not been perfected, but are now the subject of consideration. Parliament will be more fully informed when the project has been completed.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—MADOC-ELDORADO EXTENSION.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Has the government received a petition from the reeve and council of the village of Madoc, praying it to take steps to compel the Grand Trunk Railway to carry out its agreement with the government to construct and operate its extension from Madoc to Eldorado, or to refund the subsidy granted therefor?

2. If so, has any action, and if any, what has been taken thereon?

3. Is the Grand Trunk Railway bound by the terms on which the subsidy was granted, to construct and operate the road, or to return the subsidy?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Yes, the Grand Trunk Railway Company were notified by the department on the strength of the petition received from the mayor of Madoc, and asked what action the company propose to take in the matter. The company claim that they have expended a considerable amount of money, exclusive of the subsidy, in rebuilding the line and in relaying it with steel rails, and continue operations until it was demonstrated to a certainty that the line could not be made to pay expenses. They also claim that until there is some reasonable certainty of the line paying its fixed charges from the local revenue, the government cannot expect them to be considered under the necessity of again demonstrating otherwise. The company appear to have made some propositions to the parties interested, with a view to the re-opening of the branch, but so far the propositions have not been accepted.

3. This is a legal matter as to which the government, at this moment, have no advice.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What was the total expenditure to date for the construction of the Hillsborough bridge at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals). The total expenditure to date for the construction of the Hillsborough Bridge at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, is $1,142,225.95.

NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE AND ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Monk—asked:

1. Has the Ross rifle been given to the Mounted Police for use?

2. Is it true that the Mounted Police had to abandon the Ross rifle and resume the use of the Lee-Metford?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. 1,000 Ross rifles, mark No. 1, were issued to the Mounted Police.

2. When subjected to severe test defects were discovered—the use of the rifle was discontinued temporarily, the company undertaking to supply other rifles, with the defects corrected, the whole at their own expense. In the meantime the police are using their old Winchester and Lee-Enfields.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAIN SERVICE AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Have any complaints been received respecting the train service on the Intercolonial Railway to meet outgoing and incoming steamers at Rimouski ?
2. On how many occasions have trains been late, and to how many hours has the delay extended ?
3. What has been the cause of the defective service ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. Trains meeting the incoming and outgoing steamers at Rimouski were late twelve times in all ; delays having extended from a few minutes to three hours and forty six minutes.
3. The delays have been due to a number of causes. The mail tender ss. 'Rhoda' is slow. The mails are not assorted on the steamship, but are left to be divided on the wharf, and representations have been made to the postal authorities, which will bring about an improvement for next season. Delays have also been caused by the usual accidents of travel, disabled engines, and breakdowns of various kinds. The outward mail special from Montreal has to wait for the western mails, and at Rimouski has to wait for the eastern mails. Heavy trains were the principal cause of delay, as only one out of twelve light trains was late.

EXTENSION OF LETTER-CARRIER SERVICE.

Mr. McINTYRE asked :

1. Is there any truth in the rumour that the government intends giving a letter-carrying system immediately to Calgary and Edmonton ?
2. Does the government contemplate bringing in legislation to meet the demands as regards such service for other towns throughout the Dominion ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WINDSOR BRANCH.

Mr. BLACK asked :

1. When does the lease to the Dominion Atlantic Railway of the Windsor branch of the Intercolonial Railway expire ?
2. Does the government receive a share of the gross receipts of this branch ?
3. Has the Dominion Atlantic Railway another and competing line tapping the Intercolonial Railway ?
4. Does the government intend to renew the lease to the Dominion Atlantic Railway when it shall have expired ?
5. Is the government aware that the Dominion Atlantic Railway is trying to lessen certain traffic over the leased branch, by charging a much higher rate per ton for hauling coal about thirty miles, from Windsor Junction to Windsor, than is charged for hauling fifty-nine miles, from Truro to Windsor ?
6. If so, has the government taken any action in the matter ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The lease to the Dominion Atlantic Railway, of the Windsor branch, expires A. D. 1914.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. It will be a matter for serious consideration when the time arrives to the government.
5. No.
6. Answered by No. 5.

THE LETHBRIDGE COAL STRIKE.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. On what terms was the strike of the employees of the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, at Lethbridge, settled ?
2. What was the nature of the negotiations which led to the settlement of the strike ?
3. On what date was the strike settled, and work resumed at the mines ?
4. Will a report be made by the Deputy Minister of Labour of the settlement negotiations, and will such report be presented to the House ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour :

1. An increase in wages amounting to practically an extra ten per cent for most of its employees was granted by the company which also agreed to the appointment of a check weighman to protect the interests of the men, and to deduct from its employees through the pay-roll, the amount necessary for the payment of such check weighman ; except in the case of deductions for the check weighman, the company is not to make any collections through the pay-roll, save in respect to rent, doctor and hospital fees, coal, powder, oil and other supplies furnished by the company, and, if the men so desire, for a sick benefit fund and library. It was agreed that the company would not object to its employees being or not being members of any organization, but all employees, whether members of an organization or not, are to be upon an equality in the company's employment. Preference in employment before strangers is to be given by the company to any of its employees involved in the strike, providing

they make application within a reasonable time. To avoid the possibility of future strikes or lockouts, it is agreed that in the event of a dispute or grievance arising on the part of one or more of its employees which cannot be adjusted through a reference to the pit boss, the same may be appealed to the superintendent of the mine, and further, if necessary, to the general manager, and a committee of two of the company's employees are to be allowed to appear on behalf of an employee or employees seeking redress; failing an adjustment by appeal to the general manager, the matter is to be referred to arbitration, both parties agreeing to abide by the award of the arbitrators. The terms set forth the manner in which the arbitrators are to be appointed. The strikers withdrew their demands for a complete recognition of the union, for the deduction of union dues by the company, for an eight-hour day and other less important concessions.

2. Negotiations were conducted by Mr Mackenzie King, the deputy Minister of Labour under the Conciliation Act, 1900. The intervention of the department was requested by the honourable Walter Scott, premier of Saskatchewan, both parties accepting the good offices of the deputy Minister of Labour on his arrival at Lethbridge on Thursday, November 22. After several interviews with each of the parties a joint conference was arranged by the deputy Minister of Labour between the representatives of the company and the men, which conference was held on the 25th and 26th of the month. As a result of this conference, a basis of settlement was reached, which but for one clause in regard to the wording of which the parties disagreed, would probably have resulted in a termination of the strike on the 27th of November. By the 1st of December the difficulties in regard to this clause were overcome through the acceptance by each of the parties of a clause drafted by the deputy Minister of Labour as a substitute.

3. The strike was declared off on Saturday, December 1st, by the district president of the union, whose action was ratified by the men at a meeting on December 2nd. Work was resumed at the mines on Monday December 3rd.

4. Yes.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to refer to a question asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday, referring to the ventilation of this chamber. I have secured from the officers of the Public Works Department the information the hon. gentleman desires, so far as it is available.

During the winter of 1905 the opinion of experts on the question of the ventilation of this chamber was asked. Mr. Kimball, Mr. Manny, and Prof. Durley, of McGill, were those whose opinions were asked. Prof. Durley's recommendations and remedies were adopted by the department and steps were taken immediately to carry these into effect. The arrangements are now practically completed with one slight exception. I will just say in regard to the matter that fresh air from outside is introduced into this chamber through the old ventilating towers by means of fans run by electric motors. This air is introduced through the ceiling in the spaces behind the arches in the gallery and there are small openings between the panels in the room above us. It is introduced in very considerable quantities. The escape, which is necessary to enable the air to be forced in, is through the openings under the seats in the chamber and through some larger openings at the back of the seats on each side. In addition to these are also openings for the air to come in in the spaces under the gallery. The fans are worked and are capable of supplying 17,500 cubic feet of air at a speed of 400 revolutions to the minute. This air is passed over steam coils to heat it before it is introduced into the chamber and the temperature at which it is brought into the chamber can be regulated by the time spent in passing the air over these coils. It can be regulated from 40 degrees up to 75 degrees. In addition to that there is a system of washing the air by water spray which is provided for but which is not completely installed. The officers of the department tell me that it will be installed in ten days or a fortnight, so that before the Christmas recess it is hoped that the whole of the apparatus and equipment will be completed and effective.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT—CONTROL OF TELEGRAPH COMPANIES, &c.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: Mr. Speaker, there must be hereafter an annual feature in connection with the meeting of this House, namely, a discussion of the Railway Act and of the conduct of the Railway Commission which administers that Act, because that legislation is the most important measure to my mind that we have on the statute-book. It is more important even than the tariff and the grievances of this country to-day in the way of taxation concern more railway operations than the customs tariff or the inland revenue taxes. Therefore, I believe that an annual feature of the meeting of parliament hereafter will be a discussion of this Railway Act and that

we will have every session some sort of a general Act introducing improvements which will be up for discussion. Railway legislation to my mind, as pointed out some years ago by Lord Salisbury in England, is at the bottom of national policy and national prosperity. We see evidence of that everywhere and in the adjoining republic of the United States to-day the regulation of transportation is of more importance than any other question that comes up there. For the last two or three years President Roosevelt and his cabinet have given the greatest amount of consideration to this question and they have adopted a measure somewhat on the same lines as the Canadian Bill. They have the Interstate Commerce Commission which deals with all questions practically that our Railway Commission deals with. Now, after premising this discussion with these few words—and I am not going to take up a great deal of the time of the House—I wish to quote a few sentences from the position of Senator LaFollette, of Wisconsin, who was dealing with the railway question in the United States He stated what he considered the axioms at the bottom of this proposition before the House and here are some of the axioms that are laid down in his speech :

> The vital interest of organized society in commerce and the public nature of transportation imposes upon the government the duty to maintain a control over transportation as a public service.
>
> It is the duty of government to require the carrier to render adequate services upon reasonable terms and upon equal terms.
>
> The only basis upon which it can be settled finally in a free country is a control of the public-service corporations, broad enough, strong enough, and strict enough to ensure justice and equality to all American citizens.
>
> If a railroad corporation has bonded its property for an amount that exceeds its fair value, or if its capitalization is largely fictitious, it can not impose upon the public the burden of such increased rates as may be required for realizing profits upon such excessive valuation or fictitious capitalization. (United States Supreme Court.)
>
> We hold that the basis of all calculation as to the reasonableness of rates to be charged by a corporation maintaining a highway under legislative sanction must be the fair value of the property being used by it for the convenience of the public. (United States Supreme Court.)
>
> The ascertainment of the value of the railroads is the very corner stone of any great and enduring service which this legislation is to accomplish for the people of this country.

Now, I think those principles which underlie the legislation of the United States and which underlie the legislation of this country are sound principles and are accepted by the whole country. Furthermore, when, in 1903, this parliament accepted the principle of the regulation of railways and passed the Railway Act, the then Minister of Railways and Canals, in introducing the Bill made it quite clear that it was the intention of the government then, as it is now the intention of parliament, not to operate the railways, but through a commission to regulate them and compel them to deal justly by the public, and as he said to take absolute control over the rates and charges which the railways impose upon the public. These principles are admitted. They have been admitted and in the light of these principles for a few minutes I propose to discuss the railway situation of this country. First, I want to point out for the information of the House that if the government have the absolute control of rates it follows that eventually the operation of railways will come to the state. It may not come immediately but every one can see that that is the tendency. We have expressly declared that we undertake the absolute control of rates, and I believe the ultimate of that will be that we will undertake the absolute control of the operation of railways. But, be that as it may, it is recognized by the public now in every progressive country that the state has a right and ought to enforce the right of regulating railways and their attitude towards the public. Now, that being the case it is the duty of parliament more and more to assume the responsibility put upon it of regulating the railways. Not only must parliament pass a general Act but it must continually keep that Act up to date and while parliament has assigned certain duties to the Railway Commission, it has not by any means abandoned its function nor must the government abandon its executive responsibility in regard to the administration of the law in connection with railways. We have a railway commission to regulate the railway, we have this parliament possessing power over them, and we have a Department of Railways maintained at great expense which has power to enforce the railway law and to protect the public interest. It is patent to me that the responsibilities of parliament and of the executive must increase yearly with regard to transportation questions, and that unless we have yearly amendments of the law, and a yearly discussion of the law, and unless we keep the executive up to its duties the public will not be fairly treated. It requires eternal vigilance to compel railways to do fairly by the public.

I want to say a few words with regard to the board of Railway Commissioners. On the whole, I believe the public appreciate the legislation which created that commission, and on the whole I believe the Railway Commission is discharging very important duties in Canada. But already one can see that the Railway Commission is overtaxed. As it is manned and organized to-day I do not believe it is equal to the public requirements, and I imagine the time will soon come when the Railway Commission will have to be enlarged. If its usefulness is to be increased it will have to have

branches in the great commercial centres of Canada, in Toronto, in Montreal, and probably in Winnipeg. Once a decision is given by the Railway Commission it ought to be accepted all over the country and there ought to be a secretary or some official representing the commission in the large centres who would be able to say what the decisions are and to settle local differences. There is hardly a day in the city of Toronto that from one to twenty and perhaps one hundred cases connected with railway matters do not arise and which could be settled in two minutes by a representative of the Railway Commission if he were on the ground. As I understand it, the Interstate Commerce Commission now has branches in different places and that all such questions can be settled locally. There is another thing about the Railway Commission which I think is worthy the attention of parliament, and it is this : Up to the present the Railway Commission has been largely engaged in settling disputes between the different railway companies. The main object of the Railway Commission was to settle differences between the railway companies and the public, and I hope the government will see that the main duty of the commission in the future will be the settlement of disputes between the railway companies and the people of Canada. I trust that hereafter the Railway Commission will give more attention to cases as between the railways and the people and leave the disputes between the companies themselves to take a second place.

Now, I want to give the House some notable instances of the injustice that still continues to exist in this country notwithstanding that we have a Railway Commission, and railway legislation, and a special department of railways with a special minister, all maintained at great expense. There are still a great many marked cases of unjust treatment by the railways towards the public. One of these concerns the great and powerful corporation known as the Grand Trunk. When the Grand Trunk was incorporated 50 years ago, it got a charter which was very similar to the charters then given to railways in England, and among the clauses in that charter was one which stipulated that the Grand Trunk should give a penny-a-mile service throughout its system. This is called a third-class passenger service and it was limited to one train a-day each way on the line. That was the law of the land,—it is still the law of the land, I believe,—and if that law had been lived up to the people of this country would be enjoying a penny-a-mile service to-day. At the start of railroading in England there was only one train known as a parliamentary run daily each way over the different railway systems, but an enterprising manager saw it would be a good thing for the people and for his railroad to give the people cheap travel and so he improved the third-class service and put a penny-a-mile car on every train. And in England to-day they have the best third-class railway travel in the whole world. It is better than our first-class railway travel in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Oh yes, it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes; everybody in England is glad to travel third-class at a penny-a-mile. It is a better service than anything we have in Canada as to speed, as to accommodation, as to terminal facilities and everything of that kind. The people of England can travel 50 or 60 miles an hour at a penny-a-mile and they are well satisfied with the system. We would have had the same thing in Canada to-day had the Grand Trunk been compelled to carry out the provisions of its original charter. Some years ago I raised that very question in this House; on September 17, 1903, I put the following question :

Mr. MACLEAN asked:

Has the following clause in the original charter of the Grand Trunk Railway Company passed in 1852 been repealed ?

The fare or charge of each third-class passenger by any train on the said railway shall not exceed one penny currency for each mile travel ; and that at least one train per day having third-class carriages shall run every day throughout the length of the line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am having an investigation into the matter referred to, but have not sufficient information to enable me to answer, and I would ask to have the question stand.

On September 21, I put the same question, and this was the reply I got :

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The question of the hon. gentleman is a legal question involving the consideration of many years of legislation concerning the Grand Trunk Railway, and we do not think we are in a position to give any definite answer. We think it would not be wise to express any opinion on a matter of that character at present.

The people of Canada are entitled to have a penny-a-mile service from the Grand Trunk, but they are not getting it. It is the duty of the executive and especially of the Minister of Railways—because he is paid an immense sum and he has a large department at his back—it is his duty and the duty of the government to see that the law which to-day binds the Grand Trunk, is lived up to. We have not that executive capacity in the government of to-day that there ought to be; I confess we never have had it in any previous executive in Canada, and so it remained for an ordinary citizen of this country to go to the Toronto police court—that most admirable court which we have in Canada, and which is

certainly the equal of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I say it with all respect to the Supreme Court, and with all respect to the police magistrate of Toronto. It was left for the police magistrate of Toronto to declare that Charles M. Hays had violated the criminal law of this country by refusing to give the people a penny a mile service on his railway. That case, I am told, is to be appealed, and it will come up in other courts; but why is it that the Minister of Railways, after being paid by the people of Canada $7,000 or $8,000 a year, with an enormous staff of assistants, with a legal staff of his own, with the Minister of Justice and the legal machinery of the government behind him, is not enforcing this law against the Grand Trunk Railway Company requiring it to give the public a passenger rate of two cents a mile ? And yet that very same law, enforced as it is to-day in England, is giving the people one of the best and cheapest railroad service in the world. This is a case of gross disobedience of the law by a great railroad company, which has recently been given a contract by the government and parliament of Canada for the construction of a great transcontinental system on condition of the performance of certain things ; how can the public expect that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will live up to its contract and to the statute law of this country in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway if it deliberately violates the law that was passed fifty years ago in regard to the penny a mile service ? That is the position the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government are in because they have failed to observe that law.

Now, let me state another instance of the grossest kind of unfair treatment of the public in connection with passenger transportation by this same Grand Trunk Railway Company. I have had an investigation made, and it involved a good deal of trouble and expense to make it; I had to employ men specially to do what I think the government ought to do; and I found that the Grand Trunk Railway Company to-day deliberately charges all the passengers travelling over its line from Toronto to Montreal 3½ cents a mile, though it gives a second-class passenger service there at a lower rate; but it gives all the people west of Toronto a first-class service at 3 cents a mile and no second-class service. So that although we have this Railway Commission, which was to see that there was no unfair discrimination—which is the basis of the Railway Act—we have the Grand Trunk Railway Company to-day practising this unfair discrimination against the people travelling on its line east of Toronto. I want to call the attention of the members of this House representing the counties of Ontario, Durham, Northumberland, Hastings, Addington and the St. Lawrence river counties, and the members representing the counties in the province of Quebec through which the Grand Trunk Railway runs, to this unjust discrimination.

I may be told that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has absorbed roads in the west. That is no answer. The only answer is that it is guilty of discrimination. It may be said that it is the duty of the Railway Commission to remedy this. I go further and say it is the duty of parliament to remedy it; it is the duty of the executive, represented by the Minister of Railways backed up by the Minister of Justice, who is the attorney general of this country and responsible for the administration of Dominion law.

We are told by the ministers that the duty of the Railway Commission is to settle cases that are brought before them. That may be, but the Privy Council, especially the head of each department, is responsible for the administration of the law and for seeing that justice is done. The Minister of Customs sees that there is no violation of the Customs Act. The Minister of Inland Revenue sees that there is no violation of the Inland Revenue Act, and the Postmaster General in many cases sees that there is no violation of the Postal Act; they put the law in force. Why does not the Minister of Railways put the law in force in regard to the railways, and why does he not call the attention of the Railway Commission to this refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to obey the law requiring it to give a penny a mile service, and insist on the Railway Commission ordering this railway company to give fair treatment to passengers all over its system ? Let me give a few other instances of gross discrimination by the railways—and now I include the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, with all the bonuses, land grants and special franchises given to it, is to-day carrying all the travel which originates in the United States and passes over its line through Canada at 2 cents a mile, but charges every Canadian travelling on the same trains and in the same coaches, 3½ cents a mile ? Is that not a most unfair discrimination ? Was not this Railway Commission created to prevent this discrimination ? Can anybody point me to an instance where the Commission or the Department of Railways up to the present time has justified itself by interdicting this unfair discrimination ? I have never seen any instance of it; and yet here is a law establishing a most expensive commission, and another law establishing a most expensive Department of Railways, and still another law establishing a most expensive system of administration of justice under

the Minister of Justice. We are all the time getting more and more law, but no effective administration of the law. Before we make more laws, I think we had better devote our energies to putting into force the laws we have.

Let me call the attention of the farmers of this country to another kind of discrimination which this Railway Commission ought to remove at once. It happened in my own constituency, but I hear of cases of the same kind every day. A farmer in my constituency wanted three or four carloads of tiles. He lived on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in my own township not far from the city and very near to where I live. He got a tile maker at Beamsville on the line of the Grand Trunk to quote him a price for the tiles. Then he got a quotation from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for carrying the tiles seven miles over its system. I went into the matter very fully, and verified the facts and figures by communicating with the different people concerned; and the rates charged were as follows. For 60 miles from Beamsville to Toronto the Grand Trunk wanted 4½ cents per 100 pounds, and for the seven miles from Toronto on the Canadian Pacific Railway out to that farm, they charged 2½ cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is only twenty-one miles from Beamsville to Hamilton.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. For the sixty miles from Beamsville to Toronto they charge 4½ cents per hundred pounds and for the seven miles 2½ cents per hundred. That is the law to-day. The Railway Commission, the Department of Railways and Canals and parliament allow two railway companies to charge two local rates for the transportation of one carload of tiles sixty-seven miles. I thought last session that our legislation would remove that but evidently it has not. I appealed to the Railway Commission and their reply was that both roads could charge local rates, and if a third system had to be gone over, there would be three local charges. But when we have this much despised government ownership, there can only be one local charge. I call the attention of the farmers to the fact that the farmer who wants to improve his property by putting tiles on his land is liable to two or three local rates. He is told that if he puts tiles on his land, that will pay him 10 per cent, but under the circumstances, his investment would not pay him 2 per cent because the freight alone amounts to one-third of the cost of the tiles. Every product of the farm, where local freight charges are involved, is subject to these double and treble local freight rates, yet to-day we have no railway commission or railway department which will remove that grievance. I trust that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) will introduce a definition into the Railway Act which will correct that abuse. Apparently the Railway Commission has no jurisdiction in this connection. While we have given that commission wide powers, it will only act on definitions inserted in the Act by parliament, and parliament must therefore insert these definitions. The commission will not take the responsibility of making definitions but will enforce the definitions made by parliament. Otherwise these three or four or five local tariffs will drive business out of the country. Let me cite another instance. The railway companies have formed organizations which control all their cars, so that if a car is delayed a day at a siding or a man refuses to unload, he is charged demurrage at the rate of $1 a day. He is at the mercy of the railway company because unless he pays this demurrage he cannot get his freight. If the railways form these car associations which subject shippers to these charges for demurrage, parliament should enact that the railway companies should similarly have to pay for delay in delivering the goods. If they charge a merchant demurrage charges, why should not the merchant be able to go to the commission and get some kind of allowance for delay in delivery.

Let me give you another instance of injustice. I go often twice a week from Toronto to Ottawa over the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway have a fine express service between these two cities in a way but it is not so good as it should be. The express leaves Toronto at 10 o'clock and Ottawa at 11 o'clock and there should be one through car at least provided for first class passengers. Those people whose purse only enables them to pay first-class fare at the rate of three cents a mile are compelled at two o'clock in the morning, when the thermometer ranges from zero to 20 degrees below zero, to get out at Smith's Falls and transfer to another train, whereas those who are able to afford sleepers are carried straight through without any change. I think we should compel the railway company to give these first-class passengers continuous passage, without change, from Toronto to Ottawa just as they do those who take the sleepers. But evidently there is no one who considers it his duty to enforce this. True the company give a fine service in many respects, but they treat the public unfairly by making the service as poor as possible so as to make more money, and will continue to do so until parliament intervenes.

There is another matter. The Railway Commission ought to look after the sanitary conditions of these express trains that run all over Canada. I have been on them a good deal and never saw such bad sanitary arrangements. On every big train there ought to be a sanitary inspector to look

after its ventilating and heating. That is to-day neglected. Notwithstanding the money we are paying for the enforcement of the law, apparently there is nobody to enforce it and compel the companies to act fairly and provide the necessary accommodation. The answer of the railway companies is that they have so much to do in expanding their systems that they have not the time to look after local trains and improve the present traffic but must direct all their efforts to extending across the continent. What they should do is look after the traffic they have and then let them expand their business as they please.

I wish to say a few words regarding the drafting of the Bill which is a very simple one. I was taunted by the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that my drafting of the express clauses was not as good as it should be. I am only a lay member of parliament but it is my privilege to introduce a principle in the best way I can. I proposed to insert the words 'express companies' in the application clause of the Railway Act and then left it to the law department of the House and the Department of Railways and Canals to make the clause effective. I have had experience of a similar nature before. I did once employ eminent counsel at my own expense to draft an Act regarding telephones and was taunted with my bad drafting, so that I have decided just to put what is necessary in the clause, where the application comes in, and leave it to these high priced legal lights we have around us to do the rest. I shall be told that express companies are in now. We have express companies in, but the Department of Railways and Canals has not found a way of making the application of the Act fit them.

And the Minister of Railways had not found the way to apply the Act to the express companies. I do not want to be taunted with that hereafter, and so I have put in the Bill that the Railway Act shall apply not only to the railways, but to the sleeping car companies, just as the enacting clause in the Bill passed in the United States makes it apply to those companies. If there are any corporations serving the public in this country that ought to be disciplined, they are the sleeping car companies, and especially the Pullman Company. That company is so rich that it does not know what to do with its money. It cannot even give all its profits to its shareholders in the form of dividends. Yet it is under no regulation in this country. And, so far as I can make out, the sleeping car service of the Canadian Pacific Railway is under no regulation. Yet everybody who travels on sleeping cars must know that regulation is called for, especially some kind of sanitary inspection. There is another matter which ought to be under the regulation of some competent body representing the public—the charges made by these companies. They have made the rate and we must pay it. I propose that the Railway Commission shall take jurisdiction over these sleeping car companies with power to regulate their rates and compel an improvement of their service. These companies are making so much money that they can give a better service for their present charges, and they can give a cheaper service for people who cannot afford to pay the present rates. See the people passing between Toronto and Montreal every night who cannot afford to pay $2 for a sleeping car. It is true there is a kind of tourist car sometimes run on the Canadian Pacific Railway. There ought to be a sleeping car system in this country—I am not calling for anything sumptuous—that would give the ordinary citizen who has to travel by night a decent bed for a dollar. We are entitled to that, and it ought to be provided for by law. We have to make it the law before we shall get it. And this parliament is the body that must make it that law. Another point is this: There is always a contest in sleeping cars over who shall take the upper berth and who may have the lower. Everyone wants the lower berth. If the Railway Commission has jurisdiction over the sleeping car companies and fixed a certain price for a lower berth and a certain smaller price for an upper berth, this competition would be lessened. The young people, the commercial travellers and those of us who like an upper berth, would be able to get an upper berth for $1.50 and the lower berths would be left for the old people and the ladies——

An hon. MEMBER. And the millionaires.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, and the millionaires of whom there are many in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. My point is that over these plutocratic companies we have no jurisdiction. I remember that, a good many years ago, I introduced a Bill to regulate sleeping car companies. It went to the Railway Committee. The Pullman Company organized such a lobby as had rarely been seen in this House. They engaged almost every lawyer in Montreal. And when the matter came up in the committee, I did not get one vote other than my own for the regulation of these sleeping car companies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Only one just in Israel.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. These are cases of the grossly unfair treatment of the public by these sleeping car companies, and they are possible simply because we have not brought these companies under our jurisdiction.

In this same clause which defines the application of the Act, I propose to put

telegraph companies under the jurisdiction. I do not propose to go further, and, if the House will agree with me in the matter, I am ready to leave the wording to the law officers of the Crown and especially the law officers of the Railway Department. We now have telephone companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. and I do not see why telegraph companies should not be included. If this is not done, then let us have a general telephone and telegraph Act which will give practical jurisdiction over these companies. I do not care how it is done so long as the principle is carried out. Let me tell this House why the telegraph companies should be brought under the jurisdiction of the commission. I can cover what I have to say by the illustration of what has taken place in regard to the telegraph service from such points as Toronto, Montreal and New York, on the one side and Cobalt on the other. Cobalt is to-day a great centre of business, and we are told that the messages between that point and the great centres keep the wires hot. The telegraph line from North Bay to Cobalt is owned by the province of Ontario—it is a state line. It connects at North Bay with the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, which is a Grand Trunk Railway incidental, and the Canadian Pacific Railway's telegraph which is incidental to that road. Now, these two privately owned concerns thought they would break down the state system both of railroad and telegraph by making business inconvenient for the public. With that end in view, they hampered transportation and especially they hampered telegraph business. Suppose a man in Toronto telegraphed a man in Cobalt. The message went over the Canadian Pacific Railway or Great Northwestern line to North Bay. The operator there carefully received it and deliberately wrote it on paper He then hung the paper on a hook. Another clerk, in the course of business, took the message off the hook and put it in an envelope. Then he called a messenger. If the messenger did not come, he waited until the messenger did come. Then he said to him, "Sonny, take this message from here to the office next door and hand it to the clerk of the Ontario National Railway Telegraph Office.' When the message thus came into the hands of the Ontario system, it was repeated to Cobalt. This was the procedure in regard to telegrams sent over a distance of just three hundred and thirty miles from Toronto. I say these companies deliberately conspired to make that service bad in order to poison the minds of the public against the state ownership of telegraphs and railways. They thought they would 'queer' it, as the saying is. There ought to be some court in this country that would control these matters. And there ought to be a Prime Minister in Canada and one in Ontario who would simply drop a note to these companies warning them gently that we do not intend to stand for any such business. These systems should be so arranged that a message would go direct to Cobalt, without the necessity for repetition. There seems to be no law in this country, nor is there any man connected with the administration of government, to discipline these companies. These companies should be notified by some one whose notification they would respect. We incorporated you to serve the public and we intend to see to it that you do serve the public and that you shall not hamper the public business by any such conduct as this. As to the government of Ontario, I for one, would have justified them in seizing that office, taking possession of those wires, and giving the public a direct service. If the Railway Commission is given jurisdiction over these telegraph services the companies will be compelled to interchange business and give a better service. And not only that, but I believe that the time has arrived when the telegraph companies of this country ought to be compelled to give a telephone service wherever it is in the public interest. A telephone service between Toronto and Cobalt and New York and Cobalt would be even more beneficial to the people interested than a telegraph service. There is a telephone service over the state line in New Ontario. That line serves the public whichever way it wishes to be served.

These other corporations say: We are not under any law, we can do as we like, and we will serve the public just as it suits us and we will hamper the public if it suits us, and they started out to hamper the public in this business. They say they are trying to make an arrangement for through business, and I believe it will be carried out, but they are making through arrangements, because an agitation was carried on in regard to it, and because public attention has been directed to it, and if we had the proper legislation and responsible ministers of the Crown to see that that legislation is enforced, there would not be any such treatment of the public as we see to-day in that connection. I want to come to another question that is in this general Act of mine, a question that deals with the charge of transportation in this country. I have long tried to have it made the law of this land that 2 cents a-mile is a sufficient charge for the conveyance of railway passengers in this country. I think I have been able to show that the railways could make more money if they gave a two cents a-mile rate than if they charged as they do at the present time. And remember, Mr. Speaker, that when we passed the general law, dealing with railroads, we put in it this clause:

264. A standard passenger tariff shall be filed, approved and published in the same manner as required by this Act in the case of a freight standard tariff.

2. Until the company files its standard passenger tariff and such tariff is so approved and published in the 'Canada Gazette,' no tolls shall be charged by the company.

3. When the provisions of this section have been complied with, and except in the case of special passenger tariffs, the tolls in the standard passenger tariff shall be the only tolls which the company is authorized to charge for the carriage of passengers.

Now that is good legislation if it were definitive, if it said what the standard passenger rate shall be. My contention is that we should insert there one clause that the maximum standard passenger rate on roads coming under the jurisdiction of this parliament shall be two cents a-mile. The railroads could then give any preference they like, any lower rates they choose, excursion rates, or commutation tickets, but we should make it the law that standard passenger rates shall not exceed two cents a-mile. Now that is my suggestion in a word. These same roads carry American travel for two cents a-mile, and these roads having connections in the United States carry passengers there at two cents a-mile. The Grand Trunk has been carrying people for two cents a-mile in Michigan; it is now being compelled by the Railway Commission in Michigan to carry passengers for two cents a-mile on sections of its line, where it has hitherto not obeyed the law, it is a delinquent there, and the State is enforcing the law against the Grand Trunk. If they can carry passengers there at two cents a-mile why not here? If they can carry American traffic originating in the United States, through Canada, for two cents, why can they not carry Canadians? And there is this reason further: The Canadian Pacific Railway to-day is enormously rich, it is paying enormous dividends, it could double its dividend, if it wished to. Its stock to-day, a great deal of which is water, is quoted at 187, it rose a point yesterday, two points the day before and three last week. It is one of the most desirable railroad security in the world to-day and the company is so rich that it does not disclose to the people of Canada the real extent of its resources. These annual statements that we get as to that railroad do not disclose the actual richness of that company, its enormous earning, and the enormous wealth it has. That being the case should this parliament hesitate for one moment in imposing on a railroad that to-day is paying 6 per cent and hopes soon to pay 8 per cent, a condition that it should carry its passengers for two cents and no more? It charges some of them in the west four cents a-mile and I am told even more than that. It charges, I believe, between here and Prescott, four cents a mile, and in Manitoba it charged all its patrons four cents a-mile until one day the government of Manitoba made an agreement with the Canadian Northern for three cents a-mile; then it came down. It never complained of that three-cent rate from that day to this. It adopted the three-cent rate but did so because the law of competition came into effect. Why should this parliament hesitate for one moment in forcing this wealthy corporation known as the Canadian Pacific Railway, to give the public a maximum passenger rate of two cents? Why should it hesitate a moment in compelling the Grand Trunk Railway to obey the law, and give a penny-a-mile service as the law to-day provides it should do? Why should we for one moment hesitate in saying to this corporation: You must at least give Canadians the same rates that you give to Americans, and you must give Canadians the same rate on your lines in Canada that you give to every one on your lines in the United States. If our own railroads are not compelled to treat our own people fairly what stage of affairs have we reached in this country? They even discriminate against our freight; we are trying to get away from that, but these great railway companies, owned and supposed to be for the benefit of the Canadian people are constantly carrying the produce of American farmers over the Canadian system to the European market where it is competitive with the produce of the Canadian farmer, at a less price than they charge on Canadian produce.

That is the kind of treatment these great railways give to the people of Canada. That is the kind of treatment I wish to see parliament abolish and for that reason I wish to see parliament every year have a special committee, and I think we will have it every year after this, dealing with these grievances and forcing these companies to give relief. But we must not only make the law; we must have officials and ministers responsible for the enforcement of that law.

I am told in regard to this two-cent a-mile proposition, that if you make the maximum rate two cents the privileges enjoyed by the people will be discontinued, and the railway lobby that has been busy in this town to-day, busy with the members of this House and especially busy with the members who come from cities is telling them: Oh, if Maclean's railway proposition of two cents a-mile is enforced we will have to withdraw all the special privileges we give, we will have to withdraw all excursion rates, and especially we will have to withdraw the commutation tickets which people have in cities like Montreal. We have a few in Toronto, but the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway do not care to serve the public at Toronto, but in Montreal they give many commutation tickets, and a first-class suburban service, so that the Montreal members especially are being told yesterday and to-day by the railway lobby that all these commutation tickets will have to be abolished if you lower the passenger

rate to two cents a-mile. I defy any company and any member of that railroad lobby that is in Ottawa to-day to give me an instance where a state has fixed a maximum rate of two cents, and any privilege of that character was withdrawn. On the contrary we have the experience under this two-cent rate of a great many states in the adjoining union. Last spring the legislature of Ohio by an almost unanimous vote and by concurrent and unanimous action on the part of the upper and lower Houses and the Governor, put a two-cent law through in a day, and 30 days after it went into force. The Pennsylvania railroad retained the most eminent lawyers they could get in the State to present their case, and I have the brief here; they drew up a brief of 100 pages or more showing how this law would injure the railway. They had it all ready and the end of it was that they did not even present the brief. The law went into force, the people got two cents a-mile, the railroad got more travel than it could carry and not a single privilege that the people of Ohio enjoyed previous to that law going into force was abandoned. On the contrary Cleveland and Toledo to-day have just as many commutation tickets, they have the same excursion rates, they have a better service and the railroads are taking the business away from the electric roads that had it formerly and gave cheaper rates.

They are making more out of their passenger trade than they ever did. It has worked out exactly the same as the cheapening of the postal and telegraph service. The cheaper you make it and the better the service you give the more money there is in it for those who receive the revenue in connection with that service. That result has been found in connection with everything. If you reduce the price of gas you do not injure the company because the consumption increases resulting in increased dividends to shareholders. No matter what the public service is, whenever you extend it to a larger number of people the more income there is. I defy the representative of any railway company in Canada or the United States to show a case where the maximum standard passenger rate has been reduced that it has been to the detriment of the company. On the contrary it has increased the revenue of the company and the public at the same time has been benefited. Now, if the lobby that is opposing this Bill can give an instance of that kind they have an opportunity to come into court. To show how widespread this movement is I may say that they have practically a two cents a mile service in the state of Ohio. The recent election in the state of Pennsylvania, of November 7, turned altogether on the question of cheaper railway travel or of the two cents a mile rate. That proposition carried unanimously; the governor, and nearly every member of the legislature are pledged to the two cents a mile passenger rate. There are half a dozen other states that I could mention but I will give more details later on when I come to the clause—and this is the great question involved in this Bill—dealing with this subject. This is the reform I wish to see inserted in this Bill, namely, that the maximum passenger rate shall be two cents a mile. If any one wishes to argue that point now he has his opportunity. Last session I was told that I should have graduated the application of the reduced rates as they have done in Michigan. I did propose that and then I was asked: Why did not you propose a general Act? Then, I did propose a general Act and I have kept to the general Act because that is the only way it can be run. The railways can easily stand a two cents a mile rate. They will make more money out of it than they make to-day. The railways, if they care to oppose the legislation, having all the results of reduced passenger rates in the United States before them, will be able, if they can, to give an instance of where a reduced passenger rate has injured the road. If they can give such an instance I am prepared to listen to it. If they can give an instance which will show that a graduated passenger rate, where the earnings are $3,000 a mile, of two cents, or where the earnings are $2,200 a mile, of two and a half cents, has been a detriment to the railway I will consider it. But, I want some facts, I want these men who oppose the legislation and who say that it is unfair to the railways, to produce evidence of the assertion that a lower passenger rate has been injurious to the railway.

We are told that in Canada our railways run through sparsely populated sections of the country. I want any one in this House to show me a railway that is not doing a large business in passenger traffic or on which the cars are not overcrowded. The real fact is that the railways have not passenger rolling stock enough to accommodate the people who want to travel when the rates are reduced. Though they say there is a sparse population in this country all our trains are filled. But they say that in the state of Ohio, New York, Michigan and other states where they have cheaper travel there are a great many more people. Perhaps there are but there are a great many more miles of railway and the railway mileage in proportion to the population there is greater than the railway mileage in proportion to the population here. If you look at the map of Ohio you will see that it has a large population but you will also see that it is criss-crossed with railways and with electric trolley systems in every direction. Speaking of trolley systems, it was the competition of the trolley systems that made these railway

companies abandon their opposition to legislation regarding passenger rates and they were actually glad to make that an excuse for reducing their fares. The people have taken to the trolleys and what are the trolleys doing ?—the trolleys are giving the people all over Ohio and Indiana a first-class service. They actually have night expresses and sleepers on the trolleys carrying people for less than a cent a mile and they are making big profits. If a penny-a-mile is the standard of travel in the old country, if it is the standard passenger rate in the United States, as it is or is going to be, why can we not have the same thing in this country ? I see no reason why we should not. The railways are not going to lose, the public will benefit and the railways will actually increase their revenues. If that is the case—I maintain it is the case and I want some one to prove to the contrary—then I say we want to have that law. Just one more argument : It was contended here last session that if you reduce the passenger rates you are going to put up the freight rates. Will some gentleman who makes that statement give an instance of where it has occurred. He cannot give an instance in Canada because we have never experienced it. In all of the fifty years during which we have had railways in this country there has never been a reduction amounting to anything in passenger rates. Freight rates have been cut in two time after time but passenger rates have never been reduced and their argument is that if you reduce passenger rates up will go the freight rates and the poor farmer will suffer. Now, the poor farmer will not suffer because the poor farmer, as represented by the members of the legislatures on the other side is the man who is demanding these reduced passenger rates. The grangers and the farmers have demanded reduced rates. I would be very glad to be informed of a single instance where passenger rates have been reduced and that as a result freight rates have gone up. It is also said that if you reduce the passenger rates the poor little lines that go through sparsely settled sections of the country will be injured. Then they say : Oh, but the Canadian Pacific Railway, while it does a good deal of business down east, has to provide transportation facilities for a sparse population in the west. Well, the Canadian Pacific Railway has aspired to be a continental system and if it is a continental system it must average up ; it must take the lean with the fat, and I say that no railway company having a national charter permitting it to go any place in the Dominion ought to be allowed to charge more for passenger travel in these far-away sections than in well populated portions of the Dominion. If that is permitted, what will be the result ? Nobody will go to live in these outside places.

The important thing that we ought to be able to tell people coming into Canada from Europe is that they will have just as good railway accommodation and at just as low rates in the west as in the east. I appeal now to the members from Manitoba and the west to take that view and I would invite their attention to a newspaper that was directed to me as a member of this House as follows : W. F. Maclean, M.P., Ottawa ; marked copy. Then, on the cover is this :

> From the Camrose 'Mail,' Camrose, Alberta, Canada. We are working for better freight service, better telegraph service, better postal facilities on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I do not know anything about this newspaper ; I suppose that members got it also, but there is a little newspaper up in Alberta that is devoting its energy to the securing of better freight service, better telegraph service, and better postal facilities. That ought to be the key-note of the cry of every man from the west to-day. The people in the west are entitled to as low passenger and freignt rates as the people in the east. They are entitled to the enforcement of the law as against these great corporations and there should be no discrimination by these railways as between different sections of the community. Especially when the railways of this country are subsidized as they have been, they should not be allowed to compete against the west by carrying passengers and freight that comes from our rivals in the United States for less than they charge us. We have exalted the customs duties and the excise duties into being the greatest question before the people of Canada to-day, and I say it in all seriousnes, that this tariff question is an infinitesimal question as compared with the question of transportation charges on railways. The tariff does not touch the farmer at a great many points, but freight rates and passenger rates and express rates and most of all discriminative rates are the things that affect him. There must be no discrimination in this country by the railways that we have created. To-day, through a lack in the law and through a lack in the enforcement of the law the railways are in a position to discriminate against communities and against cities and against provinces and they are masters of the country. The Canadian railways can become what the United States coal barons have become. The railways in the United States have become so enormously powerful that they have had to pass a law there saying no railway company shall engage in any other business, notably mining. James J. Hill and others have been compelled to divorce their mining business from their transportation business. The mission of Roosevelt in the States to-day is a mission to discipline the railways and the corpor-

ations of that country. We must compel the railways not only to charge reasonable and fair rates to our own people, but we must insist on there being no discrimination. We must have no hesitation in defining what a 'common carrier' is. The very first clause in this United States law defines what a 'common carrier' means and it says he is under the law, and the fundamental principle is that these common carriers shall not discriminate. I have to-day given numerous cases in which discrimination prevails and I suppose other hon. gentlemen can enumerate further instances. We must approach this question seriously, we must regulate these companies, we must enact a law and enforce it.

The final clause in the Bill which I propose deals with the telephone question. I compliment the government on the telephone legislation which they gave us last session. It is not what I wanted, but it tends to show that headway is being made. The last clause in this Bill goes a step further than the law that was passed last session and it compels a universal connection between all telephone companies whether they are long distance or not. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill which stands in my name.

Mr. HENRY ALFRED WARD (Durham) Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before the House a matter which has been called to my attention within the last day or two and which has a bearing on the telephone clause of the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). When the telephone legislation of last session was passed it seems to me that the private telephones in the different townships of the country were not taken into consideration as they should have been. There is a large number of these private telephones, some of which extend twenty or thirty miles through different counties and which have no right of connection whatever with the other telephone companies which exist in the province. I especially direct attention to one of these private telephone lines in the township of Hope in my county, which has suffered in the last few days at the hands of the Bell Telephone Company. I may say that these individual telephone lines are usually owned by doctors and they are of great service to farmers as they enable them to have telephones in their houses to communicate with the doctors, and with the different villages and towns to which they extend. The cutting off of the connection between two of these small telephone companies is the grievance to which I direct attention and I desire to read a memorandum which will show the existing condition of affairs in my county. This statement is:—

Dr. A. C. Beatty, of Garden Hill, in Durham county, owns and operates an independent telephone system of about 20 miles, with instruments in all the leading villages in that vicinity. Dr. Russel, of Bailieboro, has a system about the same size, which has always been connected with Dr. Beatty's at Bewdley, at the head of Rice lake. The people were always well pleased with the service. Dr. Russel purchased his line a few months ago from another doctor who was so easy as to sign a contract with the Bell Company for three years, and of course Dr. Russel is responsible for the contract that the other doctor signed, which has been so tied up that he cannot even put in a new phone or exend his line without asking permission from the Bell monopoly. It is understood he is not even permitted to exchange messages with independent lines. Dr. Russel's line is connected with the Bell at Millbrook. On November 30th, 1906, he was commanded by the Bell agent at Millbrook to cut the line at Bewdley, as that was the order from the Bell, who is now beginning to feel the handwriting on the wall. Dr. Russel fearing an action did so. This will cause a great inconvenience to the people surrounding Bailieboro who often have to call up Garden Hill on business. It is also a great inconvenience to the business men of Millbrook. Is there any law in any half civilized country which could force Dr. Russel to carry out such a contract. If this Bell monopoly has power to separate independent telephone lines and harass the people of nearly half a county, why not embellish them with power to grant divorces and separate man and wife, then they would be running church and state at one and the same time. If there is anything worse in Russia, for goodness sake let us know of it, for Standard Oil in comparison with it is merely a kindergarten.

These expressions are pretty strong, but they are no doubt justified by the inconvenience caused to the people of half a county by utterly cutting them off from communication with the different farms and villages with which they have had connection for several years. I believe that some amendment to the law of last session should be made so as to give these independent companies the right to connect with other companies. Section 31 of the Act of last session refers only to 'provinces, municipalities, and corporations,' which have the right to connect with other companies for long distance service alone, and if this is extended in accordance with the proposition of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) I think the expression in this section should also be extended to include individual or personal telephone lines.' There is no interpretation of the word 'corporation' which would allow these lines to come in under the operation of the present law. The only interpretation which is given to this Act is the interpretation of the word 'company,' which does include individual lines; but the word 'corporation' is used in this section, and it is not in any way interpreted to mean an individual line. There can be no risk in altering this section in the way I suggest, because the latter part of the section gives the Railway Commission power not to allow such connections unless the standard of efficiency of the plant of the particular telephone com-

pany is up to what it should be. Of course, this Bill will be in committee at a later stage, and I shall then take an opportunity of moving an amendment to my hon. friend's Bill along the line I have suggested.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I think this House and the country have made good progress in many lines during the present parliament; but we have much further to go in order to serve the public as I believe it is in our power to do. It may be a big question to decide whether railroads could be run so as to pay dividends if they carried passengers at 2 cents a mile; but the fact that in the United States and other countries it has been proved possible for the railways to carry passengers at 2 cents a mile proves beyond a doubt that in that respect we in the Dominion of Canada are behind the age. There is no doubt that the great and powerful railway corporations have of themselves made considerable progress; but we have never found them to make any great advancement along the line of reduction of rates unless compelled to do so by parliament. Under these circumstances I think this Bill should be carefully considered, and we should decide whether we cannot go one step further. There is no doubt that the Railway Commission has accomplished great good; it is a step in the right direction; but it moves too slowly. Let me give an instance that happened in my own riding last summer. A man having a planing mill on one side of the railway and a contract for building a brick block in another part of the town desired to build a telephone line to connect his planing mill with his office where he was building the block. He asked the railway company for permission to carry the telephone line over the track, and the travelling agent of the company told him that he could do so if he paid $5. The man came to me, and I told him that the company had no right to demand $5 from him, and that if it refused to allow him to carry the line over the track, we would go to the Railway Commission. The company did refuse, and I made application to the Railway Commission. It was during the summer vacation, when the commission was not sitting, and the answer to my application was that it would be attended to as soon as convenient. It took two months to get the decision of the Railway Commission, which was to the effect that the man could build his telephone line across the track without any payment to the railway company. The law defines how high the wire should be, and so forth. I submit that some quicker method of settling such questions should be inaugurated. There is no subject that affects the country at large at the present time so much as the question of the telephone. If we had a system by which every farmer could have a telephone if he desired it, and in that way the towns and the country were connected, many of the young men who now leave the farm for the town or the city would remain on the farm. The law recently passed with regard to telephones has accomplished a great deal, but it does not go far enough. There should be a general law allowing all telephone lines to connect with the long distance or with other lines just as we now have connection with the railroad lines. I believe the country could be better served than it is by the railroads. The people in the western country are demanding lower rates. The railroads a year ago were charging from 4 cents to 5 cents a mile for carrying passengers in the great west. It is true, one railway brought down the rate to 3 cents, but many of them are to-day charging 4 cents. That is injurious to the country; it prevents immigrants coming in. I believe this Bill is in the right direction. I have not gone into it fully; but I think the Railway Commission should have power to carry out the requirements of the Railway Act more fully than is the case at present. I believe the commission is overworked. If there were an office at Ottawa where any large question could be dealt with, and if there were agents in different parts of the country, the work could be very much facilitated. Therefore, I hope this Bill will receive the consideration it deserves. It has been proved beyond a doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has not been carrying out the law which was placed on the statute-book many years ago, and the parliament of Canada has allowed it from that time to this to go on violating the agreement it solemnly entered into with the people of Canada at that time. That contract is as binding to-day as it was then. I believe that this parliament should see that that law is carried out. These great corporations should not be allowed to over-ride the laws of the country. I hope this Bill will receive the careful consideration of the House, and will not be voted down, as it has been on previous occasions, for I can assure you that the country demands it.

In the interests of the country it is necessary that this Bill should be sent either to the Railway Committee or a special committee and there be given the consideration it deserves. If the government should see fit to take charge of the Bill, we care not whether we have legislation along those lines at the hands of the government or coming from a private member. What we want is that the large telephone companies should be compelled to transmit messages given them by other lines. I can see no reason why an individual who chooses to establish a telephone line should not receive the same consideration as if that line were established by a company, so long as it is up to the requirements. We know that a great number of telephone lines are in the hands, not of companies,

but of individuals, who get a fair revenue from them. The business is a paying one and a great accommodation to the people, but it would be a greater accommodation still and the revenue to the individual would be larger, if these individuals were given the same advantages as are possessed by a company. Therefore the present law does not go far enough and ought to be revised. It was the intention, I believe, of the former Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to introduce such legislation. He had a committee appointed which took evidence, and very valuable evidence, regarding the operation of telephone companies in general, but unfortunately when he left the cabinet, no one else took up the work where he laid it down. The Telephone Act should be so amended as to give our farming community—which is the class that should receive the first consideration at our hands—the advantages and the conveniences to which they are entitled. We have had an example in Hamilton the other day of what the labouring element can do when they unite, and the time has come, when the farmers, if they do not get better consideration at the hands of this House, in connection with their carrying trade, post office service, and telephone service, will also combine and force parliament to give them the legislation they require. Unless we meet the just demands of the farmers and the labouring classes, we shall have, what would be most unfortunate for this country, class divided against class. We shall have each class uniting its efforts to send its special representatives to this House. To prevent that condition of things, we should enact legislation which will prevent the large corporations from treating the general community unjustly, and there never was a time in our history better suited for the enactment of progressive legislation on these lines.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENT (West Kent). While I do not always agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), I wish to say that upon many of the points in his Bill I am thoroughly in accord. I am certainly in accord with him as regards the two-cent passenger fare. While the enforcement of our Railway Act is entirely in the hands of the Railway Commission, if any legislation establishing a two-cent passenger rate can be brought about by his Bill, I am prepared to support it. Our farmers are hampered more by railway fares than any other class. Other classes enjoy better advantages in the shape of railway rates than the farmer. I have had experience, and my experience leads me to support any amendment which will relieve our agriculturists from excessive railway charges and give them lower rates?

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). If this motion of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) be pressed to a vote on the second reading, I shall have to vote for the Bill. But in order that I may not be misunderstood as to why I would do so, I desire to say a few words. The last clause of the measure is the one which would induce me to vote that the House go into committee upon it; but in giving that vote I do not wish to be understood as supporting the other two clauses. The hon. gentleman, in the first section of his Bill—and I do not propose to criticise his drafting because I am in sympathy with his appeal to the House that he should not be held responsible, owing to his being a layman, for incorrect draughtmanship—proposes to bring in sleeping car companies and telegraph companies. In my opinion, if the section should pass in its present form, it would create confusion in the whole Railway Act, and I would have to see a drafting which would not make this confusion, before I could vote for the measure. As regards telegraph companies, I desire to say that, being in favour of the public ownership of telegraph and telephone companies, I could not vote to send their control to the commission. While I do not wish to say anything disrespectful about the Railway Commission, I do not think they are attending to the rights of the people, as regards railway companies, as they should. In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as saying that they are not trying to do what they can, but I merely take the charitable view that they are overworked. That being the case and also because I am not in favour, at the present stage of affairs, of any other solution of the telegraph and telephone question except that we should nationalize these matters, I could not vote for a Bill which would give a quasi control of these companies to the Railway Commission already overburdened with work as it is.

As regards the second section, which deals with the two-cent passenger rate, I stated last session why I was opposed to that, but lest I might be misunderstood, I shall briefly repeat what I then said. If we were to fix an arbitrary rate, applicable to every railway company, irrespective of the location of its line and all the circumstances—irrespective of whether it was a small struggling company, trying to get on its feet or a powerful corporation—we might in many cases defeat the very object we have in view. Suppose there is a railway trying to open up a part of the country at present inaccessible. Is it unreasonable that such a company should be allowed to charge twice as high a rate as would the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway for traffic between Montreal and Toronto or Toronto and Winnipeg? At present the Railway Commission have power not only to fix a maximum rate for both passengers and freight, but can make one rate for Manitoba, another for British Columbia, and another for the maritime provinces, and so on they have power to do

complete justice by making all rates in conformity with the conditions.

I have another objection, which I mentioned in a former discussion on a Bill similar to this introduced by the hon. member for South York last session. That objection is that the lowering of the passenger rates would mean an increase in the freight rates. The hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) demands that we shall prove that statement. But he himself admits there has been in Canada no condition of affairs which would actually show the effect of such a change. That is, he calls upon us to prove what the verdict was in a case that has never been tried. We must judge whether the hon. gentleman's opinion should prevail, or whether we shall pay greater regard to the opinions of others who have equal rights and ability with him to form a judgment. But, though we have not instances of the working of this principle before us, let us argue from facts that are not in dispute. It is not in dispute that the Railway Commission, in fixing rates, would have to consider the cost of building and operating the road and would allow such rates as would afford the investors a reasonable compensation, a reasonble profit, in carrying on the business. If they lowered passenger rates, then, as the railway companies would collect a smaller amount on that account, they would have to allow the company to make higher returns in some other way. And there would be no other source from which this could be made up except that of the freight rates. Even if the freight rates were not actually increased, the principle would remain the same, for it would be possible to give a reduction of freight rates but for the fact that the company had been prevented from collecting as large an amount in passenger rates as before. The hon. gentleman has given—and I commended him for it—several instances in which freight rates charged were higher than they ought to have been. But he has not brought in any amendment to remedy that, while the change with regard to passenger rates would, in my opinion, increase the freight rates. Now, who pays the bulk of the freight in this country ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The farmer.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree with my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). That hon. gentleman is a farmer and he has extensive dealings with farmers, and has had for years. I represent a county which has not only farmers and manufacturers, but has almost every industry that is to be found in Canada. And I believe that every one there, if I were to ask him the question, would give me the same answer as the hon. member for Wentworth has given—that the freight rates, in the long run, are paid by the farmer. The farmer must accept the price that is paid for his products in the market, and he must pay to carry them to that market. And, when he comes to buy his implements and farm supplies, or even the supplies for his house, the merchant through whom he buys must collect every dollar of what it costs him to lay down those goods where they are to be delivered to the farmer. If the desire is to benefit the farmer by this legislation, then, in my opinion, we should not insist upon this reduction of the passenger rates, but should leave that matter to the Railway Commission. Do not fix an arbitrary line which, by forcing a reduction of passenger rates may prevent a reduction in freight rates which otherwise would be made.

As to the third section of the Bill, I am heartily in favour of it. I was in favour of it last session, and I have not seen any reason since to change my mind. I was one who favoured free intercourse in traffic being allowed to all telephone companies on reasonable terms. I do not see the sense of giving the benefit only to the long distance line and not extending it to the little fellows. I am often told that I am too fond of helping the under dog. Well, perhaps it is not a bad fault. At any rate, I shall go on helping the under dog as long as he is in the right of it. If we must make a choice, then, in this growing country we ought to protect first the small concern rather than the big one. I believe that all telephone companies in this country should be placed on an equality in relation to long distance lines. The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) has mentioned instances that go to prove the need of this section 3 or of some similar enactment. I am in favour of this section three and believe that it would lead to a better condition of affairs than we have at present.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) seems to be in favour of the second reading of this Bill. I believe that he is right and that no reasonable ground has been given why the Bill should not be read the second time. He referred to a challenge made by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as to a certain alleged effect of applying the two cent passenger rate. It is said that this cannot be proved because the two cent rate has not been applied in Canada. But we have many examples of the application of the two cent passenger rate in the United States. We have only to look up the records there to prove whether the objections of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) has been verified. So far as our inquiry goes, there are no instances where freight rates have been forced up because passenger rates have been forced down. I take it that it would be the same in Canada. I think that one principle ought to be always

held in view by parliament, and that is that when a charter is given to a corporation to do business for the public, that corporation becomes one of the public utilities of the country, and it is incumbent upon parliament to reserve to itself the right to see to it that the public dealing with that company shall not be imposed upon.

That is partly incorporated in many of our Acts. We have gone part way in the Railway Act, and in some other Acts we have reserved the right to supervise the conduct of certain corporations and to control their tariffs so that they shall not impose on the public, but that applies only to a few. In my judgment it should apply to every corporation chartered by this parliament, to deal with the public along these lines. That is one reason why this Bill should be read the second time and eventually become law. There may be particular clauses to which I would not agree, but the Bill only requires amendment to bring it into accord with my view. It deals with three lines, first, with railways. They are partly under the control of the government to-day, they should be more under the control of the Railway Commission than they are. The Railway Commission has a partial power, I think it should have greater power, and we should give it the right to examine into and determine according to its judgment whether a railway corporation is imposing on the public or charging an exorbitant price under its charter or in any way overriding the rights of the people. If in their judgment this is being done then the commission should have authority to revise the tariff or change the methods of that railway which are detrimental to the public.

I hold that the very same principle applies to telegraph or telephone companies that applies to railway corporations. There is not much difference in my judgment between these, they are all public utilities; we have given these corporations power to expropriate the property of the people to expropriate the rights of the public to interfere with their affairs of life, to interfere with their property and in many cases to depreciate its value very much. For what reason? So that they may give to the public some service which the public have not been able to secure from any other source, but in giving them that right, we should always hold over them in our own hands, that control which would enable us at any time to make an inquiry and where they are improperly or unjustly interfering with the rights of the public or unjustly overcharging them we should have the right and should exercise the authority to compel them to give what would be regarded as a reasonable rate. I think that all of these rates should be on the basis of a reasonable rate per mile. I do not care whether the distance that a message is to be carried is long or short, we can determine what would be a paying rate for a short distance as well as for a long, and you should allow them to charge a reasonable rate for that message whether the distance is long or short, but that rate should bear some proportion to the distance that the message is sent. Or, you might arrange a system of zones as they do in the United States, and say that within a certain zone they shall be allowed to charge a certain rate and outside of that zone the rate shall be proportionately reduced because it is a longer distance and it is less costly, proportionately, to send a message a long distance than a short. We sometimes give several companies the right to do business in the same line. Where we do that we should compel them to handle the business originating on the line of the other in the interests of the public, and then they should receive only the rate that would be permitted if the business were handled by one line only. That is a principle that parliament should never allow to be violated. If freight is to be carried 100 miles by two companies, the combined rate should not be more than the cost of transportation by one company except for the extra cost of transhipping it from one road to the other. In like manner where a telephone message is being sent from one portion of the country to another and has to pass over two lines, they should not be allowed to charge a greater rate than the rate permitted over one line. There is no justification, in my judgment, for any extra rate and parliament should reserve to itself the right to control the companies in that respect and to say that they shall not impose on the public. I would refer to an example that came under my own observation many times. Many years ago we had practically only one telegraph system in Canada, I think under the control of the western union. It was a very oppressive system and they made exorbitant charges. Another corporation, I think the Dominion Telegraph Company, was chartered and built lines in several parts of the country, especially in Ontario. It gave a better service to the public than the old company, and the old company wished to stop the competition of its rival, but the new company by its charter was not allowed to amalgamate with the old company. The devices of men are very many. Able lawyers can often find ways and means of evading the law without much trouble. In this case it was suggested that they might arrange an understanding with the new company, that the business of the two lines would be done under some arrangement or understanding, I do not know what the nature of it was, but at any rate they became friendly. It then transpired that where there were two offices in a town or village they closed one and would do all of the business through the other, and wherever a message could be carried to any portion of the country where there was an office belonging to either line, the message

would be carried at one rate. The public were afraid that under this amalgamation or whatever it was they would suffer some injustice and they complained very much. They were met by the argument that they could send a message from any point to any other point, on whichever line it might be at one rate, instead of two. That apparently did away with the objection raised along that line. They continued that understanding for a long time, but, for what reason is only known to themselves, they abandoned that agreement.

To-day these same two lines are in existence and are under the control of one company. A message that is sent from the office of one line to some remote part of the country where there is not an office belonging to that line, but where there is an office belonging to the other line, and which message is sent over the two lines is charged a double rate and the people are now compelled to do what they feared they would be compelled to do if amalgamation took place. Parliament very wisely provided that they could not amalgamate, but they have, by their own ingenuity, overcome that very proper safeguard in the interest of the public and to-day, although they are not amalgamated, they are charging a double rate. What is the result ? I send a ten-word message from the village in which I live a distance of only fifteen miles. How much have I to pay for it ? I have to pay fifty cents for sending a ten-word message fifty miles. Is that not an imposition on the public ? For years and years we could send the same message for twenty-five cents. At one time it could be sent for fifteen cents. But to-day you are obliged to pay fifty cents. Then, you send another message sixty miles. I was surprised when I sent a message to the locality where I had often sent messages before for twenty-five cents when I was charged fifty cents for ten words. I inquired why I was charged the double rate and the answer was : It has to go over two lines. But these two lines are under the same control for many years and as far as I know they are are under the same control to-day. Yet they have accomplished it. One office in our village was shut up and the people were told when they objected : It makes no difference to you because if you send a message from here it will reach its destination the same as it did before. But, it does not reach its destination to-day. Where a message is sent over a line that has not an office in the town or village to which the message is sent you are charged a double rate. I say that should not be the case. I say that parliament should not allow it to continue. We have brought the telephones under the Railway Commission and if you bring the telegraphs under the Railway Commission as this Bill proposes you ought to give the commission power to compel them to send these messages to their destination at what would be regarded as a reasonable charge per hundred miles whether they are sent over one line or two so long as they have a working understanding between them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That would be an argument for amalgamation.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be, there is no doubt, but it gives the public the very safeguard they want whether there is amalgamation or not. They want a telegraph service and yet they do not want to be imposed upon by over charges.

I want to say another word in regard to telephones. I think that in connection with that business also they are imposing upon the public. If you want to call up a man in some part of the country and you ask the telephone office to get him they will charge you ten cents for giving him notice to come to the telephone. He is perhaps in the hotel within fifteen rods or fifty feet. It makes no difference; there is a charge of ten cents. If we send a telegraph message they are obliged to deliver that message within the corporation for nothing. The charge they make for sending that message is ample to cover the cost of delivery and there is no more trouble in notifying the customer who is wanted at the telephone when he is within the corporation than there is in delivering the message from the telegraph office within that corporation. There is no greater expense to the company and I say there is no reason in the world why they should be allowed to make a ten cent charge for sending out to get a man to come to the telephone. Then, they may not get him, but the charge is made all the same. You may call up again and if so they make another charge and you have to pay it. I say that is radically wrong. Wherever one telephone line reaches the lines of another company, whether it is a smaller company or a larger one, in view of the provision of the General Railway Act compelling both of these companies to have a standard line and instruments that are equally good, I say there is no reason why it should not be compelled to transmit a message from one to the other without additional charge. They should be allowed to make a per mile rate and divide that rate between the two companies so as to pay them proportionately for the distance that each one sent that message over its line. Until that is done the people who are using these corporations will not get the service which they are justly entitled to. These companies that we have given such large powers to oppress the people in many instances. They are public utilities and the people of the country desire to take advantage of them. We should keep control over them. The proposal of this Bill is to bring them under such control as will give parliament the right to control them in these respects. It is seeking to do that and for

these reasons I am in favour of the second reading of the Bill which I desire shall become law.

Mr. GILBERT H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the details of this Bill, but as there appears to be a feeling on the part of a number of the speakers that it is possible that the Bill may not be allowed to pass its second reading and proceed to the committee I wish just to say a word. This Bill includes a number of amendments to the Railway Act as, of course, different amendments to the Railway Act may be included in one Bill. I regret that all these amendments have been placed in one Bill. It is perhaps somewhat characteristic of the Bills introduced by the hon. member who has presented this one and it does not tend to bring that measure of support to his Bills that they might otherwise receive. I have in the past favoured one portion of this Bill. It may be that with fuller discussion I would see my way to support other portions of it. Other hon. members of the House doubtless feel the same way, and I think it would be a pity if this Bill were refused a second reading and refused an opportunity to go to the committee where it might be fully examined and changes made. For that reason I just wish to say that I would like very much that the Bill should be allowed to pass to its second reading and proceed to the committee where individual objections to certain provisions might be taken up.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, just one word or two in reference to this Bill. I supported it last year and I have not had any reason up to the present time to change my mind. There has been no change in freight or passenger rates during that time and I can only say that the passeger and freight rates in my section of the country are exhorbitant. Some hon. members have been talking about railway rates of 2½ cents, 3 cents and 3½ cents a mile. We always think if we are geting a four-cent passenger rate we are fairly fortunate. The argument has been made that if we pass legislation to reduce passenger rates the effect will be to raise freight rates. That might apply down here, but it could not very well apply in our country because the railways would have to go into the wheat storing business themselves as with the present railway rates in my district it would not pay to carry the wheat for 500 miles. They would have the wheat for the rates, and for that reason I do not think there is any danger of them raising freight rates. I am prepared to support the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is not very often my good fortune to agree with the views expressed by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) and on this occasion I cannot say I agree with him entirely, though, I am bound to say at the same time that there are many things in the speech which he delivered to which I can take no exception at all. The hon. gentleman uttered a good many sound principles coupled with a few heresies, but the heresies were so few in a comparison with his usual standard that I am disposed not to quarrel very seriously with him. On the whole I think the best interests of the country would be served by allowing this Bill to pass its second reading, and then refer it to a committee. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. McIntyre) the Bill is open to the criticism that there are many things in it which can hardly be said to be connected one with the other. But let us take them such as they are. The first section places under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission sleeping car companies and telegraph companies. We have already accepted the principle that railway transportation should be placed under the jurisdiction of the commission, and as sleeping car companies are essentially transportation companies I can see no reason why the same rule should not apply to them. The same thing may be said to a large extent with regard to the telegraph companies, and I therefore do not think any very serious objection can be taken to that proposition. But, I am afraid the same rule will not apply to the clause of the Bill which says :

> The tolls of any standard passenger tariff shall not exceed two cents per mile.

The reasons advanced against this clause by my hon. friend from Lincoln seem to me to be very strong and worthy of very serious consideration. It is impossible to apply a uniform rate of toil in all parts of the country ; it is impossible to apply the same standard of tolls to Ontario and Quebec as to the outlying districts in the distant provinces of the Dominion. The argument of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) seems not only worthy of consideration, but to be unanswerable. This question is not new ; it was the subject of very protracted and very serious, and very complete argument when the Railway Act of 1903, was introduced. We then thought it preferable, taking everything into consideration, to leave the regulation of tolls to the commission which was instituted chiefly, though not altogether, for this purpose. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has spoken of cases of discrimination. He says there is discrimination against Canadians and in favour of Americans on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That may be true, but I am not aware that such a complaint has ever been brought to the attention of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The hon. gentleman has also spoken of discrimination between locality and locality, and I think some such cases have been brought to the attention of the Rail-

way Commission and have been dealt with. Now, if a case can be made out that there is unfair discrimination against Canadians in favour of Americans by the Grand Trunk Railway Company why should not that be brought to the attention of the Railway Commission; why should not the person who thinks he is injured submit the matter to the commission, where it can be fully ventilated, where witnesses can be heard and where reasons can be given pro and con. I have faith that the commission would render justice. It may be that there is such discrimination as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) stated between Americans and Canadians, but if it be so I do not think discrimination would take place because the Americans are on one side and the Canadians on the other; probably my hon. friend is thinking of the old question as to the long and short haul. At any rate it is a matter which can be dealt with by the Railway Commission. If after the existing law has been tried and found wanting; if we should have to come to the conclusion that the commission is not adequately endowed to deal with such a question, then it may be that we will have to pass such legislation as is contemplated. But until the law in that respect has been tried and found wanting I think we had better adhere to the policy we have adopted of leaving these matters to be dealt with by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) next seeks to deal with telephone companies. We had that matter thrashed out last year; it is a delicate and complicated and difficult question to adjust. Strong arguments were brought on both sides last year. It was stated on the one side that one telephone company should be bound to give connection to any other company which sought it, and at first sight there seems to be a good deal of justification for such a conclusion. But on the other side it is represented that if you were to compel the long distance companies to give connection to local companies you would compel the long distance companies to give the benefit of its service without any sufficient remuneration for the capital it has invested. The matter perhaps was not fully thrashed out last year. It is a fair subject of debate and a fair subject for deliberation and for that reason I think the best thing we can do is, after we have passed the second reading of this Bill to have it referred to the Standing Committee on Railways. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) shakes his head. Does he mean that we should deal with this Bill in Committee of the Whole House? If he takes that position I regret to say that I shall have to disagree with him. Does my hon. friend think that the third section of this Bill which deals with the facilities for connection between local telephone companies and long distance telephone companies, is a matter that could be adequately dealt with in this House? That question certainly requires investigation, and for that reason as well as for others I think the Bill should be sent to the Railway Committee. It may be said that this committee is a very large one and difficult to handle, but there is no reason why a select committee should not be appointed to deal with this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the report of the telephone inquiry of the year before last give you all the information that can possibly be gathered?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In my opinion it is far from conclusive and exhaustive.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) made a very important contribution to the information on this subject in his speech of to-day, and as far as I am concerned I am much more inclined to agree with what he said to-day than I have been in respect to his statements on some previous occasions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is improving.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) made one remark with respect to the duties of the Railway Commission which I thought very significant, and especially so as it embodied very much my own views as to the operation of the law. He said that the main duty of the Railway Commission is to settle difficulties between the railways and the public, distinguishing these from the difficulties which arise between railways themselves. We have constituted this commission by a very important Act, and I agree with what my hon. friend has said as to the importance of that tribunal. I have said myself on a previous occasion that I think it is the most important tribunal in Canada to-day; it is invested with very important judicial functions, functions which touch the every day life of the people at every point, and not only that, but we have endowed the commissioners with quasi administrative powers. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) that it is the main duty of the commission to settle differences between the railways and the public, and for that very reason it seems to me that a question such as he has brought to the attention of the House to-day with regard to railway rates, is one that it is more proper to be settled by that commission than by any committee of this House whether it be the Standing Committee on Railways or a select committee. If the Railway Commission as constituted to-day is not a proper tribunal to deal with such a question it must be because the gentlemen who constitute that commission are not capable of performing the duties which devolve upon them under the Act. I am not prepared to say anything of the kind. I

think the Railway Commission for the most part discharge their duties very well. The chairman of that commission is a gentleman who has had a long judicial career in this country and is a very able man. While it is possible that the commission may be overworked, I am not disposed to say that it is not able to deal with a question of that kind. The Prime Minister, however, has said something in that regard which I think deserves a little comment. He has not brought to the attention of the House the responsibilities of the government in that connection. If the matters which have been brought to our attention to-day and on previous occasions by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) have not been brought to the attention of the Railway Commission, it is well for this House to remember that the government have certain responsibilities therefor. These are matters of a certain national significance ; and, by one of the sections of the Railway Act introduced by this government, and passed without a dissenting voice in this House, so far as this particular section is concerned, it is provided as follows. I am referring to section 24 :

The board may, of its own motion, or shall, upon the request of the minister, inquire into, hear and determine any matter or thing which, under this Act, it may inquire into, hear and determine upon application or complaint, and with respect thereto shall have and may exercise the same powers as, upon any application or complaint, are vested in it by this Act.

I agree at once that it was not the intention nor is it the spirit of this section that the government should undertake to deal through its Minister of Railways and Canals with every matter of trifling importance which might arise in the nature of a dispute between a railway company and the public; but in respect of a great question such as that which has been brought to the attention of the House today, it seems to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals should, before this, have assumed the duty which is imposed upon him by this Act, and should have taken steps under section 24 to have this matter determined by the Railway Commission of Canada; and I venture respectfully to submit to my hon. friend for South York and to this House, that that body ought to be able to investigate that question better than the members of this House or any committee of this House could possibly do—for many reasons, because, in the first place, it can give the necessary time to it, it can call before it experts, it has already had experience that would be of value in enabling it to come to a determination. For these and many other reasons it seems to me that that is the proper body to undertake an investigation of that kind, and the government should see to it without delay that an investigation of that kind is held. Whether or not the present Bill with regard to that particular section is crystallized into law, I propose later on in the session to move a resolution somewhat to the following effect :

That it is expedient that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada do inquire, determine and report with the least possible delay whether or not the tolls charged in standard passengers tariffs should be reduced so as not to exceed two cents per mile upon all or any of the railways in Canada.

That the government, under the provisions of the Railway Act, and especially the 24th section thereof, should forthwith take such steps as are necessary for this purpose.

One word more. There seems to be a misapprehension on the part of some persons as to what the provisions of the Railway Act are in certain important respects. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has referred to one instance in which two railways have been permitted, as he says, each to charge a local traffic rate in respect of goods carried for fifteen or twenty miles over one line and then continuously for fifteen or twenty miles over another line. All I have to say in regard to that is that there is a special provision of the Railway Act which forbids anything of the kind—I refer to section 266, which is to the following effcet:

When traffic is to pass over any continuous route in Canada operated by two or more companies, the several companies may agree upon a joint tariff for such continuous route, and the initial company shall file such joint tariff with the board, and the other company or companies, shall promptly notify the board of its, or their, assent to and concurrence in such joint tariff.

Then section 267 provides that if this is not done, any person who wants goods carried over that line can apply to the board, and the board can itself fix the tariff and apportion the rate between the respective railways. In respect to what has been said by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to difficulties arising under the Act of last session, section 32 of that Act provides that the section to which I have just now referred shall apply to telephone companies; so that, subject to the provisions of this Act as to standard lines and as to every company having proper equipment, it is today competent to apply to telephone companies those provisions of the Railway Act to which I have just alluded, and it does not seem that a difficulty of that kind can continue to exist if brought in the proper manner before the Railway Commission. So far as the other sections of the Bill are concerned, it does seem to me that what has been pointed out by my hon. friend from East Grey is a grievance which ought to have some remedy. I allude to what he said with regard to two telegraph companies each charging a local rate on a mess-

age although it was to be transmitted a very short distance. I do not think that condition of affairs should be allowed to continue, and I think the amendment to the law which has been suggested by the hon. member for South York with respect to the inclusion of telegraph companies in the provisions of the Railway Act is well worthy of consideration. So far as I am concerned, I also concur in the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I just wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the hon. member replies, any other member who wishes to speak may do so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. With regard to what the leader of the opposition has said as to the individual case of discrimination, I referred that to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and received their reply. I have only one page of the letter here having mislaid the other, but later on I will produce it. They found that they were not able to deal with the case, and that being so, I bring it before parliament. While I agree with a great deal of what the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition and other hon. gentlemen have said, I still maintain that while we have a law creating a railway commission it is largely the duty of the legislature to provide in that law definitions for the guidance of the board. In every State of the Union which has appointed a railway commission similar to ours, the passenger rate has been a matter of legislation and not a matter of judicial deliverance by the Railway commission. While the matter may be dealt with, perhaps on the lines suggested by the leader of the opposition—I hope it may—the commission will take the position that it is rather a matter of legislation than a matter of judicial decision by them; and it is almost too large a question for them to approach. The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) said that in Canada we had no experience on which we could base an opinion with regard to what would happen to freight rates if passenger rates were reduced. I can give you at least one instance. In the province of Manitoba, when they made that agreement for a three cent passenger rate to replace the previous rate of four cents, there was a provision for reduction of freight rates as well.

Mr. LANCASTER. You do not provide for that in your Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know, but in Manitoba when they reduced the passenger rates they reduced at the same time the freight rates.

Mr. LANCASTER. They made a bargain.

Mr. TAYLOR. The business was increasing.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The business was increasing and when the passenger rates went down so did the freight rates.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was not the passenger rates which put the freight rates down.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have been asked for an instance and I have given you one.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That was a matter of negotiation between the company and the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But it was no matter of negotiation with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which the next day did the same thing. In every state of the union, where they have these railway commissioners, and where the passenger rates were reduced, that reduction has not been followed by any increase of freight rates. Hon. gentlemen talk about the poor farmer, but let me give you another instance. This movement in the United States was started by the homeless '26' in the state of Pennsylvania—an organization composed of commercial travellers. I have here their statement that they are affiliated with the chamber of commerce and manufacturers and leading business men of the state and especially with the farmers and grangers who, as an association, endorsed the movement. The farmers, including the grangers, were at the bottom of the agitation in Pennsylvania, and it was they who reduced the passenger rates, and it is they who are at the back of all the agitation in the United States for a reduction of all kinds of railway charges, and they are the men who are bringing about these reductions. I like to hear hon. members say that in some way or other the poor farmers do not want cheap passenger traffic. I have never met one who did not, nor have I ever met one who was afraid the freight rate would be raised if he got cheap passenger rates. The objection is made that in some parts of the country small railways, which are opening up new districts, would be unjustly treated if compelled to give this low rate. What is there to prevent our making an exception in their favour? Parliament will readily grant such small companies a five cent rate if necessary. All that such a company need do would be to make out a case and parliament could deal with it. I am not now dealing with the small railways, but with the great ones such as the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if it will please hon. gentlemen, I shall be quite content to let my Bill apply only to them, and then let nature take its course with regard to the others. On the whole, I am well satisfied that this Bill should go to a standing committee, although I would much rather it had been referred to the Committee of the Whole

House. If, however, the right hon. gentleman insists, I cannot object otherwise than by protest. While he is good enough to say that he approves of a good deal of what I have said to-day, and while I am very happy to have that commendation from him, might I, in my turn, compliment him on coming around to my way of thinking. Twice this session have I had him in my company. I shall be glad to have him oftener in my company and I do not think he would suffer any damage if he were.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. We shall proceed with government orders in the order in which they appear on the paper.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 7, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 17) to amend the Act respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada.—Mr. Fisher.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898. He said: The Bill is in the same form as the one I introduced last year. It has been before the House for the past four years. Last year it was referred to the same special committee as the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) with reference to masters and mates. The purport of this Bill is an endeavour to have engineers on steamboats over and above the size mentioned in the Bill, certificated, in other words, that a man who does not hold a certificate from the Department of Marine and Fisheries enabling him to act as an engineer, shall not be allowed to do so. To the original Bill as introduced there was considerable objection. Engineers met the departmental officers last year, and I thought that the department was going to accept the Bill in the form in which I had introduced it; if not, then perhaps there could be made some slight amendment. For that reason I agreed that it should go to the committee, from which it never came back. This year, I hope it will not be necessary to send it to a committee, but that we may be able to deal with it in Committee of the Whole and that some legislation which the marine engineers are asking for, shall be placed upon the statute-book in this regard.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR REPORTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say to the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Frank Oliver) that last week he promised to lay upon the table, or hoped he would be able to lay upon the table, the report of the Interior Department. I have made inquiries, and it has not been brought down.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sorry that the report has been delayed in the Printing Bureau longer than I expected. I did hope to lay it on the table this week, but that has been impossible. It will be brought in as soon as it can be obtained from the Printing Bureau.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any more definite information as to when we may expect the whole or a portion of the Auditor General's Report?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry that I cannot give any information to my hon. friend on this matter. The Minister of Finance is not here to-day, but I will call his attention to it.

COLD STORAGE WAREHOUSES.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act to encourage the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the preservation of perishable food products, by granting aid out of the public funds towards the cost of construction of such warehouses.

Mr. SPROULE. Before you leave the Chair, I beg to draw attention to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture stated in answer to an inquiry last night that government orders would be taken up to-day as they appear on the order paper. Therefore we expected that the Minister of Finance would be ready.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was the expectation, but I am sorry to say that I have received a telegram from the Minister of Finance, who is in Montreal to-day, informing me that he cannot be here this afternoon.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought before we went into committee, that the minister, who was cut short the other day in making his explanations, would make some further explanation while you were in the Chair; because, I myself, and I think some other members, would like to hear full explanations in reference to this scheme.

Mr. FISHER. I do not suppose that my hon. friend, or the House, would like me to go over again what I said on a previous occasion; therefore I will try to join on to the remarks I then made what I have to say now, and what I say now will be preparatory to a description of the scheme. On a former occasion I remarked that the proposition now before the House had been put forward in general terms for some time. We felt, however, that it was necessary to consider the time at which such legislation should be introduced in order to ensure its being made practicable, successful and profitable. There would be little use for the government to encourage investments in an enterprise which was not profitable; on the contrary, I think it would be a hurt not only to the people who put their money into it, but to the country at large and especially to the industry that it was sought to encourage. I have felt that until the people at large fully appreciated the advantages of local cold storages and were interested enough in these enterprises to be willing to support them, I might almost say, be anxious to support them, it would not be in the interest of the country to encourage the establishment of these cold storage warehouses. I think, however, that at the present time we are in a fair way to this state of public opinion even if it has not already arrived. The only excuse for government assistance in the matter is that while there may be a fair hope and expectation—I think I might say a sure hope and expectation—in a very short time of the profitable utilization of these warehouses—profitable to those who use them and profitable to those who have invested in them—there may be a period before that arrives during which the enterprise may not be profitable in the ordinary commercial sense and during that period I think it is fair and just that the government should aid so as to secure a fair return for the capital invested and so as to ensure the proper carrying out of the enterprise. I think that is the only reason why the government should interfere and why the whole thing should not be left to private enterprise.

I would refer to one or two former attempts at this which have been successful and which I think justify my contention. I will refer to the creameries in the Northwest. Some twelve or thirteen years ago the people of the Northwest, especially in what is now the province of Alberta, thought there was room for creamery enterprises. Capital was invested, companies were organized and co-operative creameries were started. But, the conditions at that time were not sufficiently favourable to secure the profitable working of these creameries. That was partly due to the conditions of the country, partly due to the fact that the enterprise was a little before its time and partly due to the fact that the people who entered into it were not able to secure the confidence of the new settlers there who did not understand that kind of enterprise and who did not take hold of it in the same intelligent way that the farmers in the older parts of Canada had done. In 1896 and 1897 we found this condition of affairs There was a considerable investment of capital in the hands of companies that had failed, that were either in liquidation or were arrested in their operations. Examining into the matter it seemed that that was a country which was suitable for creamery enterprise and creamery organization, that if the initial and doubtful stages of the enterprise could be got over in a short time the conditions of the country would be such as to make creamery enterprise successful. Incidentally and in addition to that we held the view that the establishment of creamery enterprises there would tend very much to the settlement of the country, would give an impression of its character for settlement and help very much our immigration policy. We adopted therefore the plan of aiding in the establishment of these creameries. That was done and carried on for several years. I am glad to say—and the House knows it well—that in a few years these creameries were established on a firm basis, that to-day they are being conducted on a most admirable system without the government's assistance and that probably the organization of creamery work in the province of Alberta is the most complete and successful of any creamery organization in the Dominion of Canada or perhaps in the world. This is a specimen of government assistance for a few years to aid in putting a suitable and profitable enterprise on its feet.

Something similar was done in regard to cold storage on steamships. We encouraged steamship owners to put their money into cold storage equipment by granting them a portion of the investment and for a few years paying them certain subsidies. The result is that the steamships coming to Can-

ada are now practically all fitted out with cold storage or cool air storage accommodation for perishable products. I think therefore we have proved the advantage of this system of procedure, and I think we can apply the same principle to this object of encouraging local cold storages in the country.

I now would like to say a word as to why it is that I consider these local cold storages necessary at the present time. We have already certain private enterprises which have undertaken this work. All honour to them. They have gone through the initial stages, they have been able to make their business a useful business to the community, and I trust and believe—although I am not so well informed on that—profitable to themselves. They have been able to show to the rest of the country the value and advantage of such cold storage equipment. There are other parts of the country, however, where they have not had the same enterprising individuals or companies, where they have not had the advantage of the progress or development of this industry and it seems to me that the trade in our perishable food products is to-day suffering from the fact that there are not enough of these local cold storages in the centres where their existence would be justified to meet the requirements of the trade. I feel also that at the present time the men engaged in the trade, the producers of fruit, butter, cheese, meats, eggs, fish and poultry meat especially, in the different parts of the country, are now so well persuaded of the advantages of cold storage accommodation for their products that they are crying out for that accommodation, are eager to avail themselves of it and are fully persuaded of the necessity of it in their business. It seems to me, therefore, that the time has arrived when we ought to make an effort to secure the immediate establishment of a number of these buildings wherever the demands of the trade require. The natural and obvious criticism would be: If such is the condition of public opinion and of the trade, why should you need to assist? Well, we need to assist, I believe, because, although that is the condition of affairs, capitalists, or groups of individuals who might wish to put their money into it now in the full belief that in the near future there will be a profitable use of their cold storage accommodation, still hesitate and are fearful because it is a well known condition of this work, it has been the experience, I think, of nearly every cold storage company which has gone into the cold storage business in this country, that for the first two or three years after cold storage is supplied the people of the neighbourhood or district do not utilize it to a sufficient extent immediately to make it profitable. Therefore, I think we have to encourage the people to put their money into this investment by giving them such a bonus as will enable them to tide over the first few years of doubtful or unprofitable operation of their plant and machinery.

I was very loath to undertake this assistance. I feel myself that wherever it is possible it is better to leave to private enterprise the initiation of any work in the public service, but at the same time where I find, as I think such is the condition of affairs in this business to-day, that the business as a whole is suffering for want of certain accommodation and that private enterprise is slow to provide that accommodation, it is our interest as a country at large, the interest of every class in the community, to take a share in it and try to stimulate this investment and the provision of this accommodation and to aid as far as may be necessary to bring that about. For proof of the necessity of this, I have only to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Chisholm) which were received with approval by the members of this House, to the public press, to the agricultural press especially, which has been full of articles upon this subject; and to the pronouncements made in favour of this accommodation at the meetings of the various fruit growers' associations and agricultural conventions held within the last year or two. I believe there is a consensus of opinion that it is advisable for us to move in the direction of affording this cold storage accommodation. In Ontario the attention of the people has been turned particularly to cold storage for fruit and the necessity of providing proper means for holding our apple crop until the market is suitable. But that is not by any means the only business in Canada which requires cold storage facilities. I have read with much interest various estimates of the enormous waste that occurs in the Canadian apple crop, and while I cannot go so far as some of those who have estimated the enormous losses, yet I know that there is to-day a very large annual loss suffered by the producers and the handlers of our apple crop. I firmly believe that if local cold storages were provided in the country, so that soon after they are picked our apples could be placed in a cool atmosphere and held for a suitable market, it would result in immense profit to those who are engaged in that business. Apples are one of the most difficult of products to provide cold storage accommodation for. The expense of cold storage depends upon the cost of reducing the temperature in a given number of cubic feet of storage room, and the cost therefore depends very largely on the value of the articles stored. The value of a barrel of apples in relation to its bulk is not very great comparatively; a cubic foot of butter, of cheese, or of eggs is worth a very great deal more than a cubic foot of apples; and the value of cold storage must be calculated by the cubic foot because you have to cool the chamber with a plant the power of which is capable of cooling so many cubic feet capacity. It

is true that in the case of apples you do not require to freeze them. In order to hold butter for any length of time (not for simple transportation) it is advisable to cool down to about twenty degrees, while for apples, cheese, meats and eggs, you have only to cool to a temperature of 31 or 32, or 33 degrees. For the cool curing of cheese you only have to cool to a temperature between 50 and 60 degrees. Therefore, in computing the rate of charges for cold storage accommodation you have to take into consideration the temperature at which the chambers have to be held, and in estimating the profits on the business you have to consider the value of the article which you are storing; you cannot afford to pay as high a price for an article of small value per cubic foot of its requirements for cold storage as you can on an article of high value. It will therefore be seen that cold storage for apples is difficult to provide. They are bulky, they come all together at one season of the year; they do not stay very long in cold storage and to take care of them you must have chambers of large capacity, cooled to a temperature of about 32 degrees. If these chambers cannot be utilized for the cold storage of other products than apples you have to get all your revenue during the few months of the year when apples are stored. The demand for cold storage for apples is greater in the provinces of Ontario and Nova Scotia, than in Quebec, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island. In Ontario, however, there is a considerable quantity of eggs which require cold storage of about the same temperature as apples require it, and there is also a considerable demand for poultry meat cold storage. I am glad to say that in recent years the trade in poultry meat has increased enormously and I think there is room for still greater development. As usual—and I have to be complimentary to Ontario again—Ontario has taken the lead and there is a great deal more poultry meat produced and stored in Ontario than in all the rest of the country together. In the maritime provinces there is an insistent and a very proper demand for cold storage for fish. It has been a subject of regret to every one who has studied the Canadian fish trade that to a large extent the supply of fresh fish in Canada has been in the hands of the American companies. It is an actual fact that a very large proportion of the sea fish which is consumed in Montreal and in Ontario comes through the United States. It is caught on the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, but it is taken to the United States cities and then shipped in cold storage to the central part of Canada. The reason of that is that the United States fish companies have facilities for handling this trade which our own people in the maritime provinces have not. Incidentally I may remark that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is taking steps this year to try and provide cold storage transportation for fish from the maritime provinces to the central and western parts of Canada, and from the west to the east where the trade demands it. Complementary and supplementary to that there will be a necessity in the maritime provinces for cold storage into which fish may be put immediately after they are brought to shore and kept until a suitable time for shipping them to market. This cold storage for fish in the maritime provinces is just as much needed as cold storage for fruit, meats, eggs or similar products in Ontario and Quebec. In saying this, I do not wish to be supposed to be excluding the maritime provinces from the need of cold storage for these other products. Even to-day there is a considerable poultry production in the maritime provinces and a very large apple production, especially in Nova Scotia; so that both kinds of cold storage will be required in those provinces. Since the announcement was made, I have had two or three applications for the establishment of cold storages in the maritime provinces, as well as a number from the province of Ontario.

I do not know that I need say anything more on the general question. I will now give a little more explicit explanation of the Bills I have to bring in. I have already said that it is proposed to authorize the minister to enter into contracts with individuals or companies for the establishment of cold storage warehouses, and we propose to impose conditions upon those individuals or companies. The first among the conditions is that we should control the rates that are going to be charged for accommodation in the warehouses. I think that it is called for and is perfectly legitimate. We have power to control railroad rates; we have power to control other rates in regard to public utilities—and I look upon this as a public utility in so far as we are subsidizing it. I appreciate that it may be considered to be a private enterprise; but at the same time if that private enterprise is called into being and is existing by reason of public assistance. I believe the public has a right to demand that the charge to the public for the use of that service shall be regulated and controlled by the representatives of the public. I therefore propose to provide in the Bill that the rates to be charged shall be subject to revision and control by the government. I also propose inasmuch as the whole essence of this proposition is that cold storage accommodation shall be provided, that the temperatures maintained in these buildings shall be subject to approval of the government as representing the people. I have pointed out already that different articles require different temperatures. This necessitates that the building shall provide not merely one big chamber, but a number of chambers in which different articles may

be stored at temperatures suitable to the proper preservation of those articles. I have already said that it is not our object to create unfair competition with existing private enterprises. Therefore I think I may lay it down that no building would be approved and a contract entered into for it if it were going to compete unduly and unfairly with existing cold storage facilities. I do not think I need go into that at greater length further than to say that the question of that competition is not a very easy one to solve. A cold storage building ought to be of a size and equipment sufficient to serve the needs of the district around it. Different people may have different ideas as to the distance which perishable food products could be brought profitably to a centre to be put into cold storage. That might depend very much upon the facilities for transportation. A centre where a large number of railroad lines converged might serve a larger area than a centre where that was not the case. A sparsely settled district not producing much of these perishable food products might be served for a radius of fifty or one hundred miles, while in another case, where the whole country side was practically devoted to the production of perishable food products, we might have three or four cold storage warehouses not more than twenty or thirty miles apart. The question, therefore, of deciding upon the propriety of establishing cold storage accommodation in certain centres or localities is one to be approached with the greatest care and consideration, and I cannot to-day lay down any numerical definition of the number of miles which one cold storage should be from another. Again, the size and capacity of the building will have to be regulated. It would be manifestly improper and unprofitable to have a large investment and a great cold storage accommodation in a district where there was not to-day or for some years to come likely to be a large production of these perishable food products. Therefore, in the conditions which I shall have to lay down, in the interest of investors as well as in the interest of the country at large, which has to pay these bonuses, the location of the warehouse and its size or capacity must be subject to the approval of the government. Then, I would provide for official inspection and supervision of the keeping of the buildings. I should want to see that they are kept in a sanitary and cleanly condition, and I should propose to see that any building subsidized by the government in this way was inspected periodically. We impose these conditions in consideration of the assistance we give. That assistance it is proposed to give by way of a bonus. I have suggested, after a very great deal of thought and consideration of the matter, that that assistance or bonus should be given in such a way as to encourage the investor and aid his investment through the initial, and what I might call the uncertain, years of the enterprise.

I have no doubt that within two or three years practically any cold storage building in Canada will pay a good return on the money invested in it if its location and size have been carefully chosen. At the same time I find that capital is a little frightened about investing in this enterprise. I have had a good many people tell me they have been approached and asked to put money into this enterprise, but they say it is a thing about which they know nothing and which seems a risky business. I want to encourage these people to put their money into the enterprise and to assure them that during a fair and reasonable period, there will be no danger of their losing on their investment. I think, therefore, that the best way to arrange that bonus is to give them a substantial payment on the completion and equipment of the building, that is when they have made the chief investment, and I therefore propose to give them 10 per cent of the total cost of the building as a straight bonus on the completion and equipment of the building to the satisfaction of my inspectors, that is when the establishment is ready for business.

I said the other day that I had not made up my mind just how the rest of the 30 per cent of total bonus should be allowed. I thought that 30 per cent of the whole investment ought to be abundant assistance to encourage investors. I think it ought to tide them over the initiatory or trial stages and to do that, although I wish to have more discussion and to ascertain the views of different gentlemen interested before making a final statement, I am inclined to propose an additional payment for each of four years of 5 per cent on the total cost. That is to say, on the completion of the building 10 per cent, at the end of the first year's operation, 5 per cent, and so on for four years, making in the total 30 per cent of the whole cost. It seems to me that this is a sufficient bonus to encourage investors and to bring money into the enterprise, to secure the organization of companies and the erection of buildings, and that if the bonus is so distributed it will in the first place help the original payment on the business and in the second place help the operation through the early years of the enterprise, when it is possible it might not give a profit.

The Bill which is now in the hands of the Law Clerk, almost ready for presentation, will contain the provisions necessary for carrying out the proposals I have mentioned. I wish this Bill to provide definite and clear instructions to me as minister, or to the minister whoever he may be, of the line of procedure intended by parliament for this, I might call it, new departure in our legislation, and I think that when

the hon. gentlemen have the opportunity of reading the Bill in print and discussing its provisions they will find that as far as may be foreseen the necessary provisions and the necessary safeguards are contained in the Bill to provide that this assistance shall be given properly and rightly under circumstances which would justify the enterprise in each individual case and so as to secure the satisfactory working of the enterprise after it is once started.

One difficulty I confess I have not been able to overcome. I propose to make payments extending over four years; I have not yet been able to work out any system of control or security which shall ensure the continuance of the buildings for this purpose after those four years. I have not the slightest doubt of the continuance because I am perfectly satisfied that after the first years of operation the business will be so profitable and so satisfactory and so needful to the community that it will be folly for the owners to change it to any other business. But at the same time I do not know how to work out any security to the public of the continuance of the business without imposing such a mortgage or lien upon the buildings as would frighten investors from putting their money into the enterprise. At first I thought we might impose a mortgage on the buildings and equipment to cover our part of the investment and to secure that, if the building at any time was used for any other purpose, that mortgage could be put into force and the country take back what it had given; but in conversation with business men—and on thinking over it myself I am inclined to that view—it was suggested that such a mortgage as that would absolutely preclude and frighten out any money from being invested in these buildings and that the probability is that no company would undertake such an obligation. I do not want that, I want this proposal to be such as would invite the immediate and rapid investment of money in these buildings. It is with that object that we are introducing the legislation. That is what I consider to be the interest of the trade and of the country to-day, and to put any condition or proviso into the Bill which would frighten capital away or which would prevent the utilizing of this measure, would defeat the whole object of the Bill. And I am told, and it is insisted upon to me, that any such provision as that would have that effect and that the result would be to neutralize if not absolutely spoil the whole proposition as I am introducing it. If I could see my way clear to something of that nature which would not have that effect, I should be only too glad to introduce it, although I myself consider that we are quite safe in doing what we propose to do without that safeguard, because I am so sure of the position of affairs in the country, of the demand for this kind of work, and of the ultimate profit of the business, that I am quite certain that nobody would want to change the business when they have once commenced it. I may say that I am confirmed in that by our experience in regard to cold storage on ships. The shipping companies were very fearful indeed, very loath to put cold storage equipment into their ships. They said: It will not be utilized and we will have to throw it out. As hon. gentlemen are aware I made provision that for three years they must keep it in order to get the full benefit of the bonus that I gave them. I have yet to hear of a single one of those companies to which we gave that bonus that has taken out the system, and I have yet to hear of a single ship coming to the Canadian shores, which, after having a cold storage equipment put into her, whether bonused or not bonused, from which that equipment has been removed. The growth of the demand for cold storage accommodation on ships has been such that every ship owner, after once having introduced it into his ship, has been satisfied that it paid him and was necessary to the successful working of the ship, to keep it in. I believe the same thing will occur in regard to these cold storage warehouses, and therefore I have no hesitation in proposing this arrangement without the safeguard I have alluded to—though, if I could have such a safeguard without interfering with the success of the proposition, I would be very glad indeed of assistance in working out such a safeguard.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to ask the minister whether it is his intention to distribute this money over the country so that each province may have a certain proportion? Or may it be spent in one or two provinces in which applications are made?

Mr. FISHER. I have not made any undertaking concerning that, nor have I found it necessary to consider it. I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) frankly, that I have, I believe, provided in this year's estimates for more money than will be called for on this account, in the whole of Canada. I may be mistaken. I think I explained that I propose an item of $100,000. This would furnish the first payment of bonus at the rate of 10 per cent, on an investment of $1,000,000.

Mr. BLAIN. But if application were made for the expenditure of that whole amount in the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec, would the hon. gentleman spend the money in those provinces?

Mr. FISHER. I would try to distribute it as fairly as possible according to the demand, considering the applications made and with a view to providing first for those localities in which the greatest demand existed. I would certainly try to make a fair distribution over the whole country.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention to give assistance to plants already established ?

Mr. FISHER. I have already said that it is not.

Mr. HAGGART. While the hon. minister is answering questions, will he tell me why he does not leave it to the capitalists interested to choose the location of these establishments ? Why does he insist that the government shall have the choice of the location ? Another question : From the minister's statement I gathered that different articles that are to be put in cold storage, require different temperatures. In that case, would the same building do for the cold storage of eggs, butter and say, apples ?

Mr. FISHER. The same building, yes—but in different chambers. A cold storage warehouse might be one huge chamber to be all cooled at one time, but that is not usual. The usual plan, even where the temperature is to be the same throughout, is to cut the building up into different sized chambers. They might have a butter chamber, for instance, that would accommodate ten thousand packages. But, if they have only one thousand packages, they would prefer to cool only a chamber of sufficient size to accommodate that quantity. A cold storage building will have not only insulated outside walls, but insulated inside chamber partition. In that way, different articles can be stored in the different chambers. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked why not leave the choice of location to the capitalists interested. In a general way that is a pretty safe rule to follow. But I am sorry to say that there are a great many capitalists, or rather, a great many promoters, whose only anxiety is to procure the investment without much care for other considerations. I do not want to see money invested where there is no legitimate demand for the accommodation. And perhaps I shall not be regarded as boastful when I say that I think the officers of my department know better, in regard to this business, where there is a legitimate demand and necessity for this kind of accommodation, than the average capitalist does, and I would rather take the opinion of those officers upon such a matter. I would say further, that I would be quite disposed, wherever there appeared to be a reasonable demand for the accommodation, to grant the assistance.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The hon. minister has referred to cold storage establishments in the maritime provinces for the preservation of fish, and has said that our fish go by a roundabout way through the United States to be distributed afterwards in the different provinces of Canada. I would like to ask whether in the distribution of this money there is to be a certain sum set apart for the cold storage of fish ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Then, the whole amount may be taken up in Ontario and Quebec, without doing anything to help on the work of the cold storage of fresh fish in the maritime provinces.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) evidently did not follow me in what I said. I explained that I did not believe that there would be a sufficient investment in these establishments within the year to take up the whole of the vote. Before I can pay this money over, individuals or companies have to organize ; they have to submit their plans to the department and get their location authorized ; they have then to construct their building and equip it. I shall be very much astonished if even half a million dollars is invested in this way in Canada within the fiscal year for which I am to ask this vote. I hope it may ; I shall be glad if a million dollars be so invested. But I tell my hon. friends frankly that I do not expect it. Therefore, I believe that any cold storage which fulfils the necessary accommodation will receive this grant. Of course, if, toward the end of the year, the grant runs out, I can only ask a supplementary estimate at the next session of parliament so as to meet the requirements of the year. I have used my best judgment in deciding upon the amount of the vote—and, when I say that, I do not mean my own judgment only, but I have discussed the matter with a large number of men who have been looking into this matter for a long time, as I have myself. We have no hope of the investment of $1,000,000 in this business within the course of one twelve month.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it contemplated to give assistance towards the building of cold storage establishments outside of Canada to handle perishable Canadian products ?

Mr. FISHER. No, that is not contemplated under this vote.

Mr. ALCORN. Will the assistance extend to the purchase of land or only to the putting up of the building ?

Mr. FISHER. It will extend to the whole investment.

Mr. LALOR. Does the department furnish plans and estimates of cost ?

Mr. FISHER. We have in the department a number of prepared plans. Moreover we shall be ready to aid in the preparation of plans by supplying information. But I think it would be desirable that the private individuals or companies interested should supply their own architects to be responsible for the carrying out of their

own work. Plans and specifications will be submitted to us for approval and we shall be glad to aid by supplying information for the preparation of the plans; but I would not like to undertake, on the behalf of the department, to supply plans and specifications for an individual building in a particular place. I think that ought to be the work of the other parties to the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that it is the intention, if I understood him correctly, to pay thirty per cent on the investment. The question has just been asked whether that would include the investment in the land? I understand that it would include the land as well as the buildings?

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the property purchased were inside a city or town where the price is very high, would the government include that in the calculation upon which the payment of thirty per cent would be based?

Mr. FISHER. I would say in general terms that the idea is to give thirty per cent of the whole investment. That investment, however must be considered before it is approved. I was talking about this to a gentleman yesterday, who spoke about the purchase of a rather expensive building and fitting it up as a cold storage. Now if he chose to buy an expensive building, the excess of expense over that which was necessary for effective cold storage, I would not be disposed to consider as a portion of the proper investment. I would say a building of such and such a character as the shell in which insulation accommodation could be provided would be sufficient; and if you chose to buy a building of an ornamental character worth double as much as was necessary, I would not count the excess in the amount on which I would pay a bonus. The same way with land. There would be no necessity in buying a corner lot in a booming city on which to put a cold storage building. If you chose to do that, you have to pay for it yourself, and we will not give you thirty per cent on the money.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps I owe an apology to this House for having provoked the minister to rise to his feet. I thought, after he had been choked off on Tuesday for being out of order, and after he had made then the greater part of his speech, that perhaps he would occupy five or ten minutes in supplementing it. He has occupied about an hour, and I fancy now that when we get into committee no further explanation will be necessary. Representing as I do one of the largest agricultural constituencies in the province of Ontario, and one devoted principally to the manufacture of cheese, I will support with both hands any measure whose object is to improve the cheese and butter industry. But since the hon. gentleman became Minister of Agriculture he has squandered so much of the farmers' money in fads of one kind and another, that I think we need carefully to look into this enterprise and inquire whether it is launched for political purposes, or whether it is for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of appointing, as he says he will, a number of inspectors and others. We want to know in what manner the people are going to be benefited, and how the money is to be expended. I will refer to some of the fads on which the hon. gentleman has spent a lot of the people's money among them being the cool curing of cheese, the fattening of chickens with squirt guns, and so forth. But before dealing with that part of the question I want to say that I never have and never will take much stock, nor do I think that the people of this country will take much stock, in a gentleman who, either by his voice or through the press, makes statements not in accordance with the facts. I hold in my hand a document which I presume was written by the Minister of Agriculture if not written, certainly dictated and approved by him before it went into the printer's hands. It is a campaign document entitled 'Political Pointers, No. 2, 1902.' I will read a few extracts from this document. I am satisfied the minister must have prepared them, because I do not think any person is employed in this country who would write such eulogies of the minister except himself.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party promised the electors during the elections of 1896 to work for the improvement of the condition of the agricultural class. The first act of the present Prime Minister on assuming the administration of the country was to call to the Department of Agriculture a practical farmer. Under the last administration there were at the head of the Department of Agriculture, lawyers, doctors, brewers, or other persons having neither technical nor practical knowledge of agriculture.

Mr. Laurier deemed that under his administration it should be otherwise, and called to the Department of Agriculture Hon. Sydney Fisher, a farmer with more than twenty years experience, and one knowing full well the needs of those who, like himself, were engaged in the development of the soil of Canada. The results of this wise policy are to-day being felt throughout the whole country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (reading)—

Mr. Fisher, while practising in the internal administration of his department in Ottawa the strictest economy, while reducing the number of employees of his department——

I would ask the hon. gentlemen who say 'Hear, hear,' if that is correct, if the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture has been reduced since the present minister took hold of it.

—and the total amount paid to them in salaries, has succeeded in rendering the administrative work more effective and more useful to the agricultural class. . . . . The work for which Mr. Fisher should be especially commended is the development and perfection of the system of cold storage for the transportation of perishable agricultural products. Thanks to this system, the export of butter, poultry, eggs, fruits and other perishable products has more than tripled since 1896. At the present time, owing to the system of cold storage which Mr. Fisher has established at the creameries and on the ocean steamers, Canadian farmers can export all their perishable products with the certitude that these will reach their destination in perfect condition, and that the carriage will not depreciate their value.

Now if he had done all that when he wrote this document, why is he asking for this further expenditure to-day? Then he goes on :

To secure these advantages, the Department of Agriculture in the first place sent out its experts to aid in the establishment of creameries. It has also informed Canadian farmers of the kind of produce most in demand in Great Britain, and its experts have instructed farmers how to kill and dress poultry for shipment to Britain, and how to prepare and pack other farm produce intended for the British market. It has supplemented this work by agreements with the Canadian railway companies and with the ocean steamship companies for the carriage of these goods in cold storage. During the export season every Canadian railway company reaching tide waters by its own line or by its connections, runs at least one cold storage car every week from the inland terminus of its line. The farmers shipping produce in the car pay the railway charges, but the government guarantees to the railway companies two-thirds of a carload of produce. By doing so, it secures regularity and continuity of service. At the ports the government provides cold storage warehouses for the reception and storage of produce until it can be carried on shipboard.

He told the farmers of this country then that every railway company ran a car with cold storage from the terminus of its line down to the shipping port, and there the government had provided warehouses to hold their produce until it was ready for shipment. To-day he goes back on that statement, and says to the people of Canada, what I told you in 1904 was only for election purposes. But he wrote to the farmers again in 1904, in a 'Hand-book on Canadian Politics—Liberal Government from 1896 to 1904.' There are several pages in it devoted to the Minister of Agriculture, probably written, as the former one, by himself.

The record of the Laurier government before the farmers of Canada, as shown by the administration of the Department of Agriculture, was completely endorsed in the elections of 1900.

What was the statement on which the farmers endorsed the Laurier government ? He had been telling the farmers that they had cold storage warehouses at Montreal that would hold all their supplies, cheese, butter, eggs and chickens that came there, and that they had cold storage also to the inland terminal of every railway in Canada, with warehouses to receive their goods until they were ready to ship them.

The main items of that administration then before the public were :

The establishment of a complete chain of cold storage transportation from the farm in Canada to the consumer in Great Britain.

Then he goes on to talk about cattle quarantine and several other things after which he comes back to cold storage:

The system of cold storage transportation provided refrigerator chambers at the creameries ; refrigerator car service to carry perishable products to the sea-board ; the establishment of cold storage warehouses at the chief points of export ; the provision of the ocean-going vessels of efficient mechanical cold storage chambers. By reason of these improvements, Canadian butter and other perishable products could be laid down in the British market in good condition ; the result was an immediate advance in the position of these Canadian products in the English market, where before Danish, Australian and New Zealand butter stood considerably higher than Canadian butter ; Canadian butter advanced to the second place, running the Danish pretty hard in the race.

Then he goes on a little farther to say:

During the last few years much reckless criticism of the Minister of Agriculture has been indulged in. An abundant opportunity for formal indictment was afforded during the last session of parliament, but only two attacks were made ; one by Mr. Taylor, the Tory member for Leeds and Grenville, the chief whip of the opposition, on July the 27th ; the other by Mr. E. D. Smith, M.P., for Wentworth, on July 29th.

Another statement that he placed in this book about what he had done for the farmers of Canada was this:

Some minor experiments, including the paraffining of cheese were tried at the central curing rooms. The Department of Agriculture is continually experimenting in connection with all its work.

And it goes on to state what the paraffining of cheese had done for the farmers of Canada in regard to advancing the price. Now, we have a monument to the minister's folly at Brockville, erected at great expense by the country, and at two or three other places in the Dominion for the purpose of cool curing cheese. The hon. minister spent of the people's money $107,886.14, up to the first of March of last year. The revenue received was $32,451.51, showing a loss to the farmers of this country of $75,-434.63. I want to ask the hon. minister and to ask any farmer living in the neighbourhood of where that monument has been erected what benefit it has been to him. Let me read what one of the hon.

minister's warmest supporters, one of the largest cheese producers in that district said of it a short time ago. I refer to Mr. M. K. Everetts, one of the largest cheese producers in the county.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. He did not avail himself of the curing room.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, and there is no man within twenty miles who has availed himself of the opportunity of curing his cheese in this room unless the government paid for the hauling of the cheese and putting it in there. The country paid for these men drawing their cheese from the factories and many would not allow it to be drawn and put in there. Mr. Everetts said at the weekly cheese board at Brockville :

Before the sale of cheese was taken up, Mr. K. Everetts, the extensive cheese manufacturer, who now resides in Smith's Falls, spoke at considerable length, roundly denouncing the Ottawa government on its dairy policy, particularly the introduction of the experimental cheese curing stations which he characterized as the biggest humbug ever imposed upon the people.

That is talk from a Liberal, talk from one of the biggest cheese producers in the country. He went on:

Mr. Everetts introduced the subject by reference to the resolution from the Ottawa Cheese Board, read at a previous meeting of the Brockville Cheese Board, asking the co-operation of the latter organization in bringing before the Eastern Ontario Butter and Cheese Association the matter of having cheese graded as finest, seconds and thirds. He did not agree with the suggestion. Brockville section was making nothing but finests and he urged the Brockville board to have nothing to do with the scheme whatever. This led up to a fierce attack upon the methods adopted by Prof. Ruddick, chief of the dairy division, in the discharge of his duties. Mr. Everetts took occasion to hand out a few caustic remarks bearing on the government curing stations, one of which is established in Brockville. The Ottawa government, he held, in creating these stations, was taking upon itself a burden which the calls of the trade did not demand. Each province should look after its own improved methods of manufacture, while the duty of the Dominion government was to provide for up-to-date transportation services by rail and water. The money used in the erection and carrying on of these curing rooms was a useless expenditure. Mr. Everetts claimed that the results achieved did not warrant their continuance in operation. They did not aid the patrons in obtaining one-sixteenth of a cent more for their cheese than others. He challenged a single person to contradict him. These rooms were held up as models for others to follow. How many had built curing rooms after the fashion of the Brockville 'pine monument.' Not a one. And as to the cost of construction, operation, &c., the country was yet in darkness, notwithstanding a deliberate promise made by Prof. Ruddick last year to give such information. Mr. Everetts said the dairymen were getting their eyes opened. There was too much playing to the gallery by men in high places.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. Everetts says that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was playing to the gallery bidding for votes.

The public would not be fooled all the time and the truth will come out sooner or later. He was willing to wager that next season cheese would not be hauled to the government cool curing room in Brockville at the government's expense. Mr. Everetts criticised Prof. Ruddick's doings along other lines and complained that at the gatherings of 'experts' to talk over matters pertaining to the trade, manufacturers and producers—the big men behind the industry, the men who have invested their money—were not called in consultation.

There is the opinion, if the hon. minister wants it, of one of his strongest supporters, one of the biggest cheese producers in this country in reference to the cheese curing room fad on which the hon. minister spent $107,000 of the people's money and he is closing these curing rooms up to-day because they have turned out just as Mr. Everett said. The hon. minister made a promise here the year before last that he would not pay for the hauling of any more cheese. He would not have got any more cheese if he had not continued paying for the hauling of it. He announced last fall that the station would be closed up. This $107,000 spent in building and machinery is a monument to the folly of the Minister of Agriculture.

The same thing may be said in reference to his poultry fattening stations. He spent $54,783.56 to teach people to fatten and kill chickens and the revenue which he derived from that experiment was $14,727.14, a loss to the country of $35,056.62. If you go to the districts where these poultry fattening stations are established, you will find that the men employed there are political friends of the government drawing large amounts of money for keeping a chicken pen, buying a few chickens and selling them. It represents a big loss to the country every year. These are things we know about and it looks as if the fad he is proposing before the House is something on the same lines. He proposes to take a man by the throat and say: You have to put up a building where we say; we will approve of the plans and the place and we will put one every twenty-five miles. I wonder what size of a building he would have to put up every twenty-five miles to hold the apple crop of Prince Edward. He would have to have one on every farm. A building every twenty-five miles would store the eggs, but if you want to store the apples you would have to have an air cooling room on every farm. The hon. minister said to the farmers in 1904: We have a train running every day to Montreal and when you ship your apples we have cold storage there to hold them until you are ready to export them. Now, he comes and says that when he made that statement he made a statement that was not correct. Now he wants to bonus pri-

vate enterprise to do what he told us in 1904 he had already done. While the hon. minister proposes to give assistance to the extent of ten per cent for the year there are hundreds of thousands of cold storages established by private enterprise all over the country. There is hardly a town you go into but has its cold storage facilities for all these articles. It looks to me that this is a political move on the part of the Minister of Agriculture; he intending to hold it up to the farmers of this country as another election dodge and in order to place in his hands the appointment of a lot of officials.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is a remarkable speech coming from a man who represents the best county of Ontario in the production of fancy cheese.

Mr. TAYLOR. And every one of them agrees with me about the cold storage.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that Mr. D. M. Wilson, of Gananoque, who lives in his constituency and who is possibly our largest cheese dealer, has patronized the cold storage this year by shipping all the cheese he could possibly get to the cool curing room at Brockville.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the government pay the freight on it.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The government paid no freight on it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Somebody did.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Mr. Wilson sent the cheese to the cool curing room at Brockville of his own accord. There was a shipping arrangement with the railway company by which at a rate of two cents a box a transfer is made at Brockville to the cool curing room and the cheese afterwards goes forward on the same bill of lading from Brockville to Montreal.

Mr. TAYLOR. It cost him nothing to get his cheese to Brockville.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Whether it cost him nothing or not, my point is that Mr. Wilson shipped his cheese to Brockville and found it advantageous to put it in the cool curing room there. I say, Sir, that the government acted wisely in giving us these cool curing stations. With the possible exception of Prince Edward county, no county in Canada has benefited more than has Leeds county from the establishment of cool curing rooms in connection with the factories. Those interested in the trade in Prince Edward county visited Brockville and saw the facilities furnished there; they saw the superior quality of the cheese produced; they saw that a higher price was received for these cheese and they at once commenced the building of cool curing rooms in connection with their factories, so that nearly every factory in that county has its cool curing room to-day. That same remark applies to a certain extent throughout the whole province of Ontario. Of course a good deal remains to be done in the development of this system and a good deal will be done during this next year. I want to say here that the facilities which have been furnished by the Minister of Agriculture, beginning with cool curing rooms, and continuing on refrigerator cars on the railways refrigerating compartments on ocean vessels to the ultimate destination of our cheese in the British market, has represented an addition to the wealth of the country of $3,500,000 a year for every year this government has been in power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Yes, and I say that while this government has acted wisely and well in most of its administrative acts nothing has so tended to the welfare of the country as the policy of the Minister of Agriculture in connection with the production of fancy cheese and butter and the placing of it in prime condition on the British market. When the refrigerator car system was first established it was not satisfactory, but that was to be expected in the initiation of any new enterprise. We found that a great many cars which were not ieed were paid for, but when we notified the Minister of Agriculture he at once took the matter up with the dairy commissioner, and an inspector was appointed at Montreal to see that when these cars arrived the cheese was in a cool condition and to ensure that no car was paid for which did not provide the proper facilities. The same rule was applied to the ocean steamers. Inspectors were appointed at London, Glasgow, and Bristol, who saw to the condition in which the cheese arrived at these ports, and it was only when the ships delivered our products in good condition that they were paid any bonus. The policy of the government has been amply justified by the results in our trade this year. We obtained higher prices in 1906 for our butter, our cheese, and our bacon than ever were before obtained in the history of the Canadian trade. We obtained $55,000,000 for our products last year, and it is a safe calculation to make that five and a half million dollars were added to the wealth of the country in this past year alone by reason of the furnishing of these cold storage facilities. It has been argued that the curing room at Brockville was a dead letter in the hands of the dairy commissioner, but I know a number of firms that are anxious to acquire that building to-day to utilize it for the very same purpose for which it has been used in the past, because they know that it is a necessity in order that our products may be delivered on the British market in the best condition. I am deeply thankful to the Minister of Agriculture for having established these

cool curing rooms and for thus demonstrating to the cheese manufacturers of Canada the benefits which may be derived from them. In fact the system has placed our Canadian cheese beyond competition in the markets of the world, and we have now the gratifying fact to rejoice in that Canada does 80 per cent of the cheese trade of the world. That is a thing to be proud of and that is a system which we should continue. I believe, Sir, that private enterprise will undertake the erection of these buildings all over the country, but I believe also, that private enterprises will take hold of this idea much more rapidly if the government is ready to assist. I believe that if the expenditure of this money is carefully guarded, as no doubt it will be in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, and if these buildings are erected at places in which they will not come into competition with the private capital already invested, the greatest benefit will ensure to the agricultural interests of Canada. Our beloved Taylor thinks that this policy is inaugurated by the Minister of Agriculture simply in order that he may have an opportunity to appoint more officials; that seems to trouble my hon. friend a great deal. Well, I believe we have men enough at the present time to look after this business without appointing another solitary man, but if officials have to be appointed my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) can rest assured that the government will appoint the very best men to be found in Canada. We want to be careful in the spending of public money. We want to place these buildings where they will do the most good and where there are ample supplies of perishable articles seeking cold storage. If that is done, I have no fear of the result. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) thinks that possibly one million dollars or ten million dollars will be spent in one or two years. I do not think that is likely to occur. I believe that if the people of the country spend $25,000,000 in providing cold storage facilities it will be every dollar that will be invested because they will not erect these buildings where there is no necessity for them. It is in the interest of all Canada and of all the people of Canada that encouragement should be given towards the placing of our natural products in the very best condition on the home market as well as on the foreign market, and believing that this end can be best obtained by supplying cold storage facilities I am heartily in favour of the policy proposed by the Minister of Agriculture to-day.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise to oppose this proposal, because I am in favour of any proposition which will tend to the encouragement of the agriculturists of Canada in the development of their industry. If there be proper supervision over the expenditure of this money and over the location of these warehouses, the proposal will meet with my approval and my support. But there are some features of the scheme which I do not quite approve of. The minister tells us that he will provide in the Bill that he shall have authority to enter into a contract with individuals to erect these buildings at whatever places in his judgment and the judgment of these individuals, it is decided they should be built. I think that is not a good principle. The principle that was adopted many years ago with regard to assisting those who built cold storage rooms in connection with cheese factories or butter factories was a better principle. It was that those who provided the accommodation would be granted a certain amount of money. It was to let the individual provide the accommodation where in his judgment it was required, and to give the assistance to him. This system of leaving to a Minister of the Crown to say where a public work, a post office or a cold storage warehouse shall be built is a wrong one. The minister is subject to the temptation, as often happens, of using the money for political purposes and putting it into the pockets of friends rather than using it to meet the public needs of the locality. I disapprove of that method. I think it will lead to abuse. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) made the statement that the provision which the Minister of Agriculture has made for the cold storage curing building at Brockville had resulted in the cheese and butter makers of the country adding to their factories everywhere. Why, that was done long before the present Minister of Agriculture was in office—not by him, but by James W. Robertson, who was appointed by the Hon. John Carling. I remember very well the pamphlet which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) speaks about. I remember hearing it read on many platforms at meetings in two campaigns, and I remember the unbounded praise given to the Minister of Agriculture for being the pioneer in the cold storage business and for providing cold storage for the farmers in the most ample way, so that nothing more was needed. It was said that provision was made for everything requisite to safeguard the perishable products from the time they left the farm to the time they reached the market where they were sold, whether it was butter, cheese, fish, eggs, poultry or fruit. If all this was provided for years ago, it is rather strange to find the minister to-day saying that this is a crying want which existed for years that no one has been alive to the needs of the situation, and that he has taken it up. So far as he has done that I commend him; but it is a rather striking commentary on the assertions made many years ago that this want had been fully provided for by this excellent minister. We do ultimately get out the truth sometimes, and in this case the Minister of

Agriculture has unwittingly given the country some information which is of an entirely different character from that given by his friends years ago. The government are to control the temperature of the warehouses, and it is to be subject to their approval. I take it that this will be controlled by experts under the government. I think that is right, and we offer no objection to it. I commend him for that. No building is to be approved of if it is going to be a competitor with some private enterprise. Well, I do not know that I would go that far. If it could be shown that the buildings already erected were fully supplying the needs of the people, and at a reasonable figure, then I think it would be proper not to use public moneys to provide competition in that locality; but it might be that the cold storage accommodation already in existance was so dear that the farmers would not take advantage of it, or was in a locality where it was inconvenient with regard to shipping facilities. It might be on one railroad line when the great exports of the locality went by another line. All these things would have to be taken into consideration, and if under these circumstances the government refused to assist a cold storage enterprise because another existed in the locality, they would be doing a great injustice. If I understood the minister aright, he said that it was intended to provide cold storage for apples. I think there is an equally great demand for cold storage for other lines, such as pears, peaches, grapes, plums and tomatoes. An immense quantity of grapes could be sold in the old country to great advantage if properly cared for from the time they are taken from the vines to the time they are placed on the market. Then, tomatoes are often allowed to lie on the ground until they are destroyed for the want of some such provision for them. If the undertaking is gone on with, I think cold storage should be provided not only for apples, but for every other line of produce. It is said that we have already provided cold storage for butter, eggs and cheese. It cannot be amply provided, or the minister would not be providing for it now. In plums a great deal of money is invested, but the farmers do not realize as much as they should because of their inability to keep them for any length of time. They must gather them when they are green and send them to market at once. I am trying to get the ear of the Minister of Agriculture, but he seems to be engaged with his colleagues, either because he has no respect for the speaker or that he does not think it worth while to listen to what he has to say. I do not wish to be offensive, but I have seen so much of this that I am forced to speak of it.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is unjust to me. I required to speak to my colleague for a moment, but I have no such desire as he attributes to me.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister motions to his colleagues so as to attract their attention. I have seen it time and again.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is very unjust.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to do him any injustice but I cannot close my eyes to these things and I shall mention it if it occurs again.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman do any injustice to gentlemen on his own side who have tried to get up two or three times to catch Mr. Speaker's eye but who have not been able to do so, while he has been rising time after time.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not see these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose not.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it for granted that Mr. Speaker is here to regulate that matter in the House without this assistance of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) ; he is quite able to do it and I think it is, I was going to say, unworthy of him to interrupt the business that is going on at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. Remarks with reference to courtesy were going on and I thought I would just mention this.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this discussion is out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. I was induced to enter it by reason of the remarks of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. PATERSON. May the minister say a word to me ?

Mr. SPROULE. I shall take my seat if I am to be interrupted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. M. S. SHELL. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is through—

Mr. SPROULE. I am not through yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I waited a few moments until I got the ear of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). This matter is in his department and I think I have a right to that courtesy when talking in regard to a measure that he has submitted to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the debate had better proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. In asking that I do not think I am unreasonable because I have not been condemning the proposal, but endeavouring to give my opinion in reference to safeguards that ought to be applied and

that might be overlooked. So I think I am talking directly and to the subject. If these safeguards are made, I commend the proposal of the minister to the people of the country, because I think it is in the right direction and it will certainly meet with my approval; but in so far as I think there are not proper safeguards or there are proposals made in it that will not meet with the approval of the people of the country, I shall hold myself free to criticise it when the Bill comes down or at any stage.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The resolution that has been submitted to the House, proposing to assist in the establishment of a cold storage system will, I believe, meet with the approval of practically every member of this House and I am sure it will meet with the approval of the country at large. An attempt has been made to criticise the establishment of cheese curing stations. I wish to make a remark or two in that connection. If there is any department of the administration of this government, as has already been said, that has been efficient and has resulted in great good to this country it has been the administration by the Department of Agriculture of that which pertains to the cheese industry and in the establishment of those cheese curing stations. I believe that any one who has studied the working of that experiment must be convinced that it was an experiment which has proven the wisdom of the department in entering upon it. An attempt has been made to show that these stations have not paid their way. Every one knows that in making experiments it is practically impossible to make them a financial success, that is in their initial operations; we have to look further than merely the experimental stage; we want to see the results that have followed the experiments that have been made. Now we know as a fact that the cheese buyers and the cheese experts of this country have admitted that cheese cured under the conditions that have been adopted in those cool curing stations is worth at least about one half cent a pound more than cheese cured under the old conditions. One half cent a pound on 240,000,000 pounds of cheese amounts to over one million dollars, about $1,200,000, and who would say that the government was not justified in expending a matter of some $20,000 or $30,000 in order to prove to the people of this country, the cheese makers and cheese producers of this country, that by adopting a better method of curing cheese, they might obtain increased profit? Who would condemn the government, who would attempt as our friends opposite have done this afternoon, to condemn the government for an experiment that has resulted so well?

Mr. LALOR. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell, Oxford) any statistics to show what proportion of that 200,000,000 pounds went into cool storage?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I am not saying it went into cool storage, I am saying that all cheese cured in the cool curing rooms is worth one half cent a pound more than other cheese. Prior to the adoption of this system cheese has not been cured in cool rooms, there were no cool storage plant provided at the factories throughout this province for the curing of cheese and until the last two or three years, there was scarcely a cool curing room in connection with our cheese factories. Since this experiment has been made we find that the cheese factory men all over the province are to-day changing their curing rooms to the new system, providing ice—cooled curing rooms. Not only have they been able to secure a better article but they have been able to gain in the weight of cheese heretofore lost in curing. There has thus been a gain of from one to two pounds for every cheese cured in this way. That is another item of profit that has given to the industry thousands of dollars more than sufficient to pay for the cost of any experiments made in this direction. I am referring to the advancement of this industry. It is known to every body that to-day the cheese industry of the Dominion of Canada stands at the very head of that industry throughout the world and we to-day are supplying the English market with from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the total amount of cheese that she imports from foreign countries. Only a few years ago, the United States exported about five times as much cheese as the Dominion of Canada; we are exporting to-day practically five times as much to the English market as the United States. The position has been entirely changed, we are not only supplying the quantity but we are also obtaining a better price, we are getting from one cent to two cents a pound more for our cheese in the English market than is being paid for American cheese in the same market. I do not propose to follow the discussion on this line, but I want to emphasize this fact that the Department of Agriculture is deserving of the greatest credit and whether or not my friend thinks that the proposal to establish a system of cold storage warehouses or to assist in that direction may bring credit to the government I do not care. If the policy of the department in the past has been beneficial to the trade and if what they propose would advance the interest of the agriculturists and the people of this Dominion they deserve credit and people will give them credit whether the politicians, so called, are willing to give them credit or not. Those of us who have been in close touch with this question for some years have felt the need of cold storage accommodation throughout the country. It has been discussed for some years, es-

pecially in western Ontario. Time and again have the people in my own neighbourhood discussed it with me and asked if something could not be done ; the difficulty has always been to show that it would be a paying investment.

Capital is proverbially timid and disinclined to enter upon new enterprises the profitableness of which is in doubt. And yet, nobody would deny the necessity of something being done in this matter. Hon. members on the other side of this House have been asking for it for some years. The offer of assistance which the minister has made, I believe, will meet with a fair response. There may still be hesitancy on the part of men of capital to advance the other 70 per cent that will be necessary for the establishment of cold storage plants throughout the country, still, I believe we shall find some ready to accept the offer. I think the establishment of these plants will justify the efforts that may be put forth. Our attention has been called to the articles that may be put into cold storage with profit. We all know that the demand for cold storage accommodation is increasing rapidly. To-day there is, I suppose, at least five times as much poultry put in cold storage as there was five years ago. And in this connection it may be said that the government, in what they have been doing to encourage the growing, fattening and preparation of poultry for the English market, have given a stimulus to that trade so that there is probably five times as much poultry handled with a view to export to English and other distant markets as there was five years ago. You can go to cold storage plants to-day in London and other cities and find thousands of dollars worth of poultry held for shipment. We know also that eggs are being stored in very large quantities to-day where formerly they were cured by a pickling process or kept in cool storage, as that form of storage is called in which ice is used. But it is found in the egg trade that the cool process is not at all sufficient, and nearly all the cold storage plants or at least many of them in London and Montreal are being utilized for the curing of eggs. Consequently there are almost no eggs in the ordinary storage. There will undoubtedly be an increase of demand for cold storage accommodation for the handling of our eggs. And I am informed that even in the case of potatoes it has been found that cold storage could be resorted to with a considerable profit. In this way potatoes can be held until the spring, just prior to the putting on the market of the new crop of potatoes. Everybody knows that potatoes will begin to sprout early in the spring, and that, as ordinarily stored, they grow tough, dry and unpalatable say six weeks before the new potatoes come in. A good profit is being made by the storage even of so common an article as potatoes, which are ordinarily supposed not to require even cool storage. Of course, we all know that the apple trade might be benefited immensely by cold storage. I know something of that trade, and I know that it often happens, in seasons when the crop is large and the price low that many of the finest apples are allowed to go to waste. I could give figures to show that in some years many thousands of barrels are allowed to go to waste in the orchards simply because dealers themselves feel that it is too risky to buy apples and ship them to England. The apple is a perishable fruit, and, as ordinarily handled, it must go forward to market as soon as it is picked or it will begin to deteriorate. If it is held two, or three or four weeks lying about the orchard or in an ordinary building, then, by the time it arrives in the English market it has deteriorated so in value that it will scarcely pay the cost of transportation. In fact it has frequently occurred that the money received for the apples would not pay the charges. One of the difficulties of the trade is that there are no large cold storages in England. I am glad to learn that there is some attempt in England to-day to establish large cold storage plants in some of the great seaports so as to hold shipments of apples in order that, if the market becomes a little depressed, the dealers may not be compelled to force on a sale. But, if we at this end are able to put these apples into cold storage immediately they are picked, we can carry them for six or seven months instead of being compelled to ship them away in the face of a declining market. With this accommodation it will not be necessary to allow apples to go to waste or to sell them for a song. They may be sold under conditions that will bring to the dealer, to the grower, and to the country at large, a very profitable return.

Now, I do not think there will be any serious objection in this House to the proposal that has been made. But there is one point in this connection to which I wish to draw the attention of the minister. He proposes that ten per cent be paid at the end of the first year and five per cent a year for the four following years. To my mind, that is hardly fair, or, at any rate, I think it would not be wise to extend the payment over so long a period. I think that thirty per cent is a small amount to offer in assistance to this enterprise. If those who furnish the capital receive only ten per cent the first year and wait for four annual payments of five per cent afterwards, then, in the case of a plant costing $50,000 they would lose at least $1,500 in interest. That is a considerable item. It seems to me that at least thirty per cent should be paid to those who undertake these enterprises, without delays which will effect a reduction of the payments. It seems to me that the other conditions that the minister has made are fair and right. I think

the government should have control over the matter where they are expected to pay such a large sum of money. I hope that the country generally will take advantage of this offer. I do not suppose we need look for any very rapid development, but I believe that the results will be such as to justify the proposal introduced in this resolution.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. With many of the remarks made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) I cordially agree. Beyond all question it is desirable to have cold storage in the fall for apples. It would add materially to the value of the apples, and probably, to the profits of those operating in them. The profitableness of the cold storage undertaking, however, is another question. We must realize, first of all, that the storage of these apples would only be required for a short period. When you come to the first of December, in a day such as to-day, you do not need to manufacture ice for cold storage, you would rather require warm storage. The building, however, would have to be operated at an expense, and there would be incidentals for the year round. Different articles would be put in cold storage in different localities, and there might be localities where cold storage would be utilized the year round, and in that case it might be profitable. Possibly it might be profitable some years even in sections where nothing but apples are grown. But I want to point out that all is not gold that glitters. I know men who have put apples in cold storage in the fall when the market was low, as the hon. member for Oxford has mentioned, and took them out in the spring and lost from $1 to $2 per barrel on every barrel put in. Sometimes the system works the wrong way. Cold storage is an excellent thing if managed with intelligence. The scheme which the minister proposes is a very large one, and requires a great deal of consideration. I do not know whether the minister has given due consideration to the fact that there are already in operation in this country quite a large number of cold storage warehouses. How is he going to be just to these is a matter that requires some consideration. Then again the amount of products that require cold storage is so great, the field is so widely extended, that it might easily happen that at the end of three years there would be a call for several times the amount that the minister proposes to expend. These are things that require careful consideration, and I do not feel justified in coming to any decision until we have considered the Bill further, and ascertained the circumstances under which this bonus will be given. I feel the system would be an excellent thing for those who are operating in perishable products, and to the farmers themselves, however, profitable or unprofitable it might be to those who invested their money in it.

The hon. member for Oxford, I think, probably inadvertently, took credit to the present administration for the cool curing rooms for cheese, causing the large exports of that commodity from Canada. He mentioned, what I believe is true, that our exports in that article are five times those of the United States. But the hon. gentleman must have forgotten that these cool curing rooms have only been in operation a short time, that only a small portion of the cheese manufactured in this country is put in these cool curing rooms, and that only a small portion of the cheese exported to Britain is exported in cold storage chambers provided by the government. Now the exports of this commodity, great as they are, are due, not as suggested by the hon. member to these facilities, though they may have somewhat increased the exports, but are due to the fact that Canadian cheese makers are producing an excellent article, much superior to that manufactured on the other side of the line.

I wish to congratulate the minister on one or two things. It is not often, unfortunately, that I have been able to do that; on several occasions I have had to criticise the hon. gentleman, and probably I may do so to-day before I am through. But just now I wish to congratulate him on one or two things. Yesterday when this subject came up, the minister suggested that the administration of the Department of Agriculture should be taken out of politics. I congratulate him upon his conversion to that idea. I inferred from what he said that that was the conclusion to which he had arrived after having been ten years in office. However, I could not help thinking over the history of the department for the past ten years, and wondered just when that conversion took place. I remembered that on many occasions, both on the platform and in the press, and in this House, the minister has taken to himself credit, and perhaps some credit may be due him, for having initiated this system of cold storage and brought it to the state of perfection which he claims it has now attained. Further he has stated, as my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has read in his pamphlet, that the whole of the credit of the introduction of that system and its administration is due to the present Minister of Agriculture. That surely is not taking the subject of agriculture out of politics. There was a time when the hon. gentleman was forced to admit that the system of shipping perishable articles from this country to Britain in cold storage was begun by his predecessor, the Hon. Dr. Montague. If the hon. minister desired always to be absolutely fair and not make this a political question entirely, he should qualify his remarks a little on these occasions, and be willing to admit, as he has been forced to admit, that the Hon. Dr. Montague, who preceded him, although a professional man, was the one who initiated cold storage in

this country. I know the present minister answers that the first system was ice storage, and that it was afterwards discarded. But he has admitted that when he came into office, not only had his predecessor made these experiments with ice storage, but he had also made arrangements by which this same mechanical refrigeration was to be provided the following year, that was provided by the present minister.

However, I want to say this in regard to the cold storage system of the Hon. Dr. Montague. Previous to that time the products of Australia and New Zealand in butter and cheese were being put upon the British market in a good condition by a system of cold storage, notwithstanding that they had to be shipped across the tropics, a journey infinitely more difficult than the short journey across the Atlantic from Canada to Great Britain. At that time Canada was putting her butter upon the British market in such a condition that it brought a very low price, and he conceived the idea of establishing a carriage of cold storage across the Atlantic ocean. I remember, in the following elections, the severe criticism that was levelled at that hon. gentleman for having purchased a quantity of butter and shipped it to Great Britain. The shippers not being willing then to come forward and make the experiment on their own responsibility, and with the consent of this House, the minister purchased a quantity of butter and sent it over to Great Britain, meeting with a loss on the shipment. The severe criticism he received from those who were appealing to the people at that time on behalf of the then opposition, will not be forgotten for a long time by those who were then discussing political affairs. It was said to be a serious offence that the Minister of Agriculture should take the public funds and buy butter and ship it across to the old country, and sustain a loss upon the shipment. But what do we find now? Immediately this government came into power the present Minister of Agriculture, at the solicitation of the fruit growers of the Niagara district, provided a sum of money to purchase fruit and ship it across to the old country, and he also lost money on the experiment.

Now, we do not criticise that. We have no objection to that. We claim that it is part of the duty of the government to initiate such enterprises as that, but it came with very poor grace from the very same gentleman who so severely criticised his predecessor and at a time, I imagine, when politics, or an election at any rate, had something to do with the Department of Agriculture. Since that time it has always been kept prominently before the farmers of this country that whatever has been done in this matter has been done solely and entirely at the instigation of the present minister; so that I am glad to congratulate him to-day on his change of opinion and on his statement that in future this matter should be taken out of politics and be treated as the educational departments are treated in the provinces altogether free from the animus of party politics.

I want to congratulate him upon another thing. The hon. minister said, in his speech on Tuesday, that under the present scheme the government is to retain control of the temperatures and the rates. That is as it should be. I trust the control will be very much more efficient than it has been in the past. I may say that during the past four or five years, since I have had the honour to have a seat in this House, my chief criticism of the hon. gentleman has been that in his cold storage contracts with steamship companies he had and has now no control over temperature or rates. I have maintained and I maintain still that the neglect to provide for control over these temperatures at the outset when very large sums of money were granted to these steamships for installing cold storage upon their vessels was a most serious defect and one that has made the cold storage equipment—while I will not say of no use at all—extremely deficient. The minister has had charge of this department for ten years and for nine years at any rate some of these ships have been traversing the ocean with cold storage compartments carrying our products. One would think that in that great length of time, if the government had any control of them, or if the acumen of the steamship companies was what the minister probably supposed it would be, the temperatures would be accurate and proper, The contrary, I am sorry to say, is the case. I do not pretend to say—I never have—that the temperature of all these chambers is wrong. Far from it. Each year has seen a considerable improvement until to-day out of perhaps a hundred of these chambers carrying butter there may be only eight or ten that are wrong. But, that is not what it ought to be. At the very outset if that agreement had been made as the minister proposes to-day in this case and if the government had obtained control of these temperatures, instead of waiting ten years to get nine tenths of them carrying products at proper temperatures, we should have had all these goods carried at proper temperatures from the outset. It is not difficult. The temperatures ought to be maintained within one or two degrees and not at eight or ten degrees of what is the correct temperature. A cold storage plant operated even with ice can be maintained at almost an exact temperature, so exact that there will not be a variation in all the trips across the Atlantic of more than one or two degrees.

The hon. gentleman did not have agriculture quite out of politics either in the

last campaign for I found him up in my county. This was the occasion of a by-election with the government in power and with a very large majority. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, thought that constituency should belong to the Liberal side and we found him in the township of Ancaster. This township of Ancaster is a most excellent township. The only fault I have with it is that it usually goes about 400 Liberal. The hon. gentleman appeared right in the centre of the township, in the village of Ancaster. He thought it was a very favourable opportunity to show the farmers of Wentworth what kind of a rascal they had been sending down to the House for the past four years. He appeared there and he made some statements that I had not an opportunity at the time to verify, but I find to-day in a political pamphlet which has just been handed to me, some statements, which, summed up, amount to his defence of the criticism which I have made in this House on several occasions. I might say in regard to that meeting in Ancaster which the hon. gentleman addressed, that in the by-election which followed in a few days I had the satisfaction of getting eight more votes than that polling division had ever given me before. On the following night the minister appeared in the centre of the township of Beverley, another magnificent township but with the bad habit of giving 300 or 400 of a Liberal majority. In the general election I had a minority of 202 in that township. The minister appeared in the centre of the township and the sturdy yeomanry flocked to the meeting to the number of 42. I had the satisfaction of having the adverse majority reduced from 202 to 199. The next time we have an election I shall be delighted to have the minister appear at Saltfleet, a Tory township, and I am sure that if the minister would appear there I would find my seat perfectly safe. The statements made by the hon. minister are the statements made in this pamphlet. It is the minister's defence of the criticism which I made of this cold storage system in 1904. In a speech delivered on the 28th July, 1904, in criticism of the temperatures of the cold storage chambers, I picked out of, I think, 155 thermograph records, some 20 which I seriously objected to, in which the temperatures were wrong for the products that were carried in these chambers. I had these statements divided into two parts. There were six or seven chambers that carried fruit and the temperatures in these were so far wrong for fruit that I am sure the fruit must have been ruined when it got across to the other side. The remainder of the 20 statements were in regard to butter. Somehow or other I do not know how—my notes must have got mixed on my desk and inadvertently—at least my speech so reads—all of them are given as referring to butter. I had criticised these temperatures not only on that occasion but on two previous occasions, I had pointed out that they were altogether wrong and these criticisms had never been replied to or answered. On this occasion there were 20 of them picked out as being far from right—14 or 15 for butter and 6 or 7 for fruit—and because I inadvertently classed them all together as being for butter—the cold storage facilities according to the hon. gentleman were all right. That was the hon. gentleman's defence and the only defence that has been put forward. He has no control over these temperatures, the temperatures have been wrong persistently for ten years and his defence is that I inadvertently made an error in classifying them. I am going to read a small portion of my speech, inserting the proper words, and it will show how it should read :

Last year the government had thermograph records taken of 155 cold storage chambers carrying these perishable products. In his report of 1902, the hon. Minister of Agriculture said that butter should be carried at a temperature of 20 degrees, and he stated afterwards that to bring about the best results you should have the chamber at 10 degrees.

Now, in this pamphlet the minister says that that does not mean the ships going across the ocean, but it refers to the temperatures in such cold storage warehouses as butter is carried in perhaps for several months. Therefore his statement with regard to ten degrees on the ocean steamships is wrong; if it be carried on the ocean steamships at thirty degrees or thirty-two degrees as he suggests in this pamphlet, his statement about ten degrees must be wrong. One or the other is wrong certainly.

But in these 155 records taken last year there is not one chamber that carried butter at a temperature of 10 degrees, and there are only 40 that touched a temperature of 20 degrees, and that was not the average across the ocean. Only 40 out of the 155 touched 20 degrees, and there was a very large number that carried the goods even above the freezing point. I would just enumerate a few of those. The 'Iona,' of the Thompson line, which sailed July 25, 1903, carried butter, and the butter was put in at a temperature less than 40 degrees. The Minister of Agriculture seems to be always hunting for some excuse to explain why the steamers do not carry goods at the proper temperature, and he sometimes has for excuse the plea that the butter is put in hot. But in only two of these records does it appear that the butter was put in hot. In this case the butter was put in at a temperature below 40, or 10 degrees lower than the temperature of the car in transit usually. Yet it never ran a point lower than 32, and that only when it arrives on the other side.

On the 'Montcalm' the butter was put in at Montreal at 36 degrees, an exceedingly low temperature for butter to be put in the chamber, but it never got lower than 34, and several days of the journey it was 36 or 37, or warmer than when put in. On the 'Montford,' which

sailed September 27th, butter was put in at 38 degrees and never got lower than 36 at any time during the journey and a large portion of it was at 39.

For a large portion of the journey that butter was carried at 39 degrees and is it any wonder that the following year our butter exports decreased; is it any wonder our butter shippers find fault with the cold storage system across the ocean when every once in a while the butter goes forward at 30 degrees higher than the minister reported it should be carried at.

On the 'Corinthian,' which sailed October 8th, the butter was put in at 38, a very low temperature for butter to come out of the car, and never reached a point lower than 32, and that only after the expiration of ten days. On the 'Hungarian' the butter was put in at the low temperature of 34 and never got below 31, and that in the early portion of the voyage. It gradually rose and came out at the other side at a temperature of 34.

On the 'Kildona' the butter went in at a temperature of 42 and 43, and it reached 30 on its arrival on the other side, but only very gradually, so that the average would not be lower than 34.

On the 'Iona' the butter went in at a temperature of 40. It immediately rose, however, to 43, then gradually went down, but at no point was lower than 32.

On the 'Devona,' June 28th, the butter went in at 37 and remained at 37 and 38 during the whole voyage.

Imagine butter going across the ocean in cold storage for which the shippers pay a largely increased price, and the temperature never going below 37 degrees or 38 degrees on the voyage.

On the 'Hurona' it went in at 50, or about the temperature of the refrigerator car in which it arrived in Montreal. It gradually went down, but at no time did it get to a point lower than 40, except for three or four hours before being unloaded on the docks it went down to 38.

Here was butter carried at 38 degrees at the lowest, in face of one statement of the minister that it should be carried at 20 degrees and his statement on another occasion that it should be carried at 10 degrees.

On the 'Iona,' which sailed 5th of September from Montreal, the butter went in at a temperature of 56, but never got to a point at any time during the journey lower than 44. In other words, it took the whole of the journey across the ocean in cold storage chambers to bring the temperature down to 44, whereas a good cold storage chamber would bring down the temperature in forty-eight or, at most, in 72 hours, no matter how hot were the goods when put in, to a temperature as low as required. Then on the steamer 'Ionian,' which sailed from Montreal June 20th, the butter went in at 40 and never got below 38 during the whole journey. On the 'Kensington,' which sailed the 20th of June, the butter went in at 45, and only at the time of its arrival on the other side reached 30, or an average of about 36. On the 'Tunisian' the butter went in at 37 and never got below 35 during the whole journey. On the 'Pretorian,' sailing July 11, the butter went in at 40 and never got below 35. On the 'Bavarian' the butter went at 34 and rose gradually to 35, and came out on the other side at 36. In other words, it was in better condition when it went on board than at any time during the journey, in so far as temperature was concerned. On the 'Pretorian,' which sailed 15th August, the butter went in at 60, and the lowest point reached during the journey was 37. The temperature fluctuated from time to time 4 or 5 degrees every day, showing that the storage apparatus was not in proper order.

I could read a considerable number more of those statements in regard to butter. The charge I intended to make was that the minister had failed to look after this department, and that he had no control over it, and that charge in no way that I can see lessened by the fact that there were still six or seven boats with reference to which I mentioned the word 'butter' when I should have said 'fruit.' I will take this up and see whether the temperatures were right with regard to fruit. In view of the experience we have had from the records of those steamers which show a temperature absolutely unsuited to the proper carrying of fruit across the ocean; is it any wonder that the fruit growers of the Niagara district have entirely given up trying to ship fruit across to the other side, except apples or late pears which can be shipped in the hold of the vessel without any cold storage. We had very high hopes of this service when it was first inaugurated. We grow in this country enormous quantities of Bartlett pears which sell at a good price in the old country market; we grow five times more Bartletts than all the other varieties put together except perhaps the Keefer of late years. The Bartlett is a pear we require cold storage for, but that is the very pear which we cannot ship to England. We can keep it in our cold storage chambers at home but we cannot ship it in the defective cold storage on the ships. I notice that in this pamphlet which the minister circulated it is stated that a shipment of Mr. Smith's pears went over in bad order whereas the shipments of other shippers arrived in good order. Well, I would like to see the returns of the different shippers on that boat. I know that the culls which we took out of the pears we shipped were kept in my little cold storage at home for two months and at the end of that tme they were in perfect condition, so hard and firm that we had to leave them in the heat for a couple of days so that they might be suitable for factory purposes, whereas the hard and sound pears which we shipped in cold storage arrived on the other side in bad condition. Every other shipper has had the same experience until to-day there is not a bushel of pears of this variety going across the ocean. Then with regard to our peaches. There is no reason in the world

why we should not be able to sell Alberta peaches on the old country market in perfect condition. I have kept them for two months in my cold storage chambers at home. There is a market in England for peaches at fabulous prices if we could only land them in good condition, but the cold storage system on the steamers is so uneven—the shipments on three or four boats may go all right and the next shipment may be an entire loss—that to-day no peaches are shipped to England and the enterprise has had to be abandoned. That is not to be wondered at when we find fruit carried in such temperature as it was carried in two years ago, after the minister had eight years experience. Think of paying high cold storage charges for fruit across the ocean in order to have it held at a temperature of from 32 to 34 beyond which it should not vary and at which it could be kept for a month in any proper cold storage warehouse; think of having that fruit carried across the ocean at a temperature of from 44 to 50 degrees. If it was a perishable fruit such as Bartlett pears there is no doubt that it would be entirely ruined when it got to the other side. But because I inadvertently made use of the word 'butter' in that case, the minister tells the farmers of Wentworth county and circulates it in his pamphlet, that the cold storage accommodation on the ships is absolutely all right, that the only person who criticised it was the member for Wentworth and that his statements were entirely erroneous.

We will take another of these boats, the 'Pretorian,' which sailed on August 16. The fruit went in at 60, and the lowest point reached was 37. I ask the minister if that is a proper temperature to carry fruit in. I have heard him say that if fruit is put in at 60, it takes a long time to get the temperature down. If the cold storage is a proper one, it will take only forty-eight hours to get the temperature down to the proper point, I do not care how hot it is when it goes in. Then, the 'Canada' sailed on August 22; the fruit went it at 54, and the lowest point it touched during the voyage was 37, apparently coming out at the other side at 70. The 'Pretorian' sailed on September 19, took in butter at 55 and carried fruit in another chamber. The lowest point reached was 37, it coming out on the other side at 40. On the 'Marina' the fruit went in at 50, the lowest point reached was 36, then it rose to 40 and remained at 40 during the rest of the journey. On the 'Lakonia' the fruit went in at 50, reached 32 on the other side, the average temperature for the voyage being about 40. On the 'Kastalia' the fruit went in at 42, but rose immediately to 46, and then gradually went down till it reached 34. On the 'Montcalm' it went in at 42 and reached the other side at 32. I ask this House and the minister if these were the proper temperatures for carrying fruit.

Now, I have here some records of the ensuing year, that is, last year, and let us see what improvement has been made. The 'Marina,' which sailed on May 8, carried apples in cold storage at from 39 to 40. Another boat carried apples at from 28 to 29, and the report from the other side is that they arrived in good condition. Apples in barrels carried at 28 or 29 would be all right. But what would be said of a temperature of from 39 to 40 for summer apples, and these are the only ones cold storage is for. Fall apples would be quite safe at that temperature. The 'Mongolian' sailed on July 13, and the temperatures varied from 40 to 36, the lowest being at least three degrees higher than it ought to have been. The 'Corinthian' sailed on July 27; the apples went in at 40, the temperature went down to 37 and afterwards rose to 44. What kind of care was exercised in regard to that boat, when the temperature was allowed to rise to 44 and then go down to 38, and then to rise to 42, and when the boat reached the other side to come down to 33, where it ought to have been all the way across? The 'Pretorian' sailed on August 3rd the fruit went in at 40, the temperature went down to 36, then rose to 46, and then went down to 34, being extremely irregular all the way across, jumping from 36 to 46 and not being steady for more than an hour or two at a time. That would be absolutely ruinous to fruit, which must be carried at a steady, even temperature, and it can be done. The 'Marina' sailed on August 10, and carried fruit in a temperature from 40 to 42 all the way across. The 'Athenia' sailed on August 16, and its temperature was from 36 to 46. The 'Ionian' sailed on August 24, and at no time on the way across was the temperature lower than 38, or 5 degrees higher than it ought to have been, and the fruit reached the other side at 30. The 'Lakonia' sailed on August 23; the fruit went in at 50, and at no time was it lower than 38, or 5 degrees higher than it ought to have been. The 'Corinthian' sailed on August 30; the fruit went in at 50, and at no time did it reach a point lower than 44, or 11 degrees higher than it ought to have been, if the chamber had been under proper management or care. The money for this cold storage service had been voted freely in the belief that it was a good enterprise, but the minister had no control over it, and consequently the business of shipping fruit in cold storage has been a failure. Nearly all the fruit going to-day in cold storage consists of American plums which can be carried in a temperature of 40 or 50 degrees. California plums would keep if put on a shelf without any cold storage, so the minister is able to get them across the ocean in a temperature five or six degrees higher than our perishable fruit can possibly be carried in. The 'Kastalia' sailed on September 17, and carried apples, and the temperatures ranged from 56 down to 38, the lowest. The 'Pretorian' sailed on Sep-

tember 7, and the temperatures were 40, 38, 42. The 'Marina' sailed on September 27, and the temperatures varied from 50 to 40 to 37 to 40. None of these temperatures were within five degrees of what they ought to have been for cold storage, and only about ten degrees lower than they would have been in the hold of a vessel without any cold storage, if properly ventilated. The 'Lakonia' sailed on October 5; the fruit went in at 60, and the temperature only went down to 42, or nine degrees at the lowest point higher than it ought to have been. The 'Bavarian' sailed on September 8 with apples and pears, which went in at 58, and the temperature never went below 41. The 'Dominion' sailed on September 21; the fruit went in at 60, and this went down to 46, or 13 degrees higher than the lowest point that ought to have been maintained. The 'Bavarian' sailed on October 6; the fruit went in at 60, and the temperature went down to 48, and then 40, but no lower. And so on with five or six other vessels which sailed last year. This is the result after an experience of eight years. Then, with regard to butter, I may say that last year there appeared to be very few boats carrying butter at a temperature that might be said to be ruinous, whereas a number of years ago it was a common thing to have butter carried in temperatures ranging from 35 to 40; but I did not find many carrying butter at a temperature of ten, which the minister in one of his reports said was the proper temperature. But now he says it is not a proper temperature on the ocean steamer, but only where the butter is kept in a permanent warehouse. There were some boats carrying butter last year at too high a temperature. One was the 'Montfort,' which sailed on June 17. The butter went in at 40, the temperature went down to 30 and it came out in 34. The 'Ionian' sailed June 14, the butter went in at 36, the temperature went down to 24 and reached the other side at 40. The 'Pretorian' sailed on August 3, the butter went in at 40, went up to 43 and came out on the other side at 32. The 'Lakonia' sailed on August 23, the butter went in at 50, and the lowest point reached was 34, and that only when it reached the other side. The 'Kensington' carried butter and poultry; it sailed on May 23, and the temperature ranged from 50 to 42, at least ten degrees higher than it ought to have been even for fruit; but if butter and poultry shall be carried below the freezing point, it was at least twenty degrees too high. There were twelve or fourteen boats carrying butter at a temperature much higher than it ought to have been, though there was an improvement on previous years.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman contend that all the steamers he has enumerated received a bonus for providing a cold storage system ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. A large number of them did ; I have not separated those which did from those which did not, but there is practically no difference between those boats which received a bonus and those which did not. The fact of the matter is the government has no control over the temperature, the boats carry the goods at such temperatures as they, in their wisdom see fit, and being constantly loaded with goods from Montreal they are not over particular so long as they get their boats loaded with something. That is the unfortunate position in which the farmer of Canada finds himself. The season is short, navigation closes early, the wharfs are loaded with goods all the time and the steamship companies there practically have control of the situation. They can exact such terms almost as they see fit, and as a matter of fact they do charge about 15 to 20 per cent more in freight charges than the rates from American ports, on most articles that are shipped from Montreal. In the matter of cold storage, since the minister left it entirely to the steamship companies it takes them a long time to learn the lesson that it is desirable to build up a trade and that in order to do it, certain steady temperatures must be maintained in the cold storage chambers, all of which would have been remedied by the process the minister proposes to adopt in the case of the cold storage warehouses he is building, taking absolute control of the temperature. I hope the minister will be able to do this with the cold storage warehouses he proposes to build ; I can foresee that he may have some difficulty but I imagine that a contract of such a character can be made that it will be good as long as the warehouse is used for cold storage purposes to serve the public. Under the arrangement with the steamship companies he had control only while the bonus continued.

If I might make one criticism it would be the criticism raised by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Schell) and I would suggest that the bonus be given in one lump sum. By the system of subsequent payments which the minister proposes, the bonus will only about pay the interest on the capital invested in the enterprise. As to the details of this cold storage proposal I presume the minister will bring down the Bill, and we can discuss the details then and for that reason I shall not further occupy the time of the House at present.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, the question is, do we require a system of cold storage, or do we not ? We have never had a system of cold storage yet and I think a great many of the arguments that have been put forth to-day only go to prove that we need a system. A few scattered, isolated attempts at cold

storage is not a system of cold storage. A few storage warehouses is not a system of cold storage. What the minister is proposing now is a system, a continued system. In the speech which I had the honour of delivering a few days ago in regard to this matter I said that we required a single chain from the hands of the producer to the table of the consumer. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link and a chain is of no use if any of its links are lacking. The only fault I have to find with the proposed system is that it is not complete ; there seem to be links lacking but no doubt they can be supplied. The government must provide these links. Cold storage warehouses must be provided at terminal points in Canada such as Winnipeg, Calgary, &c., and at the seaports both in Canada and in Europe, or the system will be a failure. I do not know whether or not the politicians of this country want a system of cold storage, but I do know that the farmers of this country require a system of cold storage and I believe that those farmers will resent any attempt to block an effort to give them this system of cold storage. They are suffering and we know they are suffering. I can appreciate what the minister (Mr. Fisher) has said very well. I can understand that he feels that the sentiment of the country is scarcely educated up to the point of throughly understanding what can be done. The farmers are well aware that they are suffering an immense loss at the present time that they are losing thousands of dollars every year. They look to the minister (Mr. Fisher) and to the government to remedy this evil and I am pleased indeed to see that an attempt is being made to remedy it. I think the minister (Mr. Fisher) is honestly trying to prevent a monopoly and that is the great advantage I see in this proposal. I think he is honestly trying to prevent a monopoly and that he is putting the farmers in a position to help themselves and thus to be masters of the situation. If this system of cold storage got into the hands of monopolists the farmers might be squeezed just as the monopolists chose, because certainly it would be a monopoly.

The farmers of the Niagara Peninsula and southern and south western Ontario are the ones most particularly interested in this matter. I feel satisfied that if the farmers of these districts had a thorough and complete system of cold storage, they could divide their hundred acre farms among their sons and have them all comfortably settled around them, on fruit farms and know that they were as comfortable and wealthy and prosperous as if they went to the Northwest and got 640 acres, a whole section.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. There is no doubt also that if we had this cold storage a system of trolley lines would grow up radiating from these centres in every direction. I shall give you an idea of what is being done in the United States. This is no new experiment. We know that experiments are always expensive and liable to be failures, that is why the government are requested to make experiments, we expect them to make experiments and we expect them to lose money because the individual farmers cannot afford to do it.

I have here a little extract from a newspaper showing the way in which they are doing these things on the other side :—

> The trolley has been so widely extended through the Michigan fruit belt that in some places a picker can step from the ladder used in picking the fruit to the electric cars on which it is loaded.

We must understand that trolley cars will carry fruit more quickly more cheaply and further with less bruising than waggons or any other system.

> Not only is the service thus brought to the door of the grower, but it is a cheap service. From points on one line which overlooks St. Joseph's river a fifth bushel of peaches is carried to Benton harbour and shipped across the lake to Chicago by the Graham and Morton steamer line for 2½ cents. Of this the electric line takes 40 per cent, while the steamer people get sixty. Regular fruit express trains are run, the train consisting of one or more box-cars, the entire crew of which is the conductor and motorman, and these men load the stuff into the cars. Fruit picked and packed up to six o'clock in the evening is in Chicago before daylight the next morning. These electric fruit trains, the New York 'Tribune-Farmer' says, are destined to gridiron the entire fruit and vegetable district of the state.

Now if they can do that in Michigan, why cannot we do the same thing in Ontario ? We know that mechanical refrigeration in cold storage warehouses, and we know that trolley cars require power, and I would like to know where any fruit farmers are going to get a cheaper or more abundant supply of power than at Niagara. The very spray that rises from Niagara Falls, the tears that the great cataract is shedding over what the farmers of this district are losing, if they were condensed would cool the fruit of acres and of square miles in that locality.

Another thing, if ship loads of the fruits that are raised in our beautiful country, our grapes, peaches, pears, plums, and apples, would go to the old country they would be the best immigration agents that ever went there, they would be better than Smart and Preston and Jury, for, when the people of that country saw and tasted those fruits, they would feel like emigrating to the country in which they can be raised in such perfection and abundance.

I hope the impression will not go abroad that there are many in this House who are opposed to the present measure, because I feel something like a good old Scotch Conservative farmer, whom I met just before I came away. I was talking to him about this matter of cold storage, and when I was through I asked his opinion about it. 'Mon,' he said, 'it's gran'. It's juist gran'. But dinna ye gae doon tae th' hoose and tell Sir Wilfrid Laurier aboot it. Far if ye daean he adopts this system o cauld storage that ye hae been talkin' aboot, he'll be sae pop'lar wi' the fairmer ye'll never get him oot.' I told him that Sir Wilfrid Laurier looked just like a man who would stay where he was for a long time; that we were trying very hard to get him out, but we could scarcely afford to do without cold storage until the arrival of that happy day. He said, 'Weel, weel mebbe ye're richt. But if Sir Wilfrid has na gumption enough tae tak up this question, then tell Maister Borden frae me that if he taks it up in the next election and makes it the battle cry o' the Conservative pairty, he'll sweep the country.'

Mr. FISHER. If the motion can be carried now, I shall reserve any further remarks until a later stage.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked the minister this afternoon if his intention was to devote any portion of this money to assist in the erection of cold storage warehouses in the old country, or outside of Canada where perishable products could be stored on being taken out of the ships. To my mind, following out what the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) has well said, that the connection from the producer to the consumer, must be unbroken, I would say that if some such system of storage is not provided in the old land, I fear that a great deal that is done on this side in caring for perishable products will be useless. Now, I think I read in the report of the Minister of Agriculture not many years ago, that, on one occasion, at least, butter was known to have been left on the dock at Liverpool for ten days. What is the use of us providing an elaborate system of cold storage in this country, or even on the ocean if, when the goods arrive in the old country, they are to be allowed to go to waste. I do not wish the House or the hon. minister for one moment to understand that I object to the expenditure of a single dollar of this money. I think the purpose is a good one. But I do say that I think the minister should go further, and if it is at all legal for him to spend money outside of this country, he ought to do something to make sure that when these perishable products are landed on the other side of the water there shall be the same provision for their preservation until they are taken away by the consignee to his warehouse as is made on this side of the ocean. I hope that the minister will not forget that this is a chain of communication and that the chain must be strong throughout.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to detain the House, but will just say that I appreciate the necessity of what has been proposed. But I confess I have not yet seen my way clear to accomplish the object aimed at. If it is necessary for the government to do something to bring it about, and if we find a way to do it successfully and economically, I shall be glad to propose it.

Mr. SPROULE. Denmark has done it in connection with the butter trade, I believe. And perhaps some other countries also. They provide warehouses, and even stalls in which to sell the product.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken in thinking that the Danish government is doing that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a great deal of force in what has been suggested by the hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the subject and who have pointed out that the system of cold storage cannot be considered complete unless it provides for the preservation of the article from the time it leaves the farmer's home until it reaches the market. It seems perfectly obvious that, while this proposed expenditure may be justifiable so far as it goes, it will fail absolutely to meet the requirements if it is subject to the conditions suggested this afternoon. For example, if fruit, cheese, or any other perishable article requiring cold storage is left on the docks in Montreal, Quebec, Halifax or St. John—we do not need to go outside of our own country for an illustration—under conditions which render it liable to deterioration, you cannot expect the full benefit from this expenditure which might otherwise be anticipated. While the proposal seems to be along the right lines, it does not seem to me that it is sufficiently comprehensive to meet the conditions which have been spoken of this afternoon, if we are entitled to rely upon the statements that have been made as to what will ensue from the lack of terminal facilities, whether on this side of the ocean or on the other side.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to encourage the establishment of Cold Storage Warehouses and the preservation of Perishable Food Products.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 10, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the explanation of the Bill is in the title.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the fact that I have received a wire from Prince Edward Island to-day stating that the summer boat, the 'Empress'—

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the new rule the hon. member is not in order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Under what rule ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 37.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the government whether or not they propose to place on the table of the House any documents in connection with the recent conference of the provincial premiers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About what time may we expect them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All of the documents relating to the conference are now in the hands of the printer ; I do not know at what time they will be ready but I hope before the recess.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether he has any further information as to when we may expect an instalment of the Auditor General's Report ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). A portion of the report will be down during the present week. The remainder I am afraid will not be brought down until the Christmas recess.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince). Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to a very important matter and I would pray the indulgence of the House for just a few moments.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has called to my attention the subject on which he wishes to speak and under the new rule the Speaker must judge whether it is a subject of the character to be submitted to the House. I think it comes within the class of subjects that may be brought up in this way ; it is a question touching the stoppage of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) shall have leave to introduce and discuss this question ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is a motion on the order paper to-day on which this question can be discussed. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) wants to refer to the Summerside and Cape Tormentine winter service. I will have the papers before me in a few moments when the question is brought up on the motion which I understand is to be brought in by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin).

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that motion is not to be brought up to-day, we want to discuss it more fully ; this is an urgent matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is on the order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the question is on the order paper at another point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) cannot, of course, anticipate.

Mr. FOSTER. This particular question could not be on the order paper, this is something that has arisen as an emergency.

Mr. SPEAKER. Just of course dealing with the matter as it presents itself, the hon. gentleman suggests that this is a certain question ; the minister who has spoken (Mr. Brodeur) suggested that the same question is to be dealt with a little later on. I cannot tell that if the hon. member (Mr. Lefurgey) says it is different.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I may say that the question is one that has arisen within the last few days while the somewhat related one of the order paper may not be up for some months, but this is a question that has to be dealt with at once. I have received a wire from Prince Edward Island to the effect that the summer boat, 'The Empress', stopped running on Saturday morning and to-day the steamer 'Stanley' was not at Summerside to take up the service. Early in the session I asked the minister what disposition was going to be made of the boats, what announcement he could make to the House and to the public so

that shippers would know by what route they could consign goods and the travelling public know how they were to travel to and from Prince Edward Island. That question should have been answered immediately and the information should have been in possession of the public weeks ago, but the minister saw fit to hold the answer over for a number of days until he got the information. I finally got a wire that Summerside Harbour was freezing up and asked the minister what steps he had taken and he replied that there was a question on the order paper and he would answer when he got the information.

The minister finally did get the information and he stated that the 'Minto' would be placed on the Charlottetown route and the 'Stanley' on the Summerside - Cape Tormentine route just as soon as the summer boats stopped running. The summer boat did stop running on Saturday last, but the 'Stanley' was not there and consequently the people of Prince Edward Island have been placed at great inconvenience. This is not a new question as hon. gentlemen know; we have been humbugged year after year and have been obliged to enter protest after protest. If the Department of Marine has not enough boats to attend to the buoy and lighthouse service then other boats should be secured. The late Minister of Marine, when he visited Charlottetown three years ago, told us that $175,000 for a new boat had been voted and that this new boat would be ready for service in November, 1906. Even the present minister told us in Prince Edward Island that a more powerful boat would be built, but we are still waiting for these promises to be carried out. Last year the minister told us that the 'Montcalm' would be placed on the service, but a few days later when questioned more closely he went back on his statement and said that either the 'Lady Grey' (which was then building) or the 'Montcalm' would be put on. Again this year when we came to the House to make complaint for not carrying out the programme announced, the minister shielded himself behind the Transportation Commission and stated that the 'Lady Grey' and the 'Montcalm' had been recommended for another service. I appeal to the House if that is any way to safeguard the commercial interests of Prince Edward Island. The board of trade of Prince Edward Island made an appeal early in the fall that the boats should be ready for this service by the 1st of December and I believe the Prime Minister has a communication to-day from the board of trade of Summerside asking that some definite information be given as to the movements of these boats. I want to know from the Minister of Marine to-day, whether the 'Stanley' is going to be put on that route and whether she is going to be left there for any reasonable length of time. On several occasions previously the 'Stanley' was put on that route at the discretion of the captain, and at a crucial time and without any information to the public she left the port of Summerside and went to Charlottetown. I suppose we may expect the same thing to occur again. I can mention a recent occurrence where a schooner was flying distress signals just outside Summerside harbour and appealed for assistance to the 'Stanley' and the 'Stanley' and her gallant captain steamed away, but the 'Empress,' the summer boat, came to the assistance of the schooner and got her out of the ice and towed her into port. If you have that class of man in charge of the the boat between Summerside and Cape Tormentine and give him discretion as to whether he should stay there on leave, then we cannot hope for better treatment in the future than we have experienced in the past. I have no reasonable hope that any promise the government may make now will be fulfilled, so often have their promises been broken in the past, but nevertheless I would like to know if the minister intends to build a powerful boat as his predecessor promised and as he himself promised also.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) did not give me notice of his intention to bring this question before the House, because had he done so I would have been in a better position to discuss the main matter treated of in his speech; namely, the winter service between Cape Tormentine and Summerside. The hon. gentleman complains that on Saturday last the 'Stanley' was not on the Summerside route. I have not the paper before me, but I understand the fact is that the 'Stanley' was prevented from taking up that service on Saturday, because she had to go to the assistance of some other boats which were in distress. We were asked to send the 'Stanley' there some time ago but the company which is operating the summer service, said it would not be fair to put the government boat on the route so long as their boats were plying, and in view of that we decided that the 'Stanley' should take up the service as soon as the company had ceased to run their boats. On December 5, the following telegram was sent by Mr. Lord to the deputy Minister of Marine:

> Steam Navigation Company's steamer 'Empress' on Summerside-Point du Chêne route. Manager Wakeford tells me to-day thought would run for few days. Expect 'Stanley' here to-morrow. In all probability will be Summerside before 'Empress' gives up service.

As a matter of fact there would not have been one hour's delay were it not that the captain of the 'Stanley' felt impelled to go to the rescue of some other boat; it was a question of salvage and I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) would not blame the captain for rendering assistance to vessels in distress. That is the reason why there

was a delay of a few hours, but I am informed that the 'Stanley' is on the route this morning and is performing the service. I do not see that there is any serious reason for complaint against the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I had no desire to bring this matter before the House in any snap fashion. I only received my telegram just before the House met, moreover I don't think it was necessary to give any notice to the minister as to a matter of this kind, because the 'Stanley' should have been there.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is the judge as to whether he should give notice or not. I do not complain that he did not give notice; I simply say that had he given notice I would have been in a better position to discuss the question.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I merely called attention to the fact that the 'Stanley' was not there, and I do not think the minister has given any reasonable excuse for her not being there. The 'Stanley' should have been there whether the private company wanted to carry on the service or not. Is the business of the people of Prince Edward Island to be dependent on the request of a private company to the government? If the minister has not enough boats to do the service let him get others. As regards salvage, I have instanced a case in which the 'Stanley' did not go to the rescue of a schooner in distress. Besides, the hon. minister has the steamer 'Minto,' which could have performed the service of salvage while the other steamer was in her proper place.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am afraid that my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) must have been misinformed, or at least there must have been a misunderstanding, because according to a telegram from the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Charlottetown, dated Saturday last, the 'Stanley' left that morning for Summerside, and would certainly have arrived there that day, unless an accident of some kind or the weather conditions did not permit so that the department was prepared just as soon as the summer boat stopped running.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) respecting patent of William A. Damen.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 9) respecting a patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 10) respecting a patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 11) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 12) to incorporate the Malone and Hopkins Point Railway Company.—Mr. R. N. Walsh.

Bill (No. 13) respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 15) respecting the Joliette and Brandon Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not wish to delay the proceedings of the House, but I wish to call attention to the fact that several of these Bills are not printed in French. The French translation is very much behind in every direction.

QUESTIONS.

VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

1. How long have the present New Brunswick vacancies in the Senate existed?
2. Is it the intention of the government to fill them during the present session of parliament? If not, when?
3. Are there any applicants for the positions?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). One of the vacancies in the Senate for the province of New Brunswick has existed for more than two years, the other for more than one year. It is the intention of the government to fill them during the present session. As to the third question, it is one which the government does not think it advisable to answer.

IMPORTATIONS OF PIG IRON.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. At what port or ports were the 62,647 tons of pig iron imported from the United States, referred to on page 132 of Trade and Navigation returns, entered?
2. At what port or ports of entry were the 35,897 tons of pig iron imported from Great Britain, referred to on page 132 of Trade and Navigation returns, entered?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. From the United States—Amherstburg, Berlin, Bowmanville, Brantford, Chatham, Galt, Guelph, Hamilton, Ingersoll, London, Oshawa, Ottawa, Paris, Port Hope, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Sault Ste Marie, Stratford, Toronto, Wallaceburg, Whitby, Windsor, Woodstock, Montreal, St. John, Sherbrooke, Amherst, Winnipeg, Grand Forks, Nanaimo, Vancouver, Victoria, Lethbridge, Regina.

2. From Great Britain—Belleville, Bowmanville, Brantford, Chatham, Galt, Gananoque, Goderich, Guelph, Hamilton, Inger-

soll, London, Oshawa, Ottawa, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Sarnia, Stratford, Toronto, Whitby, Windsor, Woodstock, Montreal, Quebec, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers, North Sydney, Sackville, St. John, Vancouver, Victoria.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Did the government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries employ a company of American expert auditors or accountants, examining the books and accounts or investigating the purchases made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the aids to navigation, or other supplies ?

2. If so, what is the firm name of the said auditors or accountants, and is its headquarters in New York, United States, or in Chicago, Illinois ?

3. If so, how many men have been so employed on said work, and for what length of time have they been so employed ?

4. If so, how much has the work cost, if completed, and if not completed, how much, if any, has been paid on account of said work ?

5. If so, has a report of their work been made, and will it be laid on the table of the House ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Mr. Kenneth Falconer, of Montreal, and staff, are making an audit of the accountant's branch of the Department of Marine with a view to remodelling work of same on most improved and up-to-date system of book-keeping.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Six. The work was put in hand towards the end of July last, and, after preliminary arrangements and details were settled, has since been in progress.

4. The work is not yet completed. An advance of $5,000 on account has been made.

5. No report has yet been made but as soon as it will be made I will lay it on the table if it is asked for.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBITAILLE asked :

1. Has the government ordered the printing of the evidence presented to the Tariff Commission ? If not, why not ?

2. If in the affirmative, when will it be laid before the House, and distributed to the members?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The report of the proceedings of the Tariff Commission has been laid on the table. The question of printing or not printing a document of that character comes within the control of a committee of the House. My recollection is that the committee recommended that it be not printed ; at all events they did not recommend that it be printed.

CONTRACT WITH MR. W. A. D. LEES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Has any contract or agreement been entered into by or on behalf of the government, or any department of the government, with Mr. W. A. D. Lees, or any other person, for fencing a part or tract of land near Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta?

2. What are the particulars of the agreement ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. The member for Marquette has given notice that he will move for all papers in this matter. These papers will be produced in due course and will disclose the desired particulars.

CLAIM OF THE SPARKS ESTATE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the claim of the Sparks Estate, for compensation, by reason of the diversion for railway terminals, of the land leased to the government for canal purposes, in Ottawa, been settled ?

2. If settled, what amount was paid therefor ?

3. If not settled, what steps does the government propose to take to remove the legal difficulties, if any exist, in the way of commencing the construction of the new central railway depot, in Ottawa, and when ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The amount to be paid to the representatives of the Sparks estate in settlement of their claim has been agreed upon, but payment has not yet been made pending negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the premises. The matter is entirely in the Department of Justice.

COLD STORAGE AND COOL CURING ROOMS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Has the government disposed of all the cold storage and cool curing rooms, built by them ?

2. How many of said plants have been sold, and to whom sold, the price received in each case, with the cost of building said plants originally ?

3. Were said plants sold by public auction, private sale, or tender ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The government has not disposed of any of the cold storage or cool curing rooms built by it. Having fully demonstrated the advantages of the cool curing of cheese as practised in these curing rooms, it was decided that the government should no longer be charged with the maintenance of them. Instead of disposing of the cool curing rooms, however, it was deemed advisable to lease the same for the purposes for

which they had been constructed. Tenders for the use of the several rooms have been called for and it is expected that satisfactory leases will be made.

2 and 3. Answered by 1.

WRECK OF THE 'SOVINTO.'

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Did the Department of Marine and Fisheries receive the request to send a life boat from one of the Government steamers 'Stanley' or 'Minto,' to the scene of the wreck on the north side of Prince Edward Island lately?

2. When was the request received, from whom, and what was the request?

3. What reply did the government give, and when?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. On the 7th November. Such request was received from Hyndman & Co., Lloyds agent at Charlottetown. It reads as follows: 'Men perishing on 'Sovinto' wreck near East Point. 'Stanley' in Georgetown, Souris people ask for 'Stanley's' life-boat saying they can save the men; will you order 'Stanley' to take her life-boat to Souris promptly.'

3. The same day the following instructions were wired to Mr. Lord, the department's agent at Charlottetown: 'Hyndman & Company wire as follows: 'Men perishing on 'Sovinto' wreck near East Point, 'Stanley' in Georgetown, Souris people ask for 'Stanley's' life-boat saying they can save the men; will you order 'Stanley' to take her life-boat to Souris promptly.' Department wishes you to do everything possible to assist.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. BRUCE McDOUGALL.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Is Bruce McDougall employed at the present time in the audit office of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton?

2. If so, in what capacity?

3. When was he appointed, at what original salary, what advances has he from time to time received, and what is his present salary?

4. How many days has he been absent from duty since July 1st, 1905?

5. Have his absences been reported to his superior officers? If so, when, by whom, and to whom were such reports made?

6. Did the officials responsible for the correctness of the pay-roll refuse upon any occasion to certify to Bruce McDougall's time?

7. Was the case reported to the general managers, and finally to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, and with what result?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railway and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Clerk.

3. (a) June 3, 1899. (b) $30 a month. (c) Advanced October, 1899, to $35; April, 1903, to $40; July, 1904, $45 (d) $45.

4. 174½ days on account of sickness and 15½ days on leave.

5. Yes. July last. By Mr. Williams, treasurer. To the general manager.

6. He was absent during the month of July and his name was left off the pay-list.

7. Yes. To the general manager who discussed the matter with the minister and deputy minister at Moncton, when it appeared that the usual medical certificate which had been sent in by McDougall to J. R. Bruce, his immediate superior, had inadvertently not been forwarded to Mr. Williams the accountant and treasurer. Upon this being done, following the ordinary practice, he was paid. However, as a result of the inquiry it was learned that the rules which had been in use on the railway since it was opened for traffic allowed gross abuses to creep in. On some of the older cases undue periods of sick leave had been granted, consequently the rules were revised and the possibility of abuse ended.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF OIL.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Does the Intercolonial Railway purchase oil from a company known as the Galena Oil Company?

2. If so, where are the headquarters of said company, and who is its representative with whom the Intercolonial Railway transacts business?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Franklyn, Pa., U.S.A. Invoices are received from Galena Oil Company, Toronto; cheques are issued in favour of the Galena Oil Company and sent addressed to the company at Toronto. All correspondence and returns are sent to C. C. Steinbrenner, auditor, railway department, Galena Oil Company, Franklyn, Pa., U.S.A.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PASS ISSUED TO SIR WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. During the year 1904, in whose favour was annual pass No. 4 issued?

2. To the personal knowledge of the Minister of Railways, how many times, and by whom was said pass used by persons other than the party in whose name it was issued?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. For the calendar year 1904, annual pass No. 4 over the Canadian government railways was issued in favour of the Hon. Sir William Mulock, K.C.M.G., and family, same as issued to all other cabinet ministers as had been the practice for many years past.

2. The minister has no personal knowledge of this pass being used by persons other than those entitled to use it; in fact,

he has no personal knowledge of this pass having been used at all during the year.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN ONTARIO.

Mr. CHRISTIE asked :

1. How many immigration agents were employed by the Dominion government in the province of Ontario during the present year ?
2. What are their names, and what rate of pay did they receive ?
3. In which portion of the province were their duties performed ?
4. What was the nature of their duties ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Nine agents.
2. (a) W. Moulding Baker for Oxford county.
Robt. Holmes for Huron county.
Geo. H. Mooney, for Bruce county.
Nelson Wait for Wellington county.
L. Burnett for Ontario county.
R. J. Crothers for Prince Edward county.
W. J. McNaughton for Glengarry and district.
Geo. L. Stewart for York (North).
(b) $100 per month each, and travelling expenses.
3. Answered by answer to second question.
4. To assist in distributing farm help.

EXPENDITURE ON TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. CHRISTIE asked :

1. What has been the total expenditure on the Trent canal since its inception to the 30th November, 1906 ?
2. What section remains incompleted, to afford a navigable waterway between Lake Ontario and the Georgian bay ?
3. What is the estimated cost of the incompleted work ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. (a) Capital :
Total expenditure to 30th November, 1906 . . . . . $5,054,032.97
(b) Income :
Total expenditure to 30th November, 1906. . . . . 296,059.67
$5,350,092.64

2. From Lake Simcoe to the Georgian bay. From the Bay of Quinté or Lake Ontario to Healey's Falls.
3. Estimates are not ready.

SUPPLY OF COAL TO MILITIA BARRACKS, HALIFAX.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Who has supplied the coal for the militia barracks in Halifax for the past year ?
2. At what rate per ton of 2,000 pounds ?
3. Is the coal supplied under tender and contract ?
4. What quantity is required for a year's use?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. Geo. E. Boak & Co.
2. Anthracite. Furnace size, $6.20 ; stove and egg size, $6.25 per ton. Soft coal, $4.35 per ton ; 75 cents per ton additional for delivery outside city limits. The contract for anthracite runs from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907. The contract for soft coal runs from January 1, 1906, to December 31, 1906.
3. Yes.
4. Estimated as required, 5,000 tons soft coal and 300 tons anthracite.

YUKON TELEGRAPH.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What were the receipts and expenditures, respectively, of the Yukon telegraph system in the fiscal year 1905 ?

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

Receipts : $115,876.18.
Expenditures, $229,351.05.

SUSPENSION OF IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Have any employees of the immigration office been dismissed or suspended within the last three months ? If so, what are their names, and what were the reasons for their suspension ?
2. Has a special inquiry under oath been held recently by the Auditor General into the accounts of these or other officers of the Immigration Department ? If so, what was his report to the minister?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes. George A. Johnston, George P. Ward, H. W. Ross, Monroe Charlebois, James O. Cowan and James White. Irregularity in their accounts.
2. Yes. On the 23rd November, 1906, the Auditor General addressed the following letter to the superintendent of immigration:

Sir,—Upon examination of the accounts of the travelling immigration agents, I find that the following charges cannot be accepted by this office :

Pullmans not properly vouched for.

G. P. Ward,	July, 1905-June, 1906..	$197 00
"	July, 1906-October, 1906.. ..	88 00
G. A. Johnston,	July, 1905-June, 1906.. ..	144 50
"	July, 1906-October, 1906	95 00
H. W. Ross,	July, 1905-June, 1906.. ..	229 00
"	July, 1906-October, 1906..	110 00
L. J. Kehoe,	July, 1905-April, 1906..	85 00
Jas. White,	July, 1905-June, 1906..	245 00
"	July, 1906-October, 1906.. ..	104 00

Meals on dining cars.

G. P. Ward,	July, 1905-June, 1906, 342..	346 40
"	July, 1906-October, 1906, 166	192 05
G. A. Johnston,	July, 1905-June, 1906, 422.	443 10
"	July, 1906-October, 1906, 143.	169 80
H. W. Ross,	July, 1905-June, 1906, 372..	386 85
"	July, 1906-October, 1906, 143..	159 15
L. J. Kehoe,	July, 1905-April, 1906, 274..	259 30
J. White,	July, 1905-June, 1906, 345.. ..	341 25
"	July, 1906-October, 1906, 82 ..	91 40

Hotel account acknowledged to have been changed by raising the amount—

G. P. Ward.. .. ..$8 75
G. A. Johnston.. .. .. 6 00

As no doubt, certain amounts have been expended by these agents on account of the charges made, I will return the vouchers to the accountant of your department that the amount of the refund may be ascertained.

The accounts of Messrs. Cowan and Charlebois are now being examined and will be sent in a day or two.

And on November 27th the Auditor General addressed the following further letter to the superintendent of immigration :

Sir,—With further reference to my letter of the 23rd instant. I beg now to inclose the statement of the charges made by Messrs. Cowan and Charlebois which cannot be accepted by this office:

Pullmans not properly vouched for.

J. O. Cowan, May, 1906-June, 1906.. .. ..$ 64 00
" July, 1906-October, 1906.. .. 72 00
H. Charlebois, July, 1905-June, 1906.. .. 148 00
" July, 1906-October, 1906. 122 00

Meals on dining cars.

J. O. Cowan, May, 1906-June, 1906, 69.. 69 05
" July, 1906-October, 1906, 162. 167 80
H. Charlebois, July,1905-June, 1906, 196.. 204 70
" July, 1906-October, 1906, 153. 166 45

These vouchers will also be returned to the accountant of your department that the actual amount of the refund may be ascertained.

The Auditor sent the following additional letter to the superintendent on the 28th November :

Sir,—With reference to the vouchers disallowed in the accounts of the travelling immigration agents, I beg to say that for sleepers I have struck out all the receipts which I had reason to believe were not actual payments for sleepers. If the agents can prove satisfactorily that I am mistaken in any instance it will alter the amount to be deducted but it will require strong evidence to convince me that I am mistaken.

With reference to the meal coupons, I have struck them all out as I am unable to accept them as vouchers, but this does not mean that nothing should be allowed for meals. The men no doubt had to pay something for their meals, but what that amount was, I am unable to determine, and I would suggest that, if you think it advisable, an allowance per meal might be made, such allowance as in your judgment might be fair and just.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY —OTTAWA EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Transcontinental Commission at Ottawa ?

2. What are their names, positions, salaries, and dates of appointment ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). That information has not yet been returned from the Transcontinental Commission. It is being prepared.

Mr. OLIVER.

PROMOTION OF IMMIGRATION TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government taken any action in order to promote immigration to the maritime provinces ?

2. If so, what has been done in each of the provinces, separately ; also, what is proposed to be done during the coming year ?

3. To what extent has each of the maritime provinces co-operated with the federal government, and what has been done by each province ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. (a) An agent, Mr. Anthony McLaughlin, has been engaged to promote immigration to Prince Edward Island from Great Britain; (b) Pamphlets and circulars have been printed and put in circulation. It is proposed to continue these efforts during the coming year.

3. The agent general of New Brunswick in England has co-operated in the distribution of pamphlets.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

What action does the government propose to take in reference to a resolution passed at the Maritime Board of Trade on the 16th August, 1905, and re-affirmed at the annual meeting held on 15th August, 1906, as follows :—

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TRANSPORTATION.

Whereas the province of Prince Edward Island entered the Canadian confederation under specific terms as to continuous communication, and whereas such communication has not to this day been accorded to her, and whereas much loss and very great hardship is occasioned to her yearly in the winter season especially, owing to the want of permanent communication, her natural progress and the extension of interprovincial trade being thereby greatly hampered and handicapped, and whereas no province of Canada, irrespective of size and population, should be without at least one permanent and efficient system of communication, provided it can be afforded by the reasonable expenditure of public money, since such system is essential to the intercourse of the different parts of the federation, and lends greatly to upbuild and consolidate them, therefore,

Resolved. that this Maritime Board of Trade, in annual convention assembled, requests, and does hereby urgently request, the federal government to complete the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island, by the construction and operation as soon as possible of a railway tunnel under the straits of Northumberland, the only sure, permanent and adequate system of communication available ; and,

Further resolved, that the system of navigation in vogue, pending the construction of the tunnel, be made as perfect as may be, the new ice-breaking steamer to be built being equipped with all the modern improvements for such

vessel, and by employing one of the fleet of ice-breakers on what is known as the western route.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The petition has been received and is engaging the consideration of the government.

I.C.R.—FREIGHT RATES TO AND FROM PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

What action does the government propose to take in regard to a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade, held at Amherst, N.S., on the 15th August, 1906. as follows :—

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FREIGHT RATES.

Resolution, 1904.

Resolved, that this Maritime Board of Trade now in convention assembled, reaffirm the following resolution, passed at the annual convention, held at Moncton in August, 1904, and urge upon the federal government, the necessity of adopting means to carry the same into immediate effect, thus placing shippers to and from Prince Edward Island on the same footing as those from Cape Breton Island and the Island of Vancouver :—

That, whereas shipments from points on the Prince Edward Island Railway to points on the Intercolonial Railway, and shipments from stations on the Intercolonial Railway to stations on the Prince Edward Island Railway, are subject practically to three short haul rail rates, winter and summer, the ferry service on the straits charging a short haul rate, and

Whereas, shippers on the Intercolonial Railway from points on the mainland to stations in Cape Breton, notwithstanding the ferry service at the straits, or Gut of Canso, are only charged a continuous railway haul, the resulting overcharge on shipments to and from the island on fifteen ton carloads of eighth class produce on an eighty mile haul, is equal to the difference between $45 and $88, as compared with an equal haul on the Intercolonial. Rates on first-class goods show a much greater injustice against island shippers to the mainland than mainland shippers to the island ;

Therefore resolved, that in the opinion of this board the rates of freight from all points on this government road to and from the island, should be adjusted on the basis of a continuous rail haul ;

Resolved, that the same principle applies to shipments originating at island points, and transferred to the Intercolonial ;

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Railways, and our maritime representatives at Ottawa.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This matter is under consideration by the department.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

PRIVATE BILLS—RULE 88.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many private Bills were deposited with the Clerk of the House eight days before the meeting of the House ?

2. In respect of how many private Bills to date, has the fine of $5 a day, provided for in Rule 88, been imposed ?

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

1. Thirty-two.

2. Twenty-seven.

I.C.R.—FACILITIES AT ELGIN ROAD STATION.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government, since the 26th March, 1903, instructed any of the officials of the Intercolonial Railway to lease or purchase a piece of land at Elgin Road Station, county of L'Islet, for the purpose of increasing the facilities for the manipulation of traffic ?

2. If such land is not leased or purchased has the government decided to lease or purchase a lot of land in order to help trade ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes. Superintendent Dubé was instructed to secure land for increased accommodation at Elgin Road station.

2. Written offers were received from several parties, to sell land for the purpose of increased accommodation at Elgin Road station, but no action was taken on these, as there was no money available for purchasing land there.

MAIL SERVICE TO ST. DAMASE (ASHFORD), STE. PERPETUE AND ST. PAMPHILE, COUNTY OF L'ISLET.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has the government decided to grant, on the 1st January, 1907, a daily mail service to the people of St. Damase (Ashford), Ste, Perpétue and St. Pamphile, in the county of L'Islet ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General). Yes.

BRITISH COLUMBIA JUDGESHIP ALLEGED TO BE FOR SALE.

Mr. MACPHERSON asked:

1. Has it come to the notice of the government that public statements have recently been made to the effect that a vacant British Columbia judgeship was for sale ?

2. Is there any foundation for the statement?

3. Have any representations regarding the matter been made to the Minister of Justice ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes, through items published in various newspapers.

2. None whatever.

3. Only by the forwarding to him of newspapers stating that such a charge was made in a public speech recently delivered in British Columbia.

GALT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What is the total expenditure to date on additional accommodation, alteration, fittings, &c., in the Galt post office building ?
2. What will be the total cost when the work is completed ?
3. When will it be completed ?
4. Were tenders invited ?
5. Is the work being done by contract, or how ?
6. Is there a supervisor, director or clerk of the works, employed ? If so, what is his name and remuneration, and by whom was he recommended ?

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

1. $9,307.05.
2. $11,500.
3. The work is practically completed.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. The work is being supervised by the clerk of works from Toronto, Mr. T. A. Hastings.

SUTHERLAND RIFLE SIGHTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. How many Sutherland combination rifle back sights have been purchased by the government to date ? From whom have they been purchased, and at what price ?
2. Is there any agreement or contract as to what quantity will be taken ?
3. Has the government taken steps to ascertain the exact cost of manufacture of the sight ? If so, what ?
4. On what reports was the sight adopted, and will the minister lay the reports on the table of the House ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. and 2. On April 16, 1906, a contract was made with the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited, for 36,000 Sutherland Patent Combination Rifle Back Sights. The contract was authorized by order in council. The price is $1 delivered at the Militia Inspection Room, Ottawa, between September 15, 1906, and March 15, 1908. None have been delivered as yet. Further supplies of Lee-Enfield rifle barrels, by way of renewal upon which the Sutherland back sights are to be placed, can be ordered without the leaf of the Lee-Enfield back sight, thus saving at least 40 cents on the cost of the barrel. With regard to these therefore, the net cost of the Sutherland back sight will be 60 cents each or less.

3. The exact cost could not be ascertained, but the minister is satisfied that the contract price is reasonable.

4. The sight was adopted upon reports made by the proper officers of the department, including Lord Dundonald, late general officer commanding, Lt.-Colonel Cartwright, inspector of musketry, and Lt.-Colonel Helmer, now D.A.A.G. for musketry. The reports will be laid on the table.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

CALCIUM CARBIDE.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What amount of calcium carbide has the Department of Marine and Fisheries purchased from the Ottawa Carbide Company, since the 1st of July, 1905 ?
2. What has been from time to time the price per pound paid by the department to this company ?
3. Is the freight from Ottawa to the points where the calcium carbide is used paid by the department or by the company ?
4. Does any contract at present exist between the government and the Ottawa Carbide Company for supplying this article ? If so, when would said contract expire ?
5. What quantity of calcium carbide has the government purchased since 1st July, 1905, from any company other than the Ottawa Carbide Company, and what was the price paid ?
6. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries called for tenders for the supply of this article ? If not, why not ?
7. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries received any offers from other companies to furnish carbide at a more advantageous figure, taking freight rates into consideration, than the price presently paid to the Ottawa Carbide Company ? If so, why have the offers not been accepted ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. 396·13 tons.
2. Prior to 1st July, 1906, 3¼ cents per pound, freight added. Since 1st July, 1906, 3 cents per pound, freight added. Tenders for present fiscal year called for delivery freight paid at the various agencies.
3. Paid by the company.
4. A contract has been entered into with the Ottawa Carbide Company, which expires on the 31st of March, 1907.
5. No carbide purchased from any company except the Ottawa Carbide Company.

Mr. AMES. The minister did not answer subdivision No. 7.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said, No. We accepted the lowest tender.

INSPECTION OF MILITARY STORES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Ames—asked :

1. Has the government or the Department of Militia in its employ officers whose duty it is to inspect saddlery, harness and other horse furniture, gun carriages, limbers ammunition, transport wagons, ambulances, &c. ?
2. What are the names of these officers, and the especial duties assigned to each ?
3. Are these officers on the permanent force ?
4. If not, how are they paid ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Inspectors of harness and saddlery :
   Lieut.-Colonel R. Brown, Ottawa.
   Sergeant R. Woodcock, Toronto.
   Inspector of artillery vehicles :
   Lieut.-Colonel W. G. Hurdman, Ottawa.

3. Sergeant Woodcock only is in the permanent force.

4. Lieut.-Colonel Hurdman and Lieut.-Colonel Brown receive 2 per cent upon the value of the stores inspected.

TENDERS FOR COAL FOR SOREL.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Were sealed tenders called for by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in April, 1905, for 10,000 tons of bituminous and screened steam coal to be delivered at Sorel ?

2. What offers were received in response thereto, and what were the prices quoted by each tenderer ?

3. Were any tenders refused or rejected ? If so, for what reason ?

4. To whom was this contract awarded ?

5. Was the same procedure followed in 1906? If so, what offers were received, what prices quoted, and to whom was the contract given ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. The T. F. Moore Company, Montreal—
Reynoldsville American coal : run of mine, per ton, in bond.. ..$3.70

The Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., New Glasgow, N.S.—
Sydney Mines, C.B., coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. .. 3.85
Screened, per ton.. .. .. 4.15

The Inverness Railway & Coal Co., Inverness, C.B.—
Inverness Imperial coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. .. 3.25
Screened, per ton. 3.40

Archer & Company, Quebec—
Gowerie & Blockhouse coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. 3.50
Screened, per ton.. .. .. 3.65
Dominion Coal Co.'s coal :
Run of mine, per ton 4.10
Screened, per ton.. 4,35

Andrew Baile, Montreal—
Scotch Main screened coal 3.50

L. Cohen & Son, Montreal—
American Clearfield coal:
Run of mine, per ton, in bond.. 3.75
Screened, per ton in bond.. .. 3.90
Dominion Steam coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. .. 4.25
Screened, per ton.. .. .. .. 4.50

3. Yes. The American coal offered was in bond and with duty added would bring the price higher than the other tenders.

The Old Mine Sydney screened coal was considered the best coal offered and was accepted.

4. The contract was awarded to the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Company for Old Mine Sydney coal, as it came the nearest to the specification.

5. Tenders were invited in 1906 and the lowest price for screened coal was accepted. The following tenders were received, viz. :

Archer & Company, Quebec—
Inverness coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. ..$3.50
Screened, per ton.. .. .. 3.78

The T. F. Moore Company, Montreal—
Reynoldsville coal, run of mine, per ton, in bond.. .. .. 3.65

The Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., New Glasgow, N.S.—
Old Mine Sydney coal :
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. .. 3.90
Screened, per ton.. .. .. 4.15

The Intercolonial Coal Mining Co.—
Drummond Colliery coal:
Run of mine, per ton.. .. .. .. 3.90
Screened, per ton.. .. .. 4.15

Offers only 5,000 tons.

Andrew Baile, Montreal—
Wishaw Main Scotch coal :
Screened coal, in bond.. .. .. 4.00

The contract was awarded to Messrs. Archer & Company of Quebec for Inverness screened coal.

CHIEF ACCOUNTANT OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Has the office of chief accountant and treasurer of the government railways been abolished ? If so, for what reason ?

2. Has any and what office been created instead thereof ?

3. What are the functions of the official, and in what respect do they differ from those of the official dispensed with ?

4. Has the new official been appointed, who is he, and what salary is proposed ?

5. Is the officer who was chief accountant and treasurer to be appointed to any other, and what office, and at what salary ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes. It was rendered necessary in improved system of accounting.

2. Comptroller and treasurer.

3. Wider control of all departments of accounting branch.

4. Yes. L. Shannon, $3,600, transferred from position of accountant of the Department of Railways and Canals.

5. No.

MOTOR CARS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Did the government send Mr. Joughins abroad to investigate into motor cars, with a view to their use on branch lines on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways ?

2. Did Mr. Joughins report favourably on the matter as to their use and economy and whether a suitable car could be obtained ?

3. What decision has the government reached in the matter of their use, and is it the intention to use any ? If so, when and where ?

4. Is the report that this car was to be used on the Cape Traverse branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway, correct ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Specifications are now being prepared in order that tenders may be invited, and upon the result will largely depend the decision of the government. The whole matter is having consideration.

4. No. Although it is hoped that on all branches on the Prince Edward Island Railway, this type of cars will result in economy and be of advantage to the railway and the people.

LETTER CARRYING SYSTEM IN CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to establish a letter carrying system in Charlottetown, in connection with their proposed scheme in this matter?

2. At what date does the government purpose inaugurating the system?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Postmaster General). The question of establishing a letter-carrier delivery system in Charlottetown has already been brought to the attention of the department by the Honourable A. B. Warburton, and he has been informed that his application would receive consideration whenever the general scheme for extending free delivery services was being dealt with.

EXPENSES OF FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How much expense has been incurred to date for the Fishery Commission, composed of Professor Prince, John Bernie and Mr. Noble?

2. How much has been paid to each of the said parties for per diem allowance as commissioners and for expenses?

3. What other expenses have been incurred?

4. Has the commission finished its work? If so, when may a report be expected?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $1,305.17.

2. Per diem allowance still under consideration. Expenses—John Bernie, $778.80; Jas. J. Noble, $331.70; Prof. Prince, $194.67.

3. None, so far as the department is aware.

4. Commission not yet finished its work. Report is expected shortly after the commission is finished.

POSTMASTER AT BETHANY, ONTARIO.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. Who occupies the position of postmaster at Bethany, county of Durham?

2. How long has he occupied the position?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Postmaster General):

1. Mr. William Morrison is postmaster of Bethany, county of Durham.

2. Since August 1, 1902.

IMPORTATION OF KNITTED GOODS.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What is the value of knitted goods imported from Germany during each of the following years:—1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906?

2. What is the value of knitted goods imported from Great Britain during each of the following years:—1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905. 1906?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Imports from Germany:—

Fiscal years.	
1900	$ 119,116
1901	99,804
1902	121,205
1903	214,727
1904	177,033
1905	212,808
1906	276,772

2. Imports from Great Britain:—

Fiscal years.	
1900	$ 733,042
1901	685,320
1902	671,204
1903	999,469
1904	1,213,951
1905	1,387,115
1906	1,641,312

LOBSTER HATCHERY AT EGMONT BAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Has the government received an application or petition for the establishment of a lobster hatchery at or near Egmont bay, on the south shore of Prince Edward Island?

2. Is it the intention of the government to establish such hatchery?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. There are various applications for new lobster hatcheries on the Atlantic coast; but the question of the selection of Egmont bay has not yet been decided upon.

FREIGHT TARIFF RATES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved for:

Return showing the local and general tariffs of each and every transportation line, railway or ship, giving in detail the rates upon each class of commodity from station to station; and also upon commodities passing through Canada, or from Canada to foreign countries, or to Great Britain and Ireland.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It would be quite impossible to bring in such a return. It would take a year to prepare it. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) would limit the question to some particular line we can do it, but if we have to go into all these tariffs the resources of the commission are inadequate.

Motion allowed to stand.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., ETC.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County) moved for :

Copy of all orders in council, correspondence, and all other papers relating to the Standard Chemical Company, Limited, or Pevelan & Co., in its dealings with the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, from the date of the incorporation of the said company to the present date.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). There is no objection to giving the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robitaille) all we can give him in reference to this matter. He will not of course expect the invoices or the copies of entry, but such papers as we may give him will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT OF RAILWAY OFFICIALS.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton) moved for:

Copy of all reports, investigations, orders, or correspondence, since 1st January, 1905, dealing with or touching upon alleged misconduct or remissions of duty on the part of (a) I. L. Burrill, paymaster on the Intercolonial Railway ; (b) Moses Tracey, inspector of car cleaners ; (c) Bruce McDougall, of the Intercolonial Railway audit office, Moncton ; together with a copy of the rules and regulations in force since above date, and at the present time, with reference to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may say that there are no papers with relation to I. L. Burrill, in fact there are no papers with relation to any of these gentlemen in connection with any misconduct or remissness. There could be no objection to furnishing the remainder of the information about the copy of the rules and regulations in force.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENT TO GEORGE COCHRANE, MONCTON.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton) moved for :

Return showing: All sums paid from 1st January, 1904, to date, to George Cochern, flour and feed merchant, of Moncton, for supplies furnished or services rendered the Intercolonial Railway ; such statement in respect of each item in every such transaction, when and by whom the order was given, nature of and the quantity of goods furnished, character of services rendered, prices paid, and the names of the parties who certified to the correctness of his account.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no person by that name who is a flour and feed merchant at Moncton. There is a George H. Cochrane who is a lumber manufacturer and dealer and commission merchant resident at Moncton who has had dealings with the Intercolonial Railway during the past year and in previous years. If the hon. gentleman will amend his motion in accordance therewith by changing the name to George H. Cochrane and striking out the words 'flour and feed merchant' the information can be brought down.

Mr. BARKER. I beg to move in accordance with the minister's suggestion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH SUB-TARGET GUN CO.

Hon. GEORGE FOSTER (North Toronto) moved for:

Copy of all orders in council, reports of experts or officials, and all correspondence relating to the adoption and purchase of 250 machine target guns, by the Department of Militia, and especially all letters passing between the Ontario Sub-Target Company, Mr. B. H. Jewell, Mr. Hartley Dewart, K.C., or any director or shareholder of the Sub-Target Company, and the Minister of Militia, or his private secretary, in reference to purchases or contracts, or agreements to purchase, either proposed or consummated, and payments made thereon or in pursuance thereof.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to move in amendment that the initial of Mr. Jewell be changed to 'J. H.' Jewell.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I would like to have the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) insert 'contracts' before 'orders in council' at the beginning of the motion and to strike out 'machine target guns' and insert 'sub-target guns,' which is the correct description, and to strike out the word 'Ontario.' The company is the 'Sub-Target Gun Company, Limited.' The hon. gentleman has already added Mr. J. H. Jewell's name ; I would like to add the word 'secretary' after the name—then in the fifth line after the word 'target' insert the word 'gun,' so as to have it read 'sub-target gun.'

Mr. FOSTER. What is the necessity for putting the word 'secretary' after Mr. Jewell's name.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is the secretary of the company.

Mr. FOSTER. That would simply make it include what letters passed between the department and Mr. Jewell as secretary. I want all letters.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, very well.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PORT DANIEL PIER.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.) moved for :

A copy of the correspondence, telegrams, tenders and engineer's estimates in reference to

letting the contract for the construction of extension to pier at Port Daniel in Bonaventure county.

He said: I wish to add the words: 'On May 30, 1904,' to the end of the motion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DUTIABLE GOODS IMPORTED FREE.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville)—by Mr. Hughes—moved for:

Return showing: 1. The value of all dutiable goods imported into Canada duty free during each of the fiscal years 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905 respectively, under any order in council or regulation or other authority, permitting dutiable goods for government purposes to be imported duty free.

2. The value of all such goods imported into Canada during each of the said respective years on which a rebate of duty has been given or allowed, under any such order in council, regulation or other authority as aforesaid, and also the amount of such rebate in every such instance.

3. The names and residences of the respective persons, corporations or firms who so imported the said goods in each instance, and the value of the goods in each instance imported by each such person, corporation or firm.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I think this is a repetition of the motion made last year by the hon. member, and in a conversation I had with him and with the leader of the opposition it was somewhat condensed and brought within limits. The same difficulty is present this year in regard to the motion as set forth in the order paper, but I can give the information in the condensed form as was agreed upon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the idea of the hon. member (Mr. Reid) is that the motion should be answered in the condensed form to which the minister has alluded and which I think was set out in a letter by the hon. member for Leeds to the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. Then this motion may be allowed to drop and I can lay the information on the table of the House to-morrow.

Motion dropped.

ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Foster—moved for:

A copy of all contracts between the Ross Rifle Company and the government, or Department of Militia, for the supply of rifles, ammunition or other articles, and all orders in council, correspondence, reports, documents and papers, relating to such contracts, or to the subject-matter thereof, and to the operation of the company and its dealings with the government, or any department thereof, including the Department of Customs.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). So far as the Department of Customs is concerned, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to include in his motion invoices or entries; with that exception I have no objection.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT TARIFF.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal) moved for:

A return showing, by means of a comparative statement, the difference in rates charged, in respect of the ten classes of articles most largely carried, under the standard freight tariff in force during 1904, and that in force at the present time upon the Intercolonial Railway, from stations, as hereinafter specified; 1. From Truro (a) to Hopewell, to New Glasgow, to Pictou, to Antigonish, to Port Mulgrave, to Grand Narrows, to Sydney, to Glace Bay, to Louisburg; (b) to Pictou; (c) to Londonderry, to Amherst, to Sackville, to Shediac, to Moncton, to Cape Tormentine.

2. From Moncton (a) to Salisbury, to Sussex, to Norton, to St. John; (b) to Kent Junction, to Weldford, to Newcastle, to Dalhousie, to Campbellton.

3. From Lévis (a) to Berthier-en-bas, to St. Thomas de Montmagny, to Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, to River du Loup, to Rimouski, to Causapscal, to Métapedia; (b) to Drummondville, to Ste. Rosalie, to Montreal.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There can be no objection to furnishing the information if my hon. friend will make his motion intelligible. In the first part of his motion, he says:

From Truro (a) to Hopewell, to New Glasgow.

Does that mean from Truro to New Glasgow? Then he says: 'to Pictou'; does that mean from Truro to Pictou? If it means from Truro to Pictou, why does my hon. friend make another subdivision: '(b) to Pictou.' From what point does he ask for in that subdivision (b) 'to Pictou' if he has asked it already in subdivision (a). There is no objection to the motion if my hon. friend will put it in such form as will make it possible for us to understand it. To pass the motion in its present wording would be very indefinite and very unsatisfactory to the railway and to my friend himself, as we may not understand it so as to give him the information he seeks.

Mr. AMES. There is a slight error in the printing of the motion. I had inserted in the fifth line the words: 'From station to station, as hereinafter specified,' and these have been omitted by the printer. I have taken the three points: Truro, Moncton and Levis, and I ask the freight rates radiating from these three points. The resolution would be perfectly intelligible if the words: 'from station to station' were printed, as it read in my original draft. In order to avoid tautology the words 'to Pictou' might be struck out from (a) as they are repeated in (b). If that were done, what is desired would be perfectly clear. The

desire is to secure the local freight rates on the class of articles which are carried in largest quantities from three points on the Intercolonial along radiating lines from these points. The motion will be clear if the amendments I have suggested are made.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STANDARD PASSENGER TARIFF.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved for :

A return giving a comparative statement of the standard passenger tariff in force on the Intercolonial Railway in 1904 and that in force at the present time, said statement to be so arranged as to show the former and present local passenger rates in convenient form for purposes of comparison, in each of the following cases : 1. From Truro (a) to Hopewell, to New Glasgow, to Pictou, to Antigonish, to Port Mulgrave, to Grand Narrows, to Sydney, to Glace Bay, to Louisburg; (b) to Pictou; (c) to Londonderry, to Amherst, to Sackville, to Shediac, to Moncton, to Cape Tormentine.

2. From Moncton (a) to Salisbury, to Sussex, to Norton, to St. John ; (b) to Kent Junction, to Weldford, to Newcastle, to Dalhousie, to Campbellton.

3. From Lévis (a) to Berthier-en-bas, to St. Thomas de Montmagny, to St. Anne de la Pocatiere, to River du Loup, to Rimouski, to Causapscal, to Métapedia ; (b) to Drummondville, to Ste. Rosalie, to Montreal.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). That motion should be in a different form so as to include all rates, because in many of these rates there has been no change whatever. For short distances, I think within 200 miles, the rates are the same as have prevailed for a number of years. The motion should be for a statement of the tariff in force now as compared with the tariff in force during the year 1904, and if my hon. friend will amend his motion to that effect, there will be no objection to it. Otherwise I shall require to amend it so that a full statement of the changes in the passenger rates shall appear. That will give the information which my hon. friend asks for as well as full information on the subject.

Mr. AMES. I had supposed that it was permitted to the members of this House who were desirous of saving their own time and the time of the House to secure certain abbreviated information without the necessity of going over the entire passenger returns. The minister says he proposes to lay before the House a statement of the passenger rates in force in 1904 and the passenger rates in force now, and he expects individual members of this House who have no expert knowledge to make their own comparisons. That is not meeting the point which I have in view. I desire simply to have a comparison of the passenger rates to stations of considerable traffic from points of radiation on the Intercolonial such as Truro, Moncton and Lévis. I think my motion is perfectly clear, and if it brought out the fact that there has been no change in the passenger rates in these short distances, my object would be attained. It is difficult for us who are not experts, but who desire in a general way to make a comparison of past with existing conditions, to take the extensive returns furnished by a railroad and make such a comparison from them. I had hoped the department would be willing to simplify the matter by giving a few illustrations of the passenger tariff in 1904 and 1906.

Motion allowed to stand.

LAND GRANTS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN WAR VETERANS.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House grants of Dominion lands should be set apart for those who took part in the South African war of 1899-1902, residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

He said : Mr. Speaker, every session since 1900 I have brought this matter in one form or another to the attention of the government. In the earlier sessions, the First Minister and the Minister of Militia received the proposal very courteously, and pointed out that until autonomy was granted to the Northwest provinces, it was not certain whether this government would be in a position to make these land grants without being liable to the provinces for the lands given. I will not enter into the question of the reasons which induced the government to retain control of the lands in granting autonomy to the Northwest provinces; but I do not think the government have now any valid excuse for not making these grants to the men who served in South Africa. It is not necessary for me to enter into a discussion of this question, which has been discussed again and again in the House. It has been the custom of the British government for many years to make grants of land to soldiers. Many such grants were made in the early days of Canada, and some of the soldiers who were the beneficiaries of that policy are still living. It has been the custom of the provinces which control their own lands to make similar grants. The Dominion government, at the conclusion of the Northwest rebellion in 1885, also granted scrip to the volunteers who served on that occasion. The men who went from Canada to serve the empire in South Africa did not go for the money there was in the service. It is all very well for those who remained at home to say that they went to have a good time; but we are not discussing that to-day. They went at the risk of their lives, and many of them did not return. They did splendid service for Canada—a service which, as an immigration advertisement

alone, was worth more to the Dominion of Canada ten times over than all the scrip that would be required for these men in the west. I do not know that I would be justified in asking scrip for the men from Ontario and other provinces which gave them land from their own territory; but I certainly think that the soldiers from provinces which have no land to grant, such as Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are entitled to the consideration of the government. I will not take up time to discuss this question; the First Minister and the Minister of Militia are already cognizant of it, and I hope they will grant this recognition to those splendid fellows from the Northwest who went to South Africa to risk their lives for Canada, and whose service there was the best advertisement for Canada she could possibly have.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to add very much to what has been said by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) on this question. The practice of making these land grants of land has been sanctioned by custom, as he has pointed out, and they have been made in cases in which the duties were far less arduous and the risks involved were far less serious. The people of the Northwest are proud of their volunteers and the services they rendered to the empire in the South African war. In proportion to population, I think the Northwest sent more men to the war than any other part of Canada or probably any other part of the empire outside of South Africa itself. There is no doubt that their offers of service were prompted by feelings of the very highest patriotism and duty. I need only mention one individual case that came to my notice, of a near neighbour of mine, one of the most successful farmers of the district who left his farm to be managed by his wife and himself and two of his sons went to do service in the ranks of the first or the second contingent. These men deserve well of their country, and their services should be recognized. They did greater service in the cause of the unity of the empire than perhaps they knew at the time, and that service will live long after they have passed away. This is a question which those provinces entitled to a full share in the confederation would deal with themeslves; but unfortunately the provinces of the Northwest have not received their full status in this respect, and they cannot deal with their lands. Had they the right to deal with their lands I have no doubt whatever that they would make these grants and I must confess that I was very much surprised to hear that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister made it an excuse for not agreeing to the terms of this resolution that the government were afraid it might be called to account if they granted these lands away.

In the year 1901 this resolution was passed unanimously by the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories in regard to this very question. I will read it to the House because I think this effectually answers the objection of the Prime Minister which has been quoted.

> On motion of Mr. Macdonald, seconded by Mr. Villeneuve,
>
> Resolved, that whereas during the last two years the British empire has been engaged in war in South Africa, and
>
> Whereas, certain volunteers from the residents of these territories went to assist in maintaining the integrity of the British empire ;
>
> And, whereas, these troops have acquitted themselves in a manner worthy of the country ;
>
> Therefore, be it resolved that this assembly do urge upon the Dominion government the advisability of making a grant of land, from and in the Northwest Territories to each volunteer, a resident of these territories who engaged in such war.

That was the deliberate opinion of the legislature of the Northwest Territories and I have not the slightest doubt it is still the opinion of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That resolution was passed on the 12th day of June, 1901. I was present in the assembly at the time and I remember the feeling that existed that these lands really belonged to the people of the territories and it was not right that we should have to go hat in hand to the government at Ottawa in order to ask that our own lands should be given to our own volunteers. However, the first object in view was to get these land grants and so, as I say, the resolution was unanimously passed. Now, that the Dominion government have definitely decided to keep these lands in their own hands there can be no further excuse for not dealing with the question and I trust this resolution will be allowed to pass.

Mr. J. G. TURIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has engaged the attention of all western representatives in parliament some years past. I know that it has been brought to my attention on several occasions and I have discussed the matter with the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). There is a general impression throughout the country that those of our friends who volunteered for service in South Africa, although they received all the pay that was offered at the time, should be given some recompense in the way of land. The fact that the province of British Columbia and of Ontario have taken this course makes it look rather niggardly if the Dominion government does not do something along the same lines in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan where they own the lands and where the provincial governments do not own them. I

am in sympathy with what has been said but I think that if the department should decide to make a land grant to those from the Northwest who went to South Africa when they were called upon and when the empire needed them it should be given to actual settlers, to those, who when they volunteered, were residents in these different provinces and that in giving the land grants they should be given along the same lines as the bounty warrants that were granted a good many years ago to those who took part in putting down one of the Northwest rebellions. Each warrant entitled the recipient to 320 acres of land. Any man was entitled to 160 acres as a free homesteader but the government gave a warrant for 320 acres. The recipient of that warrant had to go and fulfil the conditions as to residence and duties just the same as would be required of an ordinary homesteader. If he did so he received not only a homestead, which he could get anyway, but he received an additional 160 acres on account of having taken part in putting down the rebellion. If the same line of procedure were adopted the result would be that a quarter section of land would be given to each of the South African veterans for having taken part in the war and if he were entitled to a homestead he would not only get the homestead but he would get 160 acres additional. In this way you would facilitate the settlement of the country and it would not be made a matter of speculation. I trust the hon. minister will be able to work out something along that line to meet the generally expressed wish of those who took part in the war in South Africa from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I would be very sorry to see the resolution adopted in such a way as to restrict it to the conditions which my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) suggests. While I would be in favour of adopting a portion of the suggestion if the whole of his suggestion was carried out, a great hardship would be done to a great many people whom it is intended to help. A great many of these men are living in portions of the country where there are no homesteads to be taken. A great many of them have already availed themselves of homestead privileges and I think it would be very hard—in fact, it would be doing them a very poor service—to grant them a homestead in some other part of the country where they would have to go and reside on the land. He proposes that before they are eligible to receive 160 acres they should be eligible for a free homestead. I think they should be granted this 160 acres of land on most liberal terms and without any conditions whatever regarding previous homesteading or homesteading at the present time for the reasons I have already stated. They are generally resident in portions of the country where it is impossible for them to perform homestead duties.

In reference to the motion in general, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Dominion should not hesitate to make this grant of land to the men who served the empire in South Africa. I know from personal knowledge, having resided in a portion of the country where a large percentage of our young men left for South Africa, that a great many of them left good homes and valuable property behind them and enlisted for South Africa from a patriotic sense of duty to the empire. It is very easy to get men to volunteer when our arms are victorious on every field but it is perhaps not always so easy to get men to go out and fight for the country when their services are required, as I think they were at that time. These men volunteered because they wished to help the empire and I believe, as we all believe, that they were the men who were best suited for a certain kind of work at that particular time. There is not a doubt that they fulfilled the expectations of the people of Canada in every respect. If I might be allowed to give one instance of the bravery and self-sacrifice of our Canadian volunteers in South Africa I would like to mention the exploit of four men who left our town. They were two brothers named Miles, a third named Morden and a fourth named Kerr. They were taken from camp one morning and placed on a certain line of railway to protect that railway from the enemy. The escort had only left them a short time when they were attacked by a large number of the enemy. The man in charge sent one of the men, his brother, to the rear with the horses instructing him to report the incident at the main camp. Before relief came two of the men, Morden and Kerr, were killed, one shot through the brain and the other through the heart. Miles was shot nine times but he still held the enemy at bay. I think that an incident of that kind will advertise this country abroad more than almost anything else that Canadians could have done. I do not think that the people of Canada as a whole would hesitate to grant 160 acres of land to these men on most liberal conditions. I hope this resolution will be adopted, and that the government will deal generously with these men.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). While I do not at all wish to dissent from justice being done to the men from the Northwest Territories who did their duty in fighting the battles of the empire, I desire to say a word for those volunteers in the same service who came from the maritime provinces. The Dominion government holds no land in the maritime provinces which could be utilized for the purpose of rewarding the men from those provinces, but I think that, if the government intend to take up this matter seriously and do justice

to the men from the Northwest, it should be only as part of a comprehensive scheme which will result in justice being done to all. If the government intend to compensate those who went from the Northwest to fight the battles of the empire, they are equally bound to do the same justice to those from the maritime provinces.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I understand the terms of the motion of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to contemplate giving these grants to the men who served in South Africa and who were, at the time of their enlistment, living in what are now the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and the province of Manitoba. With that view, I heartily, concur, and I have to state that the government is prepared to accept that view. As to what my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) has said, that hon. gentleman will remember that the province of Ontario, and I think, the province of British Columbia, have already given grants of land to those of their citizens who served in South Africa. It would be equally open to the other provinces of the Dominion to deal in any way they see fit, by way of rewards, with those who served so well in the Boer war. I do not wish to make any special reference to the bravery of those men who came from the Northwest and from Manitoba. I quite agree with all that was said by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) on that subject. Certainly, these men were no less brave than those who went from any part of Canada. I believe that every contingent, including the first, contained a very large percentage of men, then residing in what are now the new provinces and Manitoba. The mover of this resolution has referred to the fact that he has brought it up in the House before. That is perfectly true. My hon. friend from East Assiniboïa (Mr. Turriff) and other members on both sides of the House from the Northwest and Manitoba, have brought the matter to my notice on several occasions. I feel that, now that the new provinces have been formed and their representatives, have expressed their views as to what should be done in this matter, it is absolutely necessary that this government should take action. The provinces are not in a position to do so themselves; but, it being clearly understood that there is a unanimous opinion in these provinces and in Manitoba that this act should be done—this act of justice to these men who served in South Africa—it seems to me there should be no hesitation in adopting the resolution unanimously in this House. I would only wish to make it clear, if it is not so already, that it applies only to those men who took part in the South African war who were residing at the time of their enlistment in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does any other hon. gentleman desire to speak before the mover replies ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have a few words to say in reply, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that the government has given a favourable reception to this motion. This act of justice has been delayed for a number of years, but it is an act of justice still. I drafted this resolution to read in favour of those 'residing in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.' That may be interpreted as applying to the time of their enlistment, or as applying to the present time. I leave it to the discretion of the minister to decide what he will do about it. For my part, I do not see any objection to a soldier from the older provinces, who, having served his country in South Africa and found himself without a situation on his return, removed to the Northwest, being included among those to whom the grant of land should be given. I do not understand that the minister (Sir Frederick Borden) is asking to amend the motion?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will ask that it be amended so as to limit it to those living in these provinces at the time of their enlistment. If it is to go further, that is a question to be considered at a later day. So far as this motion is concerned, I would ask that it be amended in that way.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The only point is this—if the minister would let it pass in its present form and without amendment, he could interpret it in the way he proposes—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One is not always allowed to do that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And if later on, he decided to extend it so as to include all those now living in the Northwest, there would be no harm done.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The reason for the amendment is obvious. A man may have had his grant in Ontario or in British Columbia and, later, have moved to the Northwest——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I appreciate that, and will accept the amendment suggested by the Minister of Militia.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

HONOURABLY DISCHARGED BRITISH SOLDIERS AS SETTLERS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House the best interests of Canada and the empire would be served by the settling in Canada of honourably discharged British soldiers and their families.

He said : This motion also is what may be called an old favourite, as it has been brought to the attention of the government a number of times. When the hon. member

for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was Minister of the Interior,—and by the way, I regret, not to see the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in his place— I interviewed him on the subject. He took it up with the War office. I had had the privilege of taking it up with the War office before. The former deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. Smart, personally visited the War office and endeavoured to make some arrangement by which these discharged British soldiers could be brought as settlers into the Canadian Northwest. I also interviewed leading officers or railways and large employers of labour with a view to forming some plan to carry out this idea. But no system could be devised to be carried out by private enterprise that would meet the situation.

It is not necessary that I should speak at length of the advantage derived by a country from the settlement in it of military men. The history of all nations gives us examples, and especially examples of the advantage of the settlement of honourably discharged and disciplined men of military training. The old Greek colonists were known the world over. They settled in Asia Minor, all through northern Italy, Southern France, up to Central France, the eastern coast of Spain, the northern coast of Africa, —all these countries were colonized with old Greek soldiers; and the democratic form of government, the love of liberty that permeated those lands up to the present time are largely due to the spirit that was put into the colonies by these old Greek soldiers who were planted there as colonists in the early days anterior to the Roman period. Britain's old military colonists are illustrations known the wide world over. We find their descendants in England and Scotland on either side of the line, men who were planted there by the various governments in Scotland on the one side and England on the other, thoroughly disciplined men. I believe that no part of either land will furnish much better men than those to be found along the borders. So with the old colonies in the north of Ireland, all through Ireland, even the south of Ireland; many of those who to-day curse the memory of Cromwell are descendants of Cromwell's troopers, a race planted as military settlers at that period.

However, the matter may be looked at, the question, as I understand it, is to devise some form of getting these men to come. The country is bringing immigrants here at its own expense. I have interviewed the railway men of the country, and they would all be delighted to accept these old soldiers as railway section foremen, section men, workers on the road, men in the yards, men in care of station houses. Another in which these honourably discharged British soldiers could receive employment is in connection with banking and business institutions. These men would make admirable caretakers and watchmen, and admirable citizens. Old soldiers have already made excellent citizens in Canada in previous days, and the old soldier of to-day is just the same as his predecessor was. Some may say these old fellows take a horn of liquor occasionally. Well, Sir, that is the only fault I have heard urged against old soldiers. But very few of them are guilty of that. I do not know that the percentage among them who do that is any greater than the percentage of men in any other walk of life. For myself I do not indulge to any extent, but I can easily understand and sympathize with the old fellows who, when they meet to draw their pay, do happen to take a drop too much. I may point out many instances where old soldiers who came to this country in days gone by have made excellent citizens, excellent merchants. The late A. M. Smith, of Toronto, a man who died almost a millionaire, was an old private soldier in the British army. The late Honourable John Macdonald, one of the first citizens of the Dominion of Canada, was the son of a British soldier. The late Honourable David Macpherson was himself an old British soldier. I could name hundreds more of old soldiers or descendants of old soldiers who became eminent in business walks of life, and a credit to the country from which they came.

Now, if the government would take up this question with the War Office—there is a very excellent officer now in charge of the War Office, he is permanent Under Secretary of State, I refer to Sir Edward Ward, one of the first soldiers of the empire, one of the best statesmen of the empire, a genial, tactical man—I am satisfied that some plan could be devised whereby these soldiers could be brought to Canada and planted on the farms, planted along the lines of railway, planted in business houses; and they would reflect credit on their native country, and inspire the youth of Canada with pride in British institutions, and in every sense would benefit the empire to which we belong. I trust the First Minister will see his way clear to devise some plan, some official plan, of encouraging this class of immigrants to come to Canada. I do not know what suggestion I could make, whether or not some special official should be detailed by this government to co-operate with officers on the other side to bring these men out. I am satisfied that if the First Minister appointed an officer to consult with the railway companies of Canada, they could take hundreds and thousands of these men every year, and give them positions along the lines of railway. And if the Minister of the Interior would direct his gigantic intellect to this matter, I am more than satisfied he could see his way clear to have these men placed on the homesteads of the Northwest. As I have pointed out on other occasions, I would be prepared to do that with any immigrant, and especially with

military men from the old country, put down on each homestead apportioned to these men a neat little cottage costing a small sum of money. I had the pleasure of seeing a nice little house built in the Northwest this last season for about $80, a very comfortable cottage. I spent many pleasant nights in it. And there are many others better than that. Give each of these men a yoke of oxen, a plough, a little outfit, and about twenty-five acres broken when they come there. This could be done for $450 or $500. Let them have the first year's seeding. Then hold a lien on the farm, and let them have a certain number of years to pay it. That would bring a class of immigrants to this country that would be a credit to the government, and the government would no doubt be repaid before the end of the ten years in almost every case, the entire outlay incurred on this behalf. I think this would be a good proposition, not only in regard to old soldiers, but I believe it would pay with every good immigrant from abroad to treat him in the same manner. I shall be pleased to leave this matter in the hands of the government to devise some scheme, appoint some high official perhaps, if it cannot be done by private arrangement, in order that we may attract this splendid class of men to come here and settle in the Dominion of Canada.

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

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENT OF RAILWAY FARES OF RIFLEMEN.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House, the best interests of the militia of Canada would be served by the payment of the railway fares of two riflemen, selected as being first-class shots, from each unit of the militia, from the headquarters of each unit, to the Dominion of Canada rifle matches annually.

He said: I have the honour to introduce another old friend, a project for assisting the riflemen from distant points to attend the Dominion Rifle Association matches. This motion needs no explanation. I need not tell this House that the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association has for its object the gathering of the crack riflemen, or supposed crack riflemen, of the country at the ranges in Ottawa once every year. At the present time these men come entirely at their own expense, at their own initiative largely. Through the kindness of the Minister of Militia some assistance has been granted from time to time. But chiefly at their own expense they have organized their ranges at home and paid all the costs connected therewith; they give their own time in addition to attend the annual drill of their corps. They give a great deal of time to the improvement of rifle shooting.

This is one of their fads you might say. Every man who knows anything about the militia of this country knows that they are not kept together year after year by the trifling sums granted by the government, but they are kept together by their own energy and enterprise, and what you might almost call the craze of the men to perfect themselves in rifle shooting, in military tactics and in the instruction necessary to mantain their high position as military men. Every man knows that these men who come here are obliged, most of them, to come from distant points at a very great cost. Any one who has brought men here knows how much it costs to bring them to Ottawa and take them back again, particularly from those parts of the province of Ontario distant from the capital. About a year ago I paid a great deal of attention to this matter, and I have come to the conclusion that the only fair way to treat men coming to the seat of government will be to pay the railway fare of one or two men from each unit of the active militia from every part of Canada, from the Yukon, from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

This might seem a rather heavy bill, but I am satisfied it would not amount to much more than the annual drill pay of these men in the camps of instruction of the country. Supposing these men were granted their annual drill credit to be applied on their railway travel to Ottawa from any part of Canada, I think the country would not be very much money out of pocket. I have figured it up and taken the summer excursion rates given by the railways from time to time and I am satisfied that the average from all parts of the Dominion would not exceed $10 per man. Supposing there are 800 or 1,000 units in Canada and only two or three men were to come from each unit, the cost would not be more than $15,000 or $20,000 and from this I believe great good would result to the militia of Canada. We would then have hundreds of men brought here who under no other possible condition of affairs would reach here. In that way we would get the best shots and I am satisfied a great impetus would be given to the building up of the militia of the country. I know there is a cry throughout the country to which ministers of both sides of politics are too inclined to bow, that we are running too much to militarism. I want to tell the gentlemen who are raising this cry, whoever they are, that they are not cognizant of the facts of the case, or they are dishonest in the contentions they place before the country. We have an army of over 20,000 clergymen in the country who are supposed to look after the morals of the people ; we have an army of judges, magistrates, lawyers and constables representing the repressive element of law and order ; these two bodies cost this country upwards of twenty times as much as the entire militia force of the Dominion of Canada,

and yet I had the pleasure of listening to a prominent clergyman, Rev. Dr. Chown, of Toronto, delivering an address on the subject: 'Is Canada a Civilized Nation?' You can search in vain through the criminal records for the names of men trained for any length of time in the militia of the country. Train the youth of the country in the discipline of military affairs, train them to appreciate what it is to be part of the military system of a great nation such as the British empire, and you lay the foundation of law and order from the outset. Look at the old military communities, whether in Quebec, where we have the descendants of the military men of the early French days, or in other portions of Canada where you have the descendants of British soldiers, and where you find the descendants of these men you find law and order regularly observed. When you have the young boys of the country trained in military drill, given that idea of holding their heads up and looking the world squarely in the face, you lay the foundation of manhood. I would urge upon the minister that he give this his very best consideration if he cannot promise anything better at the present time. I know he is as anxious to get the boys here from the remote portions of Canada as I am. We have taken the matter up in various ways again and again, and I cannot see any way whereby it can be done as economically and with so much benefit to the Dominion of Canada and with the same fairness as by the government taking hold of the matter and paying the men, say two from each corps, let all the others come next if they want to, but let the government pay two from each corps to come to the annual matches at Ottawa.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I would like to attract your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this resolution is introduced by a private member of this House and to ask you whether it is competent for him to introduce a resolution that involves the expenditure of public money?

Mr. SPEAKER. The resolution in its terms is only an expression of opinion, which is quite in order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with all my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has said as to the desirability of encouraging in every legitimate way the art and science of rifle shooting. I doubt if we can overdo it. I doubt whether we can spend more money in that direction than we ought. Certainly I believe that the people at large will agree that the money we are spending in teaching rifle shooting is as much justified as any money that is being expended on the militia. However, in this particular case my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes), having had an opportunity of bringing his views before the House, I think he will agree with me that this is largely a departmental matter. I have my own view that perhaps a larger amount of money might be granted to the Dominion Rifle Association or to the different associations of the Dominion, and that through those associations more aid might be given to representative riflemen in order to bring them to Ottawa. In any case I can promise that the matter will be most carefully looked into and I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to be kind enough to withdraw this motion and to leave it to the department to deal with the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My object in introducing the motion was merely educative. It has been my custom for many years in all these matters to present the subject and trust to the good sense of the various ministers concerned, both in Conservative and Liberal times, to work out a solution of the difficulty. It is not my intention or desire to bring a question of this kind to a division in the House. Much has been accomplished by that educative process in days gone by, and I trust that the minister, having again been reminded of it, will devise some plan and that before another year rolls around some process will be arrived at whereby the various corps of this country can be fairly represented at the annual rifle meetings at Ottawa. I have the honour to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved:

For a return showing the local and general tariffs of each and every transportation line, railway or ship, giving in detail the rates upon each class of commodity from station to station; and also upon commodities passing through Canada, or from Canada to foreign countries, or to Great Britain and Ireland.

He said: My object in moving this motion is that I understand every railway has a printed schedule of its rates; that is all I want. This can be obtained by any shipper at any local station throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion by asking a station agent for it. The part I want is the rates from through points, from Chicago, say for instance over Canadian lines to the sea-board and thence on to the old country; I want these in addition from these western points through Canada on to the sea-board. I understand that very, very frequently the short haul rate exceeds the long haul. For instance, grain comes to Midland from Chicago. The through rate from Midland to Montreal frequently does not exceed 5 cents a bushel, but grain cannot be shipped from Lindsay to Montreal for that sum of money.

Why should the people in the vicinity of Lindsay and other points on the line have to pay eight cents, ten cents, and twelve cents per hundred for Canadian grain hauled over roads built with the Canadian farmers money when American grain from

the Western States is brought by boat to Midland and hauled from Midland to Montreal for export at 2½ or 3 cents per hundred. We can see a train of grain from Victoria county going to Montreal and paying 8, 10, or 12 cents per 100, while the following train may contain Yankee grain which is being hauled for 2½ cents or 3 cents per 100 to the sea-board. Why should that be? I believe that if the tariffs are produced it would be an eye-opener to the people of Canada, and we would be in a position to see whether we are being fairly treated in the matter of freights or whether we are not. The United States government annually publishes a statement of the rates from the various shipping points to the sea-board and the railway department or the Railway Commission can write to Washington and get these rates; in fact they can be found in the library here. I see that the enterprising Minister of Railways and Canals is back in his place looking fresh and hearty from a trip to the Rocky Mountains, and I am sure he will be only too delighted to bring down these returns. Then the people of Canada will have a statement as to these freight rates and they will see whether it is true that the short haul rates are double the long haul rates. If the short haul exceeds the long haul I don't think it should be allowed by the Railway Commission; I agree that the long haul frequently should not be much higher than the short haul for bulky commodities, but I think the principle should be established that the short haul should never exceed the long haul on any commodities. That is the object I have in making the motion and I hope the minister will see his way clear to let it pass.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have stated already to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that it would be quite impossible for us to bring down the returns which he asks for unless he consents to limit his motion. I understand that what he wants is simply the general freight rates of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific and the chief transportation companies, and I think we may be able to bring these down. With this understanding the motion may pass.

Mr. SPROULE. Let it include the Intercolonial Railway as well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, the Intercolonial Railway too.

Motion agreed to.

COAL LANDS IN THE WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the coal lands owned by the government of Canada should only be alienated under such conditions, and subject to such control and regulations, as will provide for an immediate supply of coal adequate at all times to the requirements of the people, and at a reasonable price to the consumer; and that in respect of coal lands already alienated, legislative provision should be made for such control and regulation, in case of emergencies, as will in the future prevent loss and suffering to the people of the western provinces, through lack of fuel supply.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a duty I owe to my constituents and to the people of the Northwest in general, that I should submit this motion to the House. In justification of it I need only refer to the present serious situation in reference to the coal supply in the western provinces. I believe that I am capable of giving an opinion on this question inasmuch as I reside in the constituency within which is produced 80 per cent of all the coal that is now mined in the Northwest, and I think I may say also that from 75 to 80 per cent of all the coal so far discovered in the western provinces is located within the boundaries of my electoral district. I have resided in that district from the earliest days; in fact I was there before we found very much coal and before there was any coal at all produced in the province of Alberta. I have had a good deal of experience in the coal business and hence it is that I may claim to know something about the question. I may be permitted to point out also that closely akin to the coal business is the lumber business in the Northwest, and I know of my own knowledge that on account of the exorbitant prices charged for lumber in that country the people there have been unable to build houses that are sufficiently warm for the settlers to dwell in during severe weather. If an investigation were made at the present time I believe we would find that there are many people living in houses which no one here would consider fit for occupation by a white family. Not only a few of the settlers, but I believe that fully one half of them are living in houses of that description to-day. I shall not refer to the lumber business now further than to say that something will have to be done with regard to it later on during the session. The first part of my resolution deals with the coal lands now owned by the government and situated in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. I suppose I am safe in saying that the bulk of these coal lands are within the province of Alberta. As to the coal lands now owned by the government, it is a very easy thing for the government to make such regulations as to its production and sale as the government may see fit to impose. But the second part of the resolution refers to coal areas which are already alienated and in the hands of private individuals or corporations, and it is not such an easy matter for the government to make regulations with regard to these. As to the coal lands

owned by the government, if restrictive regulations are imposed there would be no inducement for the prospector to seek new coal areas and no inducement for the miner to develop these areas, because the prospector and the miner would realize that they would be at a disadvantage as compared with the owners of the mines already in operation. I would suppose that a very great percentage of the coal now discovered is already in the hands of private operators; I think that would apply to 75 per cent of the known good coal lands of Alberta. If severe regulations were made affecting unsold coal lands there would be nothing to induce the prospector or the capitalist to develop these lands. As to the imposition of regulations with regard to the mines that are already alienated I think it is the duty of the government to formulate some policy to deal with them ; I myself have nothing to suggest just now. We have been disposing of coal lands from the earliest days without any conditions whatever so far as I know; they have been sold at from $7 to $10 per acre, the only consideration being that a royalty is to be paid to the government.

We have had practically a coal famine in that country this winter and yet I suppose a thousand tons of coal are shipped every day from Alberta to the United States. A coal mine situated not more than ten miles from where I live has been shipping to the United States daily over a hundred tons of the best quality of domestic coal for the last four or five months ; and from the Crow's Nest Pass mines possibly a thousand tons of coal and coke are shipped daily to the United States. A great deal of this coal land is in the hands of speculators. To give you an example. A coal mine not far from Pincher Creek, known as the Christie mine has supplied coal for twenty-five years to the district for twenty-five or thirty miles around until five or six years ago, when it was bought by Jim Hill, who owns it at present. Mr. Hill owns about ten thousand acres of coal lands in that locality, and yet that mine has been idle during the last five or six years. We have no law or regulation to compel him to work that mine, even though all the people of the district should be freezing to death. Under these circumstances I think the government must see the necessity of devising some means for protecting the people from suffering or death for want of fuel. I would not for a moment suggest that the government should engage in the operation of coal mines ; I do not think any reasonable person would expect that ; but I think they should regulate them. This question does not appeal to the ordinary man in eastern Canada in the same way that it does to us in the Northwest, where there are hundreds of thousands of people living on the open plains, perhaps a hundred miles from a stick of firewood. Just think of the hundreds of families who are living on the open plains of the Northwest in stormy weather, such as they probably have at the present time, practically without fuel. I think that the government should in some way make provision that companies owning coal lands shall not be allowed to extort exorbitant prices for coal. At the present time they are charging at the mouth of the mine $5 a ton for slack or refuse coal, the produce of years past which usually would not sell at any price ; and good coal, which has usually been sold at about $2.50 a ton, is now selling at $10, $12 or even $14 a ton in some of the towns in the coal district. I call the attention of the government to these facts in the hope that if anything can be done it will be done to regulate the price of coal to the settlers of that country.

With reference to the strike at Lethbridge. I suppose that was the cause of the present acute degree of scarcity. The Lethbridge mines produce domestic coal almost exclusively, so that there is very little demand for their output in the summer season. The only coal they produce for other purposes is to supply the company's railways, which run in two directions from Lethbridge, one towards the boundary line at Cardston and one to Coutts, each for a distance of about seventy-five miles. The coal produced in the summer season has been either stored by the company or shipped to distant towns. In that way the people were provided with a supply of fuel when winter came on. It would be difficult to make an accurate estimate of the quantity of coal that would be required in that country, but I should think that for the next three months 250,000 tons would be required, while I do not suppose that the Lethbridge mines will be able to produce over 90,000 tons, even under the most favourable conditions. Therefore, notwithstanding the report of the Minister of Labour, which I was pleased to hear, that the strike was settled and that all danger of a coal famine in the Northwest for this year was over, I am very much afraid that if the matter were investigated, it would be found that there is or is likely to be a great deal of suffering in the Northwest this winter from lack of coal. It has not been made clear to my mind which party was at fault in this coal strike, the miners' union or the coal company. It has been stated that it was a lockout by the owners of the mines. It has also been stated that the strike at Fernie was a lockout. I would not for a moment say that it was, because I have not the knowledge to enable me to form an opinion on the matter. The mine owners, on the other hand, say that the fault was entirely with the miners' union. I think the government should investigate the matter, and find out who has been to blame for these strikes, and I hope some

legislation will be brought down this session in the direction of compulsory arbitration. It does not make much difference to the settler who has been at fault if he is going to suffer for lack of coal. Coal is one of the natural resources of the country, and I believe the people of the country should be served before any foreign market is served, and it should not be left to the corporations themselves to decide what is right or what is wrong in the management or handling of the coal. I have nothing further to say, except to express the hope that the government will see their way to accept this resolution and make some provision for the present extreme emergency.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is adopted I would like to say a few words upon it because I have always regarded the management of these great assets of the nation by almost every government to be radically wrong. They are resources of nature wisely provided for the need of man and if they are alienated from that purpose without proper control so that they can be available at any time for the needs of man, then it is not, in my judgment, proper management of them by those who, for the time being, are the trustees of the nation. Take the situation in the west as an example. What could there be a greater need of than fuel? It is a prairie country where there is very little timber and where in future there will be less. One great and absolute requirement of man, and one which is always present to the minds of the people is fuel, and when one remembers the intensity of the climate it indicates a greater need of it in that country than in many other portions of the Dominion. Yet, while nature has deposited great supplies of that fuel in different parts of the country the government, for the time being, who have charge of it, seem to be desirous of disposing of it in such a way that it is possible for the monopolist or those who control it to hold it so that at times of urgent need the price may be forced up to an exhorbitant figure—to any figure almost that they like—because man's need is their opportunity and it may be forced up so high that people are obliged to pay what they would not be obliged to pay if this great asset were properly handled, or otherwise, the conutry is brought almost to the very verge of ruin by the want of fuel to keep the people from being frozen in a climate that is perhaps one of the most intensely cold climates that can be found. Very large resources of nature are stored up there and yet we find that at the present time, this very winter, these people are face to face with that great danger. We saw as well, although that danger was imminent, how little the government could do and how little they attempted to do to remedy it. Yet, they go on, regardless of that fact, still disposing of the coal lands of the country to people who may come along without any conditions that these coal areas may be opened up at any time or may be retained under the control of the government so as to provide that there shall be an ample supply of fuel for the needs of the people at reasonable figures and at all times. Monopolists and those who have the money to invest in these great resources of nature which the people require are permitted to buy them up, to hold them regardless of the people's needs and then to turn around and supply the people at figures which they are unable to pay. That, I think is radically wrong.

Now that is one of the features of the situation that seems to me to demand serious consideration. The other is this: This is one of the supplies of nature that a wise government might properly use for the purpose of bringing in a perpetual revenue to the state. But, they do not attempt to do it. Coal lands are sold at how much an acre to-day? I am told at about $10 an acre. What is the intrinsic value of these coal deposits in the earth? Ten dollars an acre? One acre of that land might contain enough coal beneath its surface to represent millions of dollars and yet it is sold for $10. How much might the state have got in from year to year as a perpetual revenue by royalties ? The royalties might represent a perpetual revenue, but they are merely nominal and I am told that they do not represent more than the outlay for looking after the mines and mining interests of the country. The revenue from that source is very trifling. It represents little or nothing to the state. There are two features of the question that ought to attract our attention; first, fuel for man's necessities should never be put beyond the possibility of being available in time of need. That should never be allowed to go into the hands of speculators or monopolists who may control it to the detriment of the people at a time they need it. Secondly, these assets should always be held in such a way that the state would receive a perpetual revenue from them, or otherwise the government are not handling them in the wisest way as trustees of the people.

The same remark applies as well to the timber limits of the country. What has been the history of the great timber areas of the province of Ontario? Take for example the timber licenses that were given forty or fifty years ago; they have been held year after year from that to the present by the same men and although timber has been growing scarcer and scarcer all the time and the price has been going up very rapidly there has only been one change in the royalty, I believe, in forty or fifty years and the additional amount that was imposed as a royalty was a mere bagatelle. How much has the state in the province of Ontario received from these timber areas? How much might the state

have received had the government acted wisely and properly as trustees or had these resources been handled in a business-like way? The loss that the state has sustained because of the unbusinesslike methods adopted in handling the timber of Ontario for the last forty years is incalculable. Timber has gone up from $5 a thousand to $50 or $60 and the royalty has been only increased by 75 cents a thousand. Leases which were given for one year have been renewed from year to year until they have become practically perpetual leases. Parties have held them from year to year for from twenty to forty years and then they have sold them for a hundred times as much as the sum at which they purchased them from the state. They have realized that out of them when the state should have been realizing it. Such management of the assets of the state is almost incredible. It seems incredible that any business man would handle timber leases in that way. It applies as well to the mines of the country. The present government of Ontario are changing this custom and devising ways and means for handling the mines that they may provide a revenue for the state in future. If they can provide and bring back a permanent and perpetual revenue to the state it should be done because it is a benefit to the state and the property belongs to the state. It should be the object of every government to find out how much as trustees the state can realize from these great resources of nature. Then, take the grazing lands of the great western country as well.

We find that, within the last few years, the government has been renting these grazing lands in perpetuity, giving a tenure which is equivalent to ownership in fee simple. There can be no cancellation of these leases, no matter what the needs of settlement in the locality. That is very improper, very unwise, in my opinion. No government can go before an intelligent electorate and defend such conduct as we have seen within the last few years in connection with these grazing leases. This applies to our country water-powers as well. These also belong to the State, and the State should not give them away for a mere trifle into the hands of individuals or corporations that may use them for all future time to the detriment of those who should benefit from their use. The government that uses the water-powers of the country in this way adopts methods which are unjust and unbusiness like. As the trustees for the time being holding these resources of the country they cannot justify such use of the country's wealth. I think the government cannot change their policy with regard to these coal lands in the Northwest one hour too soon. And what I say with regard to these coal lands in the Northwest applies equally to other assets of the nation that are now being given away so that at length we shall find them held by the great financial monopolists of the country to the detriment of the people who ought, instead, to benefit by them more and more as the need for them grows greater.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I do not think that any fault will be found with the tenor of the remarks of either of the previous speakers. But, unfortunately, the terms of the resolution proposed do not altogether concur with the remarks made ; and, as it is the resolution upon which the House is required to vote, it is necessary that the resolution should be discussed rather than the theories which may be deduced from it. As showing the difficulty of dealing with this matter, I might point out that the two gentlemen who have spoken have expressed diametrically opposite views as to the most important portion of the resolution. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) indicated to the House, and indicated very truly, that any restrictions imposed regarding coal lands hereafter to be disposed of, instead of tending to increase the supply of coal for the consumer in the west, would rather tend to lessen that supply and keep from development the areas of coal land remaining in the hands of the government. It would restrict development rather to these areas which have already passed from the possession of the government and which are not, therefore, subject to these additional restrictions. On the other hand my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) declaims upon the necessity of the government imposing restrictions upon the coal areas not now alienated in order—I cannot recall quite the eloquent words with which the hon. gentleman closed his speech—that the public interest might be conserved. If the two gentlemen who have dealt with this question so far, are so widely in disagreement upon these important features, I think the House will agree with me that the resolution requires careful consideration and that there is a great deal of difficulty in the way of the government accepting its terms,—for, if it is adopted by the House the government will be expected to carry out its provisions.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. minister will permit me, I would only remark that I must have been very unfortunate in the way I expressed myself. For, as I understand it there is no disagreement between the member for Alberta and myself.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps I may be allowed to go over the matter again. My hon. friend from Alberta insisted, and insisted strongly and definitely, that any restrictions placed upon the alienation of coal areas in the future would tend against the increase in the actual supply of coal to the consumer, whereas my hon. friend from East Grey insisted that the way to deal with the coal lands—and, I assume the

way in which he would meet such difficulties as have occurred during the past few months—was to impose restrictions upon the disposal of these coal lands.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that the kind of restrictions I had reference to were such that, in the event of need, the output could be increased immensely according to the requirements of the people, and such as would prevent the coal lands ever coming under control of a monopoly. In the meantime, a royalty should be paid in proportion to the return that the users of the mine for the time being were entitled to, but not that they should buy it outright and work it or not work it as they might prefer, but that they be compelled to work it whenever there was urgent need for it.

Mr. OLIVER. But my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) has pointed out,—and rightly pointed out—that, as there are immense areas of coal available for operation at the present time without conditions, nobody will come forward to develop the government areas under such conditions as those which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) speaks of. My hon. friend from Alberta is acquainted with the actual circumstances of coal mining, and he thinks—and I believe that anybody acquainted with business matters generally, and particularly with coal mining will agree with him—that the effect will be what I have indicated. Whether it would actually prevent the development of new coal areas or not, it would be a hindrance to that development and therefore an obstacle to filling the requirements of the people. In regard to the alienation of coal lands, it might, perhaps, be of interest to the House to know that although the government at the present time still holds control of vast areas of coal-bearing land, there is no monopoly in the holding of coal lands that have passed from the hands of the government. It is impossible to say what the area is that has passed from the hands of the government, but that it is an immense area is unquestionable. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company received a land grant of 25,000,000 acres. Their grant carries not only the surface rights but the coal. They have selected a large part of their land grant in the coal-bearing areas of Alberta. What proportion of their land grant is coal-bearing no man can tell, but no doubt millions of acres of coal-bearing land in the province of Alberta belong now to the Canadian Pacific Railway and therefore are not in any way under the control of this government but are open to the control of any person who will buy the land. Therefore, there can be no monopoly—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When, they sell, do they reserve the coal ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say whether they do or not. The Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company received a grant of almost two million acres of land, the grant carrying with it the coal. This large area has been selected almost entirely in the coal-bearing districts of Alberta. This land, of course, is not under control of the government. It can be purchased from the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company at prices agreed upon. Besides the land in Alberta alienated by the government before 1887 carries the coal. That is, every homestead entry and every sale of land in that country before that time meant a transfer of the ownership of the coal. Besides, the government has alienated, as coal lands, in the neighbourhood of 200,000 acres. This, of course, is the area alienated by the present and preceding governments. There are millions of acres of coal lands at the present time in hands other than those of the government which are available for sale and for operation by anybody who would pay the price and who wishes to undertake their operation. Up to a few years ago the right and title to the coal were vested in the purchaser without any royalty; consequently the Canadian Pacific Railway grant carries the coal without a royalty; the Calgary and Edmonton grant carries the coal without a royalty; all lands transferred before 1887 carry the coal without a royalty, and a great deal of land transferred since that time also carries the coal without a royalty. So whether the royalty is a bar or not to the development of coal, there are still millions of acres of coal available for operation without the payment of a royalty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are any of the mines now under operation subject to royalty ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some, but very few. I may say that the Lethbridge mine in regard to which the question may be said to have arisen, was not subject to royalty. In regard to the price at which these lands have been disposed of, my hon. friend from East Grey said they were being sold at $10 an acre. That is true as regards the surface rights, but the royalty that they carry makes the price upon the coal, if I am correct in my calculation, something like $700 an acre, if the seam is four feet thick. That is a difference in favour of the revenue of the state, which my hon. friend is so anxious to conserve; that is a difference in favour of the state between the coal policy that is in operation now and the coal policy that prevailed a few years ago under which so many millions of acres of coal land were alienated.

An hon. MEMBER. How long ago?

Mr. OLIVER. Some six years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the royalty now ?

Mr. OLIVER. Ten cents a ton.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was pointing out that owing to the conditions prevailing in the Northwest, in the amount of coal available as well as in the ease of working and in the numerous and varied ownership of those coal lands, the fact of the ownership of those lands, could not have and did not have any bearing upon the unfortunate conditions which have prevailed throughout a part of the Northwest recently and which, in fact, still prevail. The conditions are that there are vast areas of coal easily workable and in the hands of many different parties. All that is required is the application of capital and of labour, and that transportation shall be available. There is no question as to the coal, the coal is the least matter for consideration. What is really at issue, is, as I have said before, the question of capital to operate the mines, of labour for employment by that capital and the provision of transportation to convey the coal after it has been mined by the capital and the labour to the consumer. There is no possible scarcity of opportunity for the employment of capital, there is no lack of opportunity for the employment of either capital or labour because of omission or commission in the administration of those lands. A coal mine is only valuable if it is so situated that transportation is available for its product. There may be millions of acres of coal land in the west, that coal land may be owned by whomsoever you please, but if there is not immediately appertenent to the mine a railway and railway facilities, then for practical purposes that coal does not exist, so far at any rate as supplying the requirements of the central part of the country is concerned. To meet that requirement of transportation the governments of the past and the government of to-day are using reasonable efforts. There is now under construction and under contract a very large mileage of railway in the coal-bearing area and it is hoped and believed that with the construction of that railway mileage, with the introduction of additional capital that will necessarily result from the opportunity thus given, and with the additional opportunities of labour the possibility of there being such a tie-up of coal production in the future as to seriously affect the people of the western country, is something that can scarcely be expected.

Speaking of the terms of the resolution I desire to say that while it cannot be shown that the administration of the coal areas of the country has been in any degree responsible for the conditions that prevail it is of course a matter that must claim attention from time to time. The administration of these coal lands must be subject to change to meet the new conditions as they arise or to correct abuses as they have existed. That is a fair matter for consideration from time to time, but I think it would be a mistake, and a very grave mistake, for the House to assume that a change in the administration of coal lands would meet the conditions which have arisen because of difficulties and limitations in the way of capital, of labour, and of transportation such as brought about the conditions prevailing in the central part of the province of Saskatchewan during recent months. I would ask the House to consider what may be necessary to be done in regard to these matters and not to rest satisfied with a resolution asking only that changes may be made in the regulations and in the administration of coal lands, which have not yet been shown to be in fault; that they should not give their attention and their time to curing an evil that does not exist and thereby have their time and attention drawn away from the possible cure of the evils which do exist in regard, as I say, to the employment of capital, in regard to labour and in regard to transportation.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I am sure it must be a great disappointment to the House to have heard that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for his part is unable to accept the resolution which has been placed upon the order paper. He has practically made the statement that in his view there could be no improvement over the present regulations in regard to the disposal of our coal lands, that is to say that this great public utility, which it is absolutely necessary that the people of that country should have brought near to them, and convenient to them, cannot as far as he can see, by regulation at any rate, be brought nearer and more conveniently to them.

I do not wish the discussion to pass off in a sort of academic way as to how it is possible to improve present economic conditions. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is grave necessity for the government to take some action now in regard to this matter and for that reason I intend to speak at some length of the situation as it exists at the present time and then to call upon the government to take some action. I think that the people of this country, the people of any civilized country, can have no use for a government that is content to stand still and fold its hands and confess impotence in the face of grave public danger. The announcement that the strike at Lethbridge had been terminated was of course most gratifying to me as it must have been to every one in this House. That with the patriotic action of the Canadian Pacific Railway in placing their own supply of coal

at the disposal of the people of the Northwest of which I think we should take some notice, have gone far to relieve a situation which was full of danger. But any one who studies the condition of affairs in the Northwest must realize that the situation is still serious, and that it is serious enough to call for continuous action on the part of the government in order to keep a supply of fuel moving to the country points. If this is done then there may be grounds for accepting the statement of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) that there need be no fear of a coal famine in the Northwest this winter, but unless it is done I fear there will be great danger of suffering at any rate and possibly worse than suffering in the Northwest. I want to say a word as to the termination of the strike and the way it has been brought about. I think that Mr. Mackenzie King is to be congratulated on the courage he evinced when he took an action which he must have known would be likely to subject some one at any rate to a certain amount of criticism in this country, that is to say when he undertook to proceed on a deputation to a subject of a foreign State, living in that State, to ask his consent that Canadian workmen should work in Canadian mines for the purpose of supplying coal in their own country to Canadians who were in danger of freezing to death from the want of it. In an interview given to the press justifying his course, Mr. King says that the country had suffered greatly, that the prospect was "appalling" and that the people were facing acute suffering and possible death by freezing in their homes. No one can doubt that under the circumstances Mr. King was fully justified in doing what he did, but the people of this country have the right to complain of being placed in such a false and I might even say humiliating position, and they have a right to call to account those who are responsible for allowing such a condition of things to exist. Further, the people have a right to demand that parliament shall take such action as will render such a thing impossible in the future.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What action would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. LAKE. I will speak of that later—there are many actions which could suggest themselves to the government; at any rate anything is better than that the government should sit with folded arms regretting they are unable to cope with the situation. In my opinion the government cannot be considered free from the charge of carlessness and negligence in this matter. Last session the leader of the opposition called attention to the fact that under the existing law the whole question of coal mining laws and regulations is in the hands of this government. In 1905, the government introduced an Act which withheld from the new provinces the ownership and control of their minerals, and later on when a resolution was proposed from this side of the House asking that a committee be formed to inquire into the working of the mining regulations amongst other things, and to make any suggestions that might be to the public advantage, the government refused to grant such a committee; they told parliament they were responsible, that they had hitherto been able to carry on the Department of the Interior with acceptability to the public (as they said) and that they would continue to do so. There can be no doubt therefore as to where the responsibility rests. Let us see how the government have discharged that responsibility. The strike at Lethbridge was started last spring and the Department of Labour must have been fully aware of its existence; in fact the Deputy Minister of Labour was at Calgary, I understand, during the summer. Why was not action taken then. Why did not the government take steps to endeavour to bring the strike to an end? If they then thought the time was not opportune for mediation or interference why did they not take some other action to prevent the crisis developing as it did at the beginning of the winter. The government cannot plead ignorance as to the seriousness of the situation because the press was full of reports on the matter; the government of Saskatchewan published reports from the different centres of that province, and surely this information must have come to the government at Ottawa. An abstract of these reports was published a short time ago in the Manitoba 'Free Press' from some fifty centres in the province of Saskatchewan, and in addition to the reports as to the great shortage of coal, such expressions as these were used:

Moosejaw.—Most serious.
Fleming.—Many persons will be in serious want within a week.
Osage.—Situation critical.
Maple Creek.—Very serious situation.
Moosomin.—Situation as bad as it possibly could be.
Indian Head.—Case decidedly serious.
Halbrite.—Does not know what will be done if cold weather sets in.
Lumsden.—Very serious.
Carievale.—Getting very serious.
Mortlack.—Situation getting desperate.
Newdorf.—Situation desperate, quite destitute of fuel.
Saskatoon.—Situation very serious.
Craik.—Farmers have resorted to burning fences; situation very serious, indeed.
Churchbridge.—Fuel urgently needed.
Cupar.—Matter serious.
Abernethy.—Situation serious; if cold weather comes will be entirely without.
Davidson.—People in dire want, farmers having come 75 miles have to go back without fuel.
Lang.—Outlook very grave.
Bladworth.—People suffering right now.
Heward.—Great suffering will result if drastic measures not taken immediately.

Now, all this showed a very serious state of affairs and there is no doubt that had other centres in the province been called upon to furnish such information they would have used similar language. I estimated recently from these reports that 110,000 tons of coal were absolutely required to be delivered during the present winter in the province of Saskatchewan alone, not reckoning the sister provinces of Alberta and Manitoba in which there is also a coal shortage. Surely such statements as I have read to the House were sufficient to call for immediate action on the part of the government. Appeals were made to the provincial government in regard to the matter and the Premier of Saskatchewan and his Minister of Agriculture stated that in their opinion the provincial authorities were not responsible for dealing with the situation. Thereupon a definite appeal was made to the Dominion government contained in a letter written by a gentleman who signed himself as chairman of a committee, and in order that it may appear in 'Hansard' I shall read it.

Bladworth, Sask., November 19, 1906.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—The hamlet of Bladworth is the supplying point for settlers in approximately twelve townships surrounding. These townships have approximately fifty settlers each settled therein. The country is open rolling prairie, devoid of trees. The settler depends for fuel on coal and wood obtained at the nearest railway station, Bladworth. The local dealers secure their wood from the Prince Albert country and their coal from the Galt mines, Lethbridge. No coal has been obtained from this latter source since April last. One car has been obtained from Banff. September last, since which no coal has been received here. Ten cars are under orders from Lethbridge, and none delivered. One car is ordered for Estevan and promised by the mine operator for 17th December next.

Wood has been ordered from the Cowan Company, Prince Albert, and their answer is, 'We have neither slabs, edgings nor cuttings, and though we have inquired we are unable to purchase any cordwood—there is none in the city.'

Settlers have been burning lumber at $30 a thousand, willow bramble, twisted hay, and grain. These sources are well-nigh exhausted.

Dr. J. Fyle reports from observation that no fuel is in the settlers hands, and that suffering and perhaps death will ensue therefrom. All public schools are closed for want of fuel. The Saskatchewan hotel, a 30-roomed house, has but one fire.

A blizzard has been blowing on the 15th, 16th and 17th, with zero weather. I leave you, sir, to imagine what the condition of your fellow-subjects is in this electoral district of Batoche—a name not unknown in history. This condition is not local but general.

We are informed that those persons operating the mines of the people are disputing over their rights—regardless of the rights of the people to live.

I would respectfully ask that you, sir, put an end to a dispute that is intolerable and the maintenance of which endangers the life and happiness (inalienable rights of all free people) of all settlers.

I ask you, sir, on behalf of a suffering people that by the powers vested in you that the right of eminent domain be exercised.

I can assure you, sir, without exaggeration, that this matter is one of life and death to the settlers here, one requiring imediate action.

Your obedient humble servant,

WM. L. RAMSAY,
Charman of committee.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Premier of Canada,
Ottawa.

To this the Prime Minister replied as follows:

Ottawa, Nov. 24, 1906

My dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 19th inst. This matter is unfortunately a very serious one and, I am sorry, one over which the government has no control. We have sent the Deputy Minister of Labour to Lethbridge with instructions to endeavour, if possible, to bring the strike to a close.

This is not a matter as to which we can give peremptory orders, but we have been in fact, ready to offer and have offered, all the police protection at our command and we will do anything else that is in our power to assist, but you will readily realize that it is not our business to supply the coal.

I have reason to believe that within a few days, if not already, a solution will have been found to the trouble.

Yours very sincerely,

WILFRID LAURIER.

Wm. L. Ramsay, Esq.,
Bladworth, Sask.

What a confession of impotence on the part of the Prime Minister that the government has no control, that they cannot give peremptory orders even in a matter of life and death. If it is not their business to supply the coal, whose business is it? That is the question the people of Saskatchewan and of the Northwest generally are asking. Surely some one must take the responsibility in an emergency of this kind. That letter was written on the 24th of November, and, so far as we know, no further action was taken on the part of the government for four or five days. Then apparently they aroused themselves to do something, and what they did was simply to send a telegram appealing to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That telegram was read to the House by the Minister of Labour. The reply of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy showed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had not been as idle as the government in regard to this matter, and that they had already taken action in regard to Bladworth. The coal had been despatched to Bladworth three days before the Prime Minister wired to the Canadian Pacific Railway to ask them to do so. When I called the attention of the government to this question the day after the House opened, the Prime Minister contented himself with a general regret that

they had not more power. Later on in regard to this question he said: 'I must frankly say that I am at a loss to know what measures should be taken by this government to overcome the difficulty.' I venture to say that the country will not be satisfied with a government who in the face of such an emergency fold their hands and confess impotence and express a pious regret that they do not see what they are to do in the matter. I say that in such a case a government which refuses to take action has no right to exist. What are governments for if not to take hold of such a matter and protect the lives and welfare of the citizens of the country which they are supposed to govern. It is a great mercy that up to the present time there has been very little severe weather in the Northwest; it is quite an unusual condition. At the same time I venture to say that up to the present time there has been a very considerable amount of suffering; there can be no doubt of that in the mind of any one who knows anything of that country. Even the long trips which the settlers have to take, often in vain, in the search for fuel in extremely cold weather must have been fraught with a great deal of hardship. Settlers living in poorly built houses such as those described this afternoon by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) get very little comfort from burning twisted hay or green willows or green poplars or wheat screenings. It is all very well for people to sit here and indulge in pious expressions of sympathy for those poor people and do nothing. Sitting in a comparatively comfortable house in Ottawa is quite a different matter from being in a cottage on these bleak prairies with the full sweep of the northwest wind driving the snow before it, especially in the case of new settlers who have not had time to fix up their places properly to stand the severity of a Northwest winter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government must not rest on their oars and consider that everything necessary has been done now that the Lethbridge strike has been settled. There is still ground for anxiety; there may be, and I think will be, much privation when the full rigour of the winter sets in.

I might call the attention of the Prime Minister to a pamphlet which was issued by the Immigration Department of his government in regard to the supply of fuel in the Northwest. The pamphlet is called 'The Last and Best West,' and it consists of a series of questions and answers. On page 26 appears the following question and answer for the information of the incoming immigrant:

> Q. What does he do for fuel? Do people suffer from the cold?
>
> Answer.—The principal districts of western Canada are within easy reach of firewood, while the settlers of Alberta and Saskatchewan are particularly favoured, especially along the various streams and from some of which they get all the coal they require, very frequently at the cost of handling and hauling it home. No one in the country need suffer from the cold on account of the scarcity of fuel.

To a certain extent that may be true, but it is not universally true, and it is decidedly misleading to people who have been brought up in the large cities of the old country or even in country districts, accustomed to the ordinary routine of life and able to procure everything they require when they have the money to procure it with. This statement in view of the present situation there, fixes a very considerable responsibility upon the government to see that not one word of that can be proved untrue and especially in view of the remarks in the speech from the Throne in regard to giving improper information to intending immigrants. I trust that the House will accept this motion in spite of what the hon. Minister of the Interior has said in regard to it. There are vast supplies of mineral in that country and I hold that they belong to the people. Even if the Dominion government did decide to withhold their ownership and control from the people there and look upon them merely as assets for the purpose of adding to the wealth of the Dominion at large they must realize that they have a special responsibility in regard to the residents of the new provinces. What has been done with the vast resources of coal which exist in that country? We have had a statement from the Minister of the Interior this afternoon. I was looking, Sir, at a return which was presented to parliament last year which gave a statement of the lands which had been disposed of by sale from the beginning of the year 1896 to the end of last year and I find that in that time something like 110,000 acres of coal lands were sold. The conditions under which they were sold carried no obligation whatever to work them and they might be held by speculators for an indefinite period for increase in value. That is a position, which, to my mind, is absolutely intolerable at the present stage of our national existence. A great portion of our Northwest to-day is no doubt without the advantage of having wood for fuel. A portion of the country is without wood of any kind. But nature has provided vast supplies of coal. It is one of the richest countries that exist in regard to supplies of coal, and something must be done surely to make that coal available for the settlers in that country. It seems to me that the purchase of coal areas should be taken as an indication that the people who buy them intend to work them. Anyway I think, in view of an emergency of this kind and in view of the possibilities of suffering in the future, some strenuous action should be taken on the part of the government to see that these coal areas do not remain in the hands of speculators to be

kept by them for unlimited lengths of time without being opened up for the benefit of the country, and to see that conditions shall not exist in future such as were called attention to by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) this afternoon under which a coal area that had been supplying the people of his immediate district for many years was suddenly closed up by the fact that it was purchased by people who apparently intend to hold it for a rise in value. I do not think I need say anything more about this matter. I have called the attention of the government to the fact that there is a very grave situation in the Northwest at the present time and one which may recur at any time in the future. The government have it in their hands to relieve the situation. They can at any rate take some strenuous action which will prevent these strikes in future. That surely is a matter they should take into consideration and act upon. They can at any rate take such action as will prevent the alienation of any more coal areas without any obligation on the part of those who secure them to work these areas and in my opinion they should go further and insist that the people who have obtained these coal areas are not allowed to retain them in an undeveloped state but are forced to produce for the benefit of the people for whom nature intended these deposits.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, coming as I have the honour to do, from a constituency which is perhaps the largest consumer and the smallest producer of fuel of any kind, it has been a source of interest and gratification to me that my hon. friends from the Northwest have brought this subject up for discussion in this House. They, no doubt, have given much consideration to it. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has, on more than one occasion this session brought it to the attention of the House. We were scarcely away from the atmosphere of the Throne before he had brought this matter up in the House and he has been very consistent in keeping it before us from day to day. Both of my hon. friends from the prairies the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) have stated the proposition very truly. I paid a great deal of attention to what they had to say because they know whereof they are speaking. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gave us a great many truths also. He said that Providence had planted the coal there for man, which is no doubt true only it is not at all startling in its originality. He likewise led us to consider the matter of dealing with timber and water powers, all very important matters in themselves, but I shall endeavour to keep myself within the limits of the debate for the little while that I shall speak. My hon. friends from the west spoke very truly in regard to the great privations the people have suffered there. There can be no doubt that a lack of fuel is one of the most serious things that the people in a country such as that can be exposed to. If any of my hon. friends from the east have ever driven over the prairies when the wind was blowing they will know what it means to be out in that cold country and they will realize how great the suffering must be in a case of this kind. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) said this afternoon that he had found great happiness in a house that had cost him $80, but I do not think he ever lived in that house when the wind was blowing in the manner described by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. We are all in accord in regard to the suffering that was experienced there. As the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has said, men came great distances to get fuel and their quests for fuel were vain. They went home without any more than they had come with in a great many instances. The condition of affairs was indeed desperate and I take second place to no man in appreciating and feeling its gravity. But how is it ever going to bring relief when we have a problem such as we have here if you simply state that problem and if you simply read as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle did, a score of resolutions and reports from different points to the House and employ it only as a justification for condemning the government, alleging, as the hon. gentleman does, that the government that cannot solve it has no right to exist. If the opposition are going to make this one of their questions and to cry : 'The government has no right to exist,' but have themselves no solution to offer, then I in turn throw back to them their own accusation and cry that 'an opposition of such a calibre has no right to exist.' My hon. friends have given it great consideration, yet they have no solution to suggest. They say that drastic measures should be taken, that strenuous means should be adopted. They say until we are almost weary of hearing it 'someting must be done.' But I ask them : What must be done ? The hon. member for Qu'Appelle never suggested anything. He gave a promise to my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) that he would give a little later on what he thought would be necessary to be done, but if I understood him rightly he forgot to implement that promise.

He says that the government sat with folded hands, that day by day went by, and nothing was done to relieve the distress. I venture to think that my hon. friend will not go back to the west where the government of Hon. Walter Scott is in power and utter those words. I think the hon. gentleman must know, in his heart

he knows, that Hon. Walter Scott has strengthened his own hands and the hands of his cabinet by the way he grappled with this serious problem. And I have no doubt that one of the reasons why this matter is being brought before this House is the hope, in some way, to take away from the strength that Hon. Walter Scott has gained and to cause, if possible, a revulsion of feeling. The hon. gentleman said that the government sent their representative up there and that something humiliating occurred at Indianapolis. But then the hon. gentleman went on to say that the government's representative was justified in what he did. I do not know that I was quite able to follow what my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) said. But I believe that Mr. Mackenzie King was fully justified in doing what he did, and a man would have been justified in doing ten times more before he would allow the people of that country to freeze. One of my constituents was talking to me on the subject of what he had read in the papers, concerning Mr. Mackenzie King's visit to the United States, and he picturesquely expressed his opinion that a man ought to be ready to go to hell, pretty near, for coal, rather than let the people freeze. That man's sentiment is largely my own. If by humiliating yourself to accept the version of my hon. friend you can save the people from freezing that is an easy settlement of the problem—I say humiliate yourself, and do it quickly.

Mr. LAKE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) will allow me to correct him, I did not state that Mr. Mackenzie King had humiliated himself. I said that he was justified in what he did. But I said that the country had been placed in a humiliating position by the necessity which existed for the action which he took.

Mr. KNOWLES. I accept the correction. The position, I understand, according to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake), is that Mr. Mackenzie King was so placed, that he, in turn was compelled to put the Dominion of Canada in a humiliating position. I have not seen that stated in any of the papers yet, but I take that as a correct statement of the hon. gentleman's view of the action of Mr. King. All I can say is, that if in all the problems that we find in the development of our great west, now in its formative condition, we can find a solution as easy as this so-called humiliation of the Dominion of Canada, we shall have a great deal to be thankful for in working out our destiny.

So far as, with my humble powers, I can think the matter out, I do not find any issue between hon. gentlemen opposite and ourselves. They say, that we have been faced with a great problem—we say the same. They say there has been suffering—we admit that to have been the fact. They are grateful that Mr. Mackenzie King's and Hon. Walter Scott's efforts have been crowned with success ; we share that sentiment with them. We seem to agree on every point. And we stand in the presence of the problem yet. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) had a suggestion which he did not press very much, if I understood him aright. He spoke—perhaps only by way of suggestion and for a moment—favourably of compulsory arbitration. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is in itself a great problem. If the hon. gentleman will give us a compulsory arbitration by which we and the rest of the world can settle coal strikes and other labour troubles, I think he will be accounted just about the greatest man of this age. The hon. gentleman raises one of the greatest problems which the men of our day—the men of the Anglo-Saxon world at any rate—are trying to settle. If the hon. gentleman will say that compulsory arbitration should be adopted as a means of settling such difficulties, I ask him how will the people in his constituency regard it ? The hon. gentleman has in his constituency many coal miners—honest, industrious, hardworking citizens. Will he tell them that we must have compulsory arbitration ? And if the board of arbitration should find against the men, would he go back to his constituents in Lethbridge and say : 'The board has found against you, and therefore you are all wrong ?' I fancy he will refrain from making such a suggestion, because we know that no man in public life would care to make such a suggestion to the men to whom he owes the position which he holds.

Mr. HERRON. I would not be afraid to make that statement here or in my constituency either. I can assure the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) that compulsory arbitration would be acceptable to the miners in my locality.

Mr. KNOWLES. I asked the hon. gentleman for Alberta a question, and I am grateful to him for answering that question. But, if we go a little further, I think the hon. gentleman will agree that, in carrying out the suggestion he has made it would be just as difficult for a board of arbitration to make men work who do not want to work as it is for the mine owners to make them work. The proposal is to have legislation to establish compulsory arbitration. It is very easy to have legislation but that of itself will not give us the result we desire. We can legislate that water shall run up hill and furnish power in doing so, but water will still run down hill. We can legislate that this chamber shall be always free from foul air, that will not purify the air. You must deal with circumstances as you find them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) will agree that we have to take

human nature as we find it. And I venture to say that all the compulsory boards you could appoint in Canada could not make a man work at a price that he did not want to accept, whether his work was under the ground or upon the surface, or whether it was for a board of arbitration or for mine owners. If the hon. gentleman can solve this problem, he will remove one of the greatest causes of contention in the arena of public discussion at the present day. The hon. gentleman, however, does not pledge himself to that or put it in his motion. He simply says—and we come back again to what I said before—that something should be done. But no suggestion is given as to what should be attempted. As I have already said a good deal has been done. In all parts of the west at least the action of the deputy minister of labour is appreciated and all are glad that it was attended with success. It is agreed by all parties there, I believe, that had it not been for his efforts, in all probability the strike would have been on still. Mr. Mackenzie King carried on his work under the Conciliation Act which this government passed—and whatever credit there is for that must be given to the government—and under the powers provided by that Act he was able to effect a reconciliation, for the present at least, between employer and employed.

I agree with what the Minister of the Interior has said that one of the great difficulties in this matter is the transportation problem. If we had greater facilities for transportation this problem could have been solved more easily. I cannot give the House the exact data or furnish sworn statements, but I believe that, with better transportation facilities it would have been quite possible to supply the needs of the people from several different mines in the Northwest. But the cars were needed for the transportation of wheat, and so it was impossible to rush the coal with sufficient speed to the consumer. So, it comes back to what the Minister of the Interior has said we need greater facilities for transportation. That is a part of the situation which is peculiar to us. We have the same difficulty that all the world has in differences between employer and employed. But the lack of means for transportation imposes an additional difficulty which would not exist under similar circumstances in the east. We are trying to hurry up another railroad there. Our hon. friends opposite have adopted as a bye-word the saying 'Cox can't wait.' But in the case of this road it is the people of the Northwest can't wait. That road is a necessity for the industrious people who are making their homes in the west. These are the men who cannot wait much longer for improved transportation facilities.

Last year the hon. gentlemen opposite did not see eye to eye with us with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific branches; they thought that we could wait a while longer. On that occasion the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) parted company with his bosom friends in the Railway Committee room, and voted with the government, and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) did the same, because they knew that we needed greater transportation facilities out there. They came from the spot, and they knew it was not Cox that could not wait, but it was their constituents who could not wait, and would refuse to send them back to parliament if they tried to make them wait much longer. As for the hon member for Qu'Appelle, I do not recollect what he did. But I desire to emphasize the point that what we need in the Northwest is the removal of the local restrictions which weigh like a nightmare upon our commercial activity, hampering our trade coming from the east, and our grain transportation going to the east. That is what is grinding us down to-day. We need greater transportation facilities, and we find that question cropping up in this discussion. As I said before, it is not an easy matter to find a solution of this problem. I hoped that some hon. gentleman opposite would offer a suggestion to that end, but no one has done so. I desire to move the following amendment:

That all the words after 'that' in the resolution be omitted, and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:

The recent difficulties in relation to the supply of fuel in the western provinces did not arise from any defect in our legislation, but from the lack of transportation facilities, and from conflicts between employers and employees.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Knowles) has found a dearth of suggestions from this side of the House as to a solution of the difficulty existing in the Northwest regarding the recent coal famine, most assuredly he has not enlightened the House with any suggestions of his own. This brilliant idea of his in proposing an amendment which he has placed in the hands of the Speaker, I do not think will satisfy the people of the Northwest, and I do not think this House will find in his amendment any solution of the difficulty which has recently confronted us. Although I come from a province that has not suffered to any appreciable extent on account of coal famine, still I must say that I was somewhat disappointed in the remarks of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, the manner in which he received the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Alberta, and the lack of any suggestion from him as the responsible minister of the Department of the Interior, as to how a repetition of the coal famine could be prevented. Instead of haggling over the phraseology of the resolution and

trying to find certain differences, real or imaginary, between hon. gentlemen on this side who have addressed the House, I think it would have been much more to the purpose if the minister had grappled with this question and proposed some solution himself. I remember certain resolutions which were brought into this House, and when they were not found acceptable and did not meet with the views of a minister of the Crown, he did not delegate to the back benchers the duty of proposing an amendment, but he proposed an amendment himself that would meet the requirements of the case as he understood it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a short time ago there was a great agitation throughout the whole continent of America in regard to the coal strike that took place in Pennsylvania, which, as you are aware, lasted for some months. The winter was coming on, and people were greatly agitated not only in the United States, but in Canada, who were largely dependent upon the Pennsylvania mines for our anthracite coal. An agitation arose in the United States in favour of the federal government taking some steps to put an end to that strike in order to prevent the people from perishing from cold in the approaching winter. It is doubtless owing to that agitation that the Inter-State Commerce Commission made a report to the President of the United States, recommending that the government should in future hold on to all its coal areas, and control their development for all time to come, even to the extent of restricting, if not entirely preventing, the wholesale export of coal to other countries. This, they claimed, would tend to do away with the monopoly that the coal barons enjoyed. The Inter-State Commission reported that the revenues derived from these coal lands would be sufficient to support the government. It was no doubt owing to that report that the President of the United States, in his message to Congress last week, made a recommendation on those lines. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I propose to read that portion of his message which refers to the coal question:

> It is not wise that the nation should alienate its remaining coal lands. I have temporarily withdrawn from settlement all the lands which the Geological Survey has indicated as containing, or in all probability containing, coal. The question, however, can be properly settled only by legislation, which in my judgment should provide for the withdrawal of these lands from sale or from entry, save in certain especial circumstances.
>
> The ownership would then remain in the United States, which should not, however, attempt to work them, but permit them to be worked by private individuals under a royalty system, the government keeping such control as to permit it to see that no excessive price was charged to consumers. It would, of course, be as necessary to supervise the rates charged by the common carriers to transport the product as the rates charged by those to the mines; it must extend to the conduct of the common carriers, so that they shall in no way favour one competitor at the expense of another.
>
> The withdrawal of these coal lands would constitute a policy analogous to that which has been followed in withdrawing the forest lands from ordinary settlement. The coal, like the forest, should be treated as the property of the public, and its disposal should be under conditions which would inure to the benefit of the public as a whole.

Now here are certain suggestions made by the President to Congress that I think this government might well take into their serious consideration. The hon. gentleman has asked for a solution of the difficulty, and I think he will find in the President's message some suggestion upon which this government could act with great advantage. For instance, they should not in the future alienate our public lands containing coal, nor allow them to be locked up in the hands of private individuals. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has suggested that one of the conditions should be, when coal lands are alienated, a clause compelling those lands to be operated, and forbidding them to be locked up for private speculation. Now, Sir, we have heard the Minister of the Interior this afternoon speak about the millions of acres of land that have been handed over or alienated to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and one of his colleagues in the ministry endeavoured to make party capital by asking him the date at which those lands were alienated. Well if the alienation of this 25,000,000 acres of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway was a detriment to the people of this country, and particularly to the Northwest Territories of Canada, an alienation that was necessary to secure transportation facilities for that country in order to open it up and to develop it when it was absolutely necessary to give large grants of money and of land to attain that object, how much more detrimental would it have been to the people of this country had the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite been put into effect, a policy by which for one acre that was offered and that has been given by the Conservative government, two acres were offered by the hon. gentleman's own friends when they were in power? They failed in their purpose so that any point the hon. gentleman desires to make on that score, I think falls very flat.

We have heard during recent days of cases where the people of the Northwest Territories were really driven to hold up some cars of coal that came in at various points along the different railway lines. The people of that country are not a lawless people and they were quite justified in doing what they did. Their families at home no doubt were on the verge of freezing to death. The temperature has been as low as 30° below zero and we all know what that means, particularly in that country. I saw a despatch

which appeared in one of our papers here on December 4. The item appears under large headlines, which, going out to foreign countries, would have a very detrimental effect on immigration to our country. This despatch says :

> So desperate has the fuel famine grown and to such terrible stress have the farmers been driven, now that zero weather has set in, that at Drinkwater, Saskatchewan, on Saturday, a train on the siding was held by a band of farmers, who turned the switch and stood guard until their wagons were loaded from a car of coal bound for Weyburn.
>
> Many of these farmers were burning lumber from their buildings for fuel. Farmers living thirty and forty miles from town often remain three or four day to obtain a supply of coal and then return home with a few hundred pounds. At many points on the arrival of a car there are sixty or seventy teams awaiting their supply.

That shows the straits to which the people of that country must have been driven for want of fuel and who can blame them if when a little coal came in they took what steps they could in order to secure a supply? It is in order to prevent a repetition of these scenes and of the coal famine that the hon. member (Mr. Herron) has proposed this resolution. The hon. member is not hidebound as to the wording of the resolution, and if any better wording can be proposed I am sure he will adopt any suggestion that is made but not such wording as is suggested in the amendment, that is no solution of the problem at all. And, by the way, in speaking of transportation facilities the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) stated that the trouble was due, not to a scarcity of coal, but to a lack of labour and transportation. I read an interview held with Mr. William Whyte, superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, resident at Winnipeg That gentleman denies any such contention and says that the company anticipated this famine and purposely held in reserve many cars to carry coal to various points on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think that Mr. Whyte is more conversant with the situation than any hon. gentleman in this House and can speak more authoritatively upon it ; in fact many of those who are complaining to-day of shortage of grain cars to take out their grain, attribute that shortage to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway had retained the cars in order to meet the contingency of carrying coal to various points as necessity arises. I do not know why the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) should try to switch it on to transportation, because while the transportation may have had some influence on it in certain districts, that was not at all the reason of the coal famine, and if the hon. member had adopted the suggestion of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) that there should be some legislation to prevent strikes in the future, it would have had a very good effect. I quite agree with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) that while Walter Scott or Mackenzie King or anybody else, as the people were situated at that time, was quite justified in taking steps that under ordinary circumstances should not have been taken, still I say it would be a humiliating position in which to place our country in the future, that it should be dependent on the whim or will of a gentleman who resides in a foreign country, whether our mines should be worked and whether our labourers should go to work to produce coal owned by our own people to prevent our people from freezing to death.

A return was brought down to this House last session showing not the number of acres that were alienated to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but showing the number of acres of coal lands alienated to political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Last session some hon. members attempted to make quite a point against this party by reading out a long list of names of politicians who, when this party was in power, had in their own names applied for timber limits, some for themselves, and some for friends, but not one in twenty of whom had ever got one single acre of timber limits. But if we look over the return brought down last year we find that the very same complaint that these gentlemen were making against the Conservative government can be successfully made against the present government ; these gentlemen, now that it lies in their power, have been alienating by the hundreds of thousands of acres the coal lands of the Northwest for the benefit of their own political friends. In taking a cursory glance over that return what do I find? I find the name of the Hon. A. C. Rutherford, now Premier of Alberta, a gentleman who, in the past, has tried to make a very great deal of capital upon the public platform because of the alienation of our timber limits under the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite ; but not only has the alienation of the timber limits been kept up but the coal lands as well have been alienated and this gentleman himself participated in the distribution of some of these coal lands. Another gentleman whose name figures there is Mr. A. L. Sifton, a brother of the then Minister of the Interior, a gentleman who received many acres of coal lands. Another man is Mr. D. C. Cameron, who was the Liberal representative for the Rainy River district in the Ontario legislature until two years ago. He, too, had many acres of coal lands. Another gentleman whose stentorian tones reverberated against this government in years gone by for the alienation of timber limits was the Hon. Robert Watson, yet we see his name on the list as holding a certain amount of coal lands. Another man is C. A. Stuart, now appointed to the Bench, then a lawyer in Calgary, who had at least 320 acres of land. The last of this list to whom I am going to refer, but not the least, is Hon. G. H. Bulyea, and it is a rather singular thing, in

fact I rather question the propriety of it, but this hon. gentleman did not receive these lands until the 13th of December, 1905, several months after he was appointed lieutenant-governor of that province.

These are just a few of the friends of hon. gentlemen to whom were alienated the coal lands of this Dominion, not for development, to produce coal to prevent a coal famine, such as we have experienced in recent months, but in order to hold these lands for speculative purposes, to reap some personal benefit.

We have heard a good deal about the land for the settler. I do not think that handing over all these lands is following out that policy of the land for the settler and if the people of that country are not themselves the best judges as to what should be done, I do not think my hon. friend is. If you take up the public press to-day, not the Conservative press alone, but the press irrespective of party politics, you will find that it is calling upon this government to take some steps, and what reply is given to this request made through the public press ? Simply the amendment placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, which will effect no relief whatever. The government have spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars in inducing immigrants to come to this country ; they have got out literature printed in the most glowing language in order to attract immigrants, but let the reports of this coal famine, let the headlines in our papers, be distributed through Europe and the United States, and it will result so detrimentally to our future immigration that it will more than offset all the glowng accounts published in the immigration pamphlets. Those immigrants who came over last year have no doubt felt this famine more than any other class, and it will be a serious detriment if they write home and tell their friends and relatives in different places that their lives have been jeopardized by the coal famine that has struck the Northwest in recent months.

The hon. member of Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has spoken about the humiliating position in which our country has been placed. In the first place I claim it was a humiliating position in which to place those new provinces to withhold from their hands the control of their own public lands. Had the right of the people of those provinces been fought for as they should have been fought for by hon. gentlemen supporting the government, the provinces would have control over their lands to-day, and the provinces would have been able to grapple with their own coal strike without calling on the federal government for relief. It is because they have been denied the ownership of their lands ; it is because this government practically declared that they were not competent to manage their own affairs in that respect, that a serious responsibility rests upon this government to provide a remedy in order to prevent a recurrence of the recent conditions. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) has asked the members on this side of the House : What is your solution ; what have you to suggest? If I desire to reply to him in the words used by his leader on a memorable occasion, I would say that it is time enough to ask the opposition to prescribe when they are called in. When the Prime Minister was on this side of the House and when he was asked to propound a policy in regard to another serious question that is the kind of reply he made.

Mr. BERGERON. Torres Vedras.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, he believed in fighting behind the lines of Torres Vedras, and I suppose that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. But hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have made suggestions, and if they had been accepted by the government and its supporters a solution would have been found to the difficulty under which the people of the Northwest have been labouring. In my opinion the amendment offered will not meet the needs of the situation. The transportation facilities have not been the main cause of the fuel famine by any means, and even if it were the amendment proposed is not the right way of remedying it. The mere expression of opinion by this House that what we want is more transportation facilities is not by any means going to prevent another strike and is not by any means going to prevent another fuel famine in that country. I would strongly urge on this House the advisability of adopting the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) and in doing so I feel convinced that the House will be in accord with the feelings of the people of the Northwest in the matter.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and Conuty. I rise to the point of order. That the amendment is not an amendment to the resolution, it not being analogous to the subject under consideration. The resolution is with respect to the alienation of the public lands and it also looks to the regulation of the coal supply in the future in respect to lands that have already been alienated by the government. The amendment does not touch that question at all. I read from Mr. Bourke's Parliamentary Practice, a decision by Mr. Speaker Shaw Lefevre, which I think is to the point:

> The Order of the Day being read for the House to resolve itself into a committee on the Sugar Duties Bill,
>
> On the question that the Speaker do leave the chair,
>
> Mr. Cobden moved as an amendment,—That in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that, in addition to the great expense to which the people of this country are subjected for the civil, military and naval establishments of the colonies, they should be compelled to pay a higher price for the productions of those colonies than that at which similar commodities

could be procured from other countries; and that, therefore, all protective duties in favour of colonial produce ought to be abolished.

Mr. SPEAKER. I apprehend that the amendment cannot be put in its present shape All amendments except on motions for going into committee of supply and ways and means ought to be essentially analogous to the subject. The amendment of the hon. member relates to colonial duties generally, and goes far beyond the sugar duties, and cannot, therefore, be put.

Now, this resolution relates to the alienation of public lands in the future and to the regulation of the future supply of coal from lands that have been alienated, but this amendment refers to the past and is in no way analogous to the resolution which is before the House. I submit that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that the last clause of the resolution has reference to the lack of coal in the western provinces and the prevention of loss and suffering in the future with respect to the fuel supply. I find that the recent difficulties in relation to the supply of fuel in the western provinces is made a point of the amendment. Under these circumstances I am inclined to think, and I so rule, that the amendment is relevant, deals with the same subject as the motion and is, therefore, in order.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Representing as I do one of the most populous districts in Saskatchewan and a district which is largely dependent on coal for fuel, I feel that the time of the House has been well spent in discussing this question. The matter is one of very great importance and I am very pleased indeed at the fair and reasonable tone which has characterized the discussion. There is no doubt that a great deal of anxiety exists in that part of the country in regard to the supply of fuel. I fear, however, that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Alberta does not offer any solution of the difficulty because it does not appear to me that the regulations governing the disposal of the coal lands have had anything to do with the shortage in the coal supply that exists to-day. The main difficulty in connection with the shortage of coal has been in reference to the transportation. I may say that for all practical purposes the only railway that touches the coal mines is the Canadian Pacific; the Canadian Northern touches certain coal mines at Edmonton, but that coal is not shipped to any great distance from the mines. I do not wish to put any great amount of blame on the Canadian Pacific Railway, because they have been dealing with a business that was increasing faster than it was possible for them to get cars and engines to handle the traffic in that country. The solution of the supply of coal to settlers on the prairie lies in the building and supplying of more railways to the different coal centres, because you will find that where there are competing railways to the same point they generally manage to find cars for that traffic when freight is offered. During the last ten days I met in Ottawa a gentleman who for many years has been superintendent of coal mines in that country supplying altogether domestic fuel, and he told me that not more than one half of the present shortage of coal on the prairie was due to the strike either at Fernie or Lethbridge, and that at least one-half of the shortage was due to the lack of transportation facilities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. TURRIFF. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would there have been any shortage if the Lethbridge mines had been in operation?

Mr. TURRIFF. This gentleman told me that about one half of the shortage that exists to-day has occurred through the strike at Lethbridge, but that the other half was due to the shortage of cars for transporting the coal from the different mines that are in operation. I understand none of the mines have any storage capacity for the coal after it is mined and before it is shipped, and that if there is not a supply of cars right on the switch so that the coal can be dumped on the screen from the tipple and into the cars, they shut the mine down. During all the summer and the fall up to about a month ago when the question became acute, there were only about half enough cars at the different mines to keep them running their full time. This is the information which I have from one of the most reliable men in the Dominion of Canada, a man who has been superintending the mining of coal in the country for the last fifteen years. During the months of September and October I was myself in that country where they are producing coal, and at that time these mines were running only from two to four days a week, simply because they could not get cars in which to ship the coal when it was mined. As I have said, I do not wish to cast any particular blame on the Canadian Pacific Railway on this account, because I know they have been doing their very best and Mr. Whyte, as soon as he found how serious the matter was, used his very best efforts to relieve the situation. But we may as well face the question as it exists and face it manfully. This is not the first time that this question has come up. I lived for twenty years on the prairie, and from the time the railways came in we have had this same question recurring every fall without a single exception, but never so acute as this fall, simply on account of the strike at Lethbridge. One of the main difficulties is that our season is a short and busy one. The farmer is hurried in the spring to get in his seed, then he has to do his summer fallowing, then the harvest comes on, and

shortly afterwards the threshing and then the ploughing, and it is almost impossible for him to leave his work and attend to his fuel supply. It is not only the case with the farmer but with the people in the towns and villages, that you can hardly get one of them to put in his supply of coal until the cold weather is on. On the 1st of October you will not find one man in ten who has thought of putting in his supply of coal. The farmer wishes to wait until he can take his wheat to market and bring a load of coal back. So long as that state of affairs exists there will be more or less of a shortage of the fuel supply in different parts of that western country every year ; because I am satisfied that there is no railway company in existence that can supply cars with engines enough to haul the coal as quickly as the farmers want it in November and December and at the same time to provide sufficient cars to haul out the wheat. If any railway company had such an extraordinary amount of rolling stock, it would be idle nine months in the year. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company used to draw largely from the east for their supply of cars to help them out in the haulage of wheat and coal in the west ; but they do not do that any longer owing to the great demand for cars in the east. One great drawback this year has been that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been unable to use their flat cars to carry coal, as they used to do in the Souris district, because they have been using many of these cars in the work of double tracking their line between Winnipeg and Fort William. The whole solution of this difficulty lies in the desirability of endeavouring to educate the people of the western country to lay in their supply of coal during the summer months. As a matter of fact, the Souris Coal Company six or eight years ago authorized all their agents to sell coal at a reduction of twenty-five cents a ton up to a certain date in the fall in order to induce the dealers to persuade the farmers and the settlers in towns and villages to buy their winter's supply before the great rush of wheat came on. This had some effect, but not a great deal. There is no doubt that it is a serious problem, but I think we are beginning to see our way out. I represent one of the most populous constituencies in the west, and I received to-day the only letter I have yet received touching on the coal question in any way, and that letter was a complaint that the coal company since the shortage occurred was charging $2 a ton for coal on the cars instead of $1.60, which they had been charging before, and asking if the company could not be prevented from increasing the price owing to the necessities of the people. Well, that is a question which I do not feel competent to answer just now. I do not know how prices can be regulated except by supply and demand, and $2 a ton is not a very high price. At $1.60, the price at which the company sold the most of their coal, there certainly could not have been more than a fair and reasonable profit. If we are going to avoid having to face this question every year, we must persuade the settlers to lay in their coal supply earlier and we must get more railway companies into the different coal fields so that there will be more competition in the hauling of coal. I do not see how the situation would be assisted by amending the regulations for the disposal of the coal lands. As the Minister of the Interior pointed out, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of coal lands about which the government has nothing to say. There are coal lands along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway which anybody can buy from the company at a very moderate price. Any one who wants to go into coal mining can buy coal lands. My hon. friend complains about Mr. Rutherford, the Premier of Alberta, being interested in coal lands. Surely he would not say that a doctor or a lawyer should be prevented from buying half a section of coal lands on the ground that at some time he might be either a member of parliament, a premier of a province or a member of this or any other government

It was a perfectly legitimate matter for these gentlemen, or any other gentlemen, to buy a half section of coal land. If there is to be a change in the regulations in regard to coal lands to help out the settlers it seems to me that it should be along the line of making these lands more available although I do not know what more can be done than has been done. The lands are there; they are open to anybody to secure. Nobody is going to buy these lands and work them unless he can do so at a profit. One hon. gentleman made the remark that conditions should be applied. I remember that some years ago when the government made a contract with the Crow's Nest Coal Company they stipulated that they were not to charge more than $2 a ton for coal. Just here I may say that for the last two or three months there have been something like 5,000 or 6,000 tons of coal mined every day at the Crow's Nest. Every day right along there has been coal mined and it has been for sale. They do not want to bury the coal after they mine it. They dig it up, put it on cars and then it is on the market for sale. But it is a coking coal. While it is a good domestic coal, while it is a stronger coal, will give more heat and go further than a ton of Galt coal, it does not work well. It is unhandy to work; the people do not know how to manage it and there is a great deal of difficulty in using it for domestic purposes. Therefore, it has not been called for to any great extent on the prairie. But that coal has been available during the last month to every one who chose to buy it. The freight is a little higher because it

is farther away. I do not see how you could get over the present difficulty by putting more restrictions on the development of coal mines. If the government undertook to work these coal mines themselves they would have the same difficulty that a company has. We all know that when the government employ labour they do not get as cheap labour as a company will get. No government can get work done as cheaply as a company can and if the government undertook to mine coal it would cost the government more and would cost the consumer more either directly or as a tax to pay for the loss in coal mining than it does to have the coal mined by these companies and sold direct to the people. Coal all through that western country is being sold, generally speaking, at a very low price, or at a moderately low price. I do not say that during the past month or two some of the mines may not have charged an extra price. The government stipulated that the Crow's Nest Coal Company should not charge more than $2 a ton at the mine for the coal, which is a reasonable price. I remember spending a couple of days at the Crow's Nest mines some years ago and the manager told me that owing to the conditions existing at that time they could not mine coal for less than $2. Where they are making the bulk of their money in the handling of coal is in the coking of it. They get a better price for the coal after it has been converted into coke. The difficulty would not be overcome by any change in the regulations. The regulations existing at the present time have not caused in any degree the shortage of coal that unfortunately we have at the present time. If the government were mining coal they would have no more control over the railways than they have at the present time. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) there has been no suggestion made as to how to get over the difficulty, and I am free to confess that I am not able at the present moment to offer a suggestion for any immediate relief. It is a very difficult question and outside of providing better railway communication and trying to educate the people to buy their coal, or a part of it, in the summer time, when they are able to get it, I really do not know how the difficulty can be got over. There are ten or a dozen coal mines working at the present time, most of them shipping coal down to the prairie section of the country, and they are always anxious to sell coal if they can get a reasonable rate of transportation and a price that pays them to mine it. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) cited what the American government had done. Well, it seems to me that our government have done exactly what the government of the United States did at the time of the great coal strike a few years ago. The matter was brought to their attention after it had gone on for a long time and they appointed a commission and sent somebody who brought the two parties together and the strike was arranged. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) sent his deputy up there and he accomplished the same thing. Some one asked a while ago why that had not been done earlier. You cannot settle a strike unless the parties interested are ready to settle it. You have to wait until they tire themselves out as a rule before they are willing to listen to any sort of reason and it seems to me that the Department of Labour did exactly what the American government did at the time of the big coal strike in Pennsylvania. Something was said by the hon. member for Marquette that if the provinces had these lands they could deal with them. I venture the assertion that if any of the provinces wish to go into the coal mining business they can make arrangements with the Dominion government for the working of a certain amount of coal lands, or they can buy them at a low figure, or if they do not want to buy them they can make satisfactory arrangements whereby they can work the mines if they are disposed to do so. The matter is a most serious one. I believe the worst of the difficulty is over. It is awful to contemplate what might happen from a shortage of coal in that country with the severe climate we have, and if we had two or three weks of cold and stormy weather that would tie up the railways and not even let the amount of coal that is being mined and the cars available be taken to their destination. We hope that will not occur. With the amount of coal being put out at the Lethbridge mines, and if they will use some of the coal from the Crow's Nest Pass, although it is not first-class coal for domestic purposes, the difficulty will be overcome. I hope, if there is not too much suffering this fall in connection with it, that our settlers in different parts of the country will look upon it as a warning and in future, if possible, and in so far as it lies in their power, lay in at least a portion of their stock during the summer months and in the early fall when there is no trouble about getting coal at the most moderate prices of any time of the year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) who has just taken his seat seems to regard this question as one entirely of the education of the people and he attributes all the suffering which has taken place and which may take place later on to the fact that they have been negligent during the past summer, as in previous summers, in not laying in full supplies. He differs in that respect from the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) who regarded it almost altogether as a question of transportation. I may say, in passing, that the hon. member for West Assiniboia assured us that the view of those on the govern-

ment side of the House was exactly the same as our own in regard to this question. We would respectfully decline the compliment in that regard, because we think that some suggestions have been made from this side of the House and that no suggestions whatever has been made from the other side for the solution of this difficulty.

Now, you cannot emphasize too much the importance of this question or the danger of the situation. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has referred to the question of transportation, and so has the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles). Did not these hon. gentlemen know this when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) rose in this House and told us that the strike had been settled and the danger was over? We heard nothing of transportation then. The leaders of these hon. gentlemen from Assiniboia, the men who occupy the treasury benches have, over and over again, acknowledged before parliament and the country that the difficulty arose from the strike at Lethbridge. Why did not the hon. member for East Assiniboia correct the Minister of Labour in the statement to which I have referred? Why did not he rise in his place and say that there was coal to be had at the Crow's Nest Pass, but the people could not get it transported? I do not think the parliament or the country will be likely to attach very much importance to such statements made at this late day and when the matter is the subject of a resolution. The words of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) deserve the greatest consideration on the part of the government. You could not give to the world any worse advertisement of the Northwest into which immigration has been pouring at so rapid a rate than to announce that the people who have settled there on the representation that there was a supply of coal always ready, have been suffering for lack of fuel during the present month and are likely to suffer during the month to come. It would be impossible for the government to aim a severer blow at the development and prosperity of that country than to permit the situation to arise which has arisen and to sit in their places and say, as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said that absolutely nothing could have been done about it. But the minister did not stop there even—he said there was nothing to be done about it in the future. They put their defence as it is given in the speech and resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) not in the shape of any policy for the future designed to correct these grievances, but in the shape of a statement that everything has been done that could be done, and that no possible remedy could be devised to meet the conditions which have threatened the people of the Northwest. What is their excuse—for it is not so much an amendment as an excuse? They say in relation to the supply of fuel in the Northwest provinces that the difficulty does not arise from any defect in our legislation. Therefore, according to the terms of the resolution no legislation can be devised that will have any bearing on the situation. That is the answer of the government when confronted with the suffering and danger of the people of the Northwest. Nothing can be done by way of legislation, they say, to remedy this situation; therefore, so far as the action of this parliament is concerned, it is absolutely hopeless to offer any remedy to the people of the west. The other excuses offered are the lack of transportation facilities and conflicts between employers and employed. This government has been in power ten years. It boasts of the influx of people into our Northwest. It holds out to these people the assurance that fuel will be always there ready for their use. If this cannot be carried out because of want of transportation facilities, why has not the government provided transportation facilities so that the reasonable requirements of the people in the west could be met? These hon. gentlemen condemn themselves by the very terms of the resolution, which they have put up one of their supporters to move as an amendment. And, if there are conflicts between employer and employed, why did not the government send out Mr. Mackenzie King—a very competent officer—to the scene of the conflict long ago? There has been no explanation of that. When Mr. Mackenzie King did go to the scene of the strike his efforts were found availing. He succeeded—and it is greatly to his credit—in bringing about a settlement of this dispute between employers and employed. Why was he not sent to the scene of the strike sooner? Had anything recently occurred? Was any recent invitation given? Had anything arisen that will serve as an excuse for the government in this matter? There may be such; all I can say is that it has not been communicated to this House up to the present time. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was remarkably philosophic about the whole situation. I venture to say that if some other member were filling the position of Minister of the Interior and the present incumbent of that office were still playing the role that he has so often played in this House, there would have been, if I may use the expression, some tearing of hair and some agonizing of spirit when the hon. gentleman rose to discuss the situation which now faces the people in the west. The responsibilities of office have lessened the ardour of my hon. friend. Instead of the fervour and zeal with which I have heard him defend the rights and interests of the people of the west, we heard a remarkably calm and philosophic statement the effect of which was that nothing could be done, but the situtation

must be let take care of itself. Are we so helpless as that? Suppose that we had a condition in the Post Office Department such as that which arose in the carrying on of these coal mines. And I venture to say that the carriage of mails through our country is in one aspect not of so much moment as the suffering and even danger of death to the people of the Northwest through lack of fuel. If the Post Office Department or other department of government were paralized through reasons of this kind, would the government still sit idle and tell us, 'Well, you cannot make people work; there is the situation, and the situation must take care of itself?' I venture to think that when a difficulty of this kind arises between employers and employed concerning the providing of a necessary of life for the people of a large section of country, parliament ought to consider, and the government ought to consider, whether or not some remedy can not be devised. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) dealt, in a few words and in a somewhat lighthearted manner with the question of compulsory arbitration. I do not say we should have compulsory arbitration in this country. But I do say that the hon. gentleman can go into the library of parliament and, if he has the time to spare for a study of the subject, he can find there five or six volumes of cases settled by the board of conciliation of New Zealand, under a law that has been pretty thoroughly thought out, as I have reason to know, having read it carefully. Whether we will have that, or whether we will have some other means to settle these difficulties, it ought to be evident to hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches as well as to members on both sides of the House that it is important for us to have some legislative means devised by which the supply of fuel and other necessities of that character proceeding from the natural resources of the country shall be supplied to the people,—this is at least as important as that the mails should be carried by the servant of the Post Office and that other departments of the government should perform their functions.

Now reference has been made as to what may be done. Let me point out to the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and to the Minister of the Interior, that when a much slighter cause operated in the empire of Germany, that government did not sit idle, it did not sit down and say that nothing could be done. It found the coal mines of Germany in the hands of a syndicate, it found that the syndicate was putting up prices according to its own sweet will. And what did the government of Germany do? They employed the Dresden bank to go into the market and buy a controlling interest in one of the mines, in order that the government, by obtaining control of that mine, might prevent this syndicate from charging the German people too high a price for their coal. That is an object lesson which might be taken into consideration by the government of this country. Because after all, what does this acknowledgment of helplessness mean? The Minister of the Interior practically says on behalf of the government, we are absolutely impotent, nothing can be done, the situation must take care of itself, parliament is helpless, and we are helpless. Well, it strikes me that the people of the Northwest will not be inclined so to regard this subject when they consider that this government has in its own possession and in its own control at the present time, thousands of acres of coal lands in the Northwest, and of as good a quality as you can find anywhere in the world. If you cannot deal with the situation in one way, then I say you must deal with it in another way. Can no legislative remedy be devised so that, instead of having lockouts and strikes in this country, we should have an arrangement by which the operation of these public resources shall be continued and parties shall be governed by a determination of their rights? I think it is worth while for both capital and labour to consider whether that would not be better than the present situation as it has been developing in the past two or three years. If we cannot have that, then I say we must consider whether the government may not otherwise place us in such a position that the country shall not be made to suffer by coal strikes, and other strikes of a similar character, which affect the very life and comfort of the people. For my part I am disposed to vote for the resolution which has been brought up by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron). I do not think that the amendment is deserving of consideration by this House, for two reasons: In the first place, because it is a mere statement, a mere excuse, and does not set forth any remedy; in the next place, it declares what I do not admit, that the government and parliament are absolutely helpless and unable to deal with the situation.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). My principal reason for rising to speak on this subject is the evident attempt of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), backed up by the leader of the opposition, to advertise the conditions in regard to the coal strike which, after all, prevailed over only a small area of the province of Saskatchewan. I have the honour to represent one of the largest constituencies in the Northwest, outside of Winnipeg; I have the honour to represent one-third of the population of the province of Alberta, and over that whole area I have yet to hear the first grumble, the first complaint about a coal famine. I do not deny that conditions did exist as stated by those hon. gentlemen, but I am in a position to say

that my constituency was not affected in the least. The area affected was comparatively small. The trouble all occurred in the vicinity of the Lethbridge mines, and consequently when the Lethbridge mines are closed the people feel the lack of coal most acutely. I venture to say the Minister of the Interior had no complaint from his own constituency, I have no complaint from mine, and those two constituencies constitute more than half the area of the whole province of Alberta.

Now, as hon. gentlemen have gone into the advertising business, let me also point out one or two facts. So far as northern Alberta is concerned there has been a plentiful supply of fuel, and the coal famine in one locality came somewhat as a surprise to the people there, as it has come to the members of this House. I must congratulate the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) on the fair manner with which he advocated his resolution. His desire evidently was to bring about a better set of circumstances. But what did we see after he had finished his speech ? We saw the whole policy of the Minister of the Interior attacked, we saw only a factious argument advanced by the opposition rather than any suggestion of a method of solving this problem. Now, Sir, as regards this coal supply, there seems to be a conception on the part of some hon. gentlemen that the coal in Alberta is grouped in certain favoured areas, and that those areas are in the possession of certain corporations. Let me say that from a geological standpoint the north branch of the Saskatchewan river has burrowed through an immense plain, and in burrowing down a distance of 100 or 160 feet it has disclosed a seam of coal averaging five to thirty feet in thickness. This obtains on both sides of the river. also the streams that lead to the Saskatchewan have burrowed to great depths, and have exposed this seam, just as some of you may have observed a stratum of rock along certain streams. Now, is it not fair to conclude that if that great river, for hundreds of miles, reveals a seam such as I have described, the land adjacent to it for many miles doubtless contains underneath the fertile prairie this immense bed of coal ranging from five to thirty feet in depth. So when you come to talk about coal, and about cornering the coal market the talk is absurd. When the Canadian Pacific Railway bought this land that was, so to speak, unentailed, they bought it in fee simple with the coal underneath it, a seam of coal 160 feet below the surface and seven feet thick. The coal resources for domestic purposes in the northwest of Alberta are unlimited. Now, you have along the banks of the Saskatchewan a great many settlers who took advantage of the long lots, as we say, before 1887.

You will remember the statement of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who said that all lands patented before 1887 took the coal-right with it. You have a great many of those settlers on the banks of the Saskatchewan. They have that coal easy of access, so easy of access that coal mining in the immediate vicinity of Strathcona and Edmonton has not been carried on by mining operations, but merely by burrowing holes in the sides of the bank, taking out the coal and shipping it as required. At the present time I know of only one place within seven miles of the town of Strathcona or the city of Edmonton where there are stored 10 tons of coal. Why ? Because the coal is so easily obtained that there is no necessity for storing it. Now why did it not relieve the coal famine in Saskatchewan? What was the reason that this coal was not shipped there? That question was asked me one day by the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It was as much a mystery to me as to any one except for one possible explanation and that was, transportation. That is a difficult problem, your coal cannot be shipped to these points at an advantage and for that reason you have not the preparations for shipping. There never has been any demand for coal outside a certain district around the river. Other rivers leading into the Saskatchewan have given many rural districts their supply of coal. Coal mining is not a lucrative occupation there for the simple reason that the access to the coal is so easy. Time and time again, and I am sure the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will bear me out in this, coal corners have been formed of the few mines operating in the winter months there in the vicinity of Strathcona and Edmonton and the farmers, when the roads would get good and the sleighing perfect, would take their sleighs and take the coal out of the side of the bank and deliver it at half the price a miner would charge. These are some of the reasons why coal mining is not now being carried on in that vicinity to the same extent that it will be in the future.

I shall cite a couple of instances to give you an idea of how easy of access this coal is. In the mining steamers on the Saskatchewan for some years the only means of coal supply was to moor alongside the bank, dig the coal out and fill up the coal bin. I can well remember seeing the first engine the Canadian Northern sent up on the Strathcona and Edmonton branch running up on the bed of a creek stopping on the main track and coaling up, before a proper coal shed was built. At the present time the largest coal mine in the vicinity of Strathcona or Edmonton is being operated within the corporation of Strathcona right on the side of the hill.

The crucial point to my mind is that spoken of in the amendment, first, the lack of operation of the available coal supply, and second, the lack of cheap transportation. On those two points the whole situa-

tion hung, during the late trouble in Saskatchewan.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Now as regards the resolution suggested by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) he was not sure how his resolution would operate. He suggests in the first place that he government retain a certain control over the lands that are disposed of in the future. Immediately that policy is brought into play you are putting the future operators at a tremendous disadvantage. Those who have secured coal lands since 1887 are at a disadvantage as compared with those who procured coal lands before 1887, because the royalty has been charged since that date; but you are going to further restrict the mining of coal on all lands purchased since then. In the lands that have been disposed of in fee simple so to speak, there has been no restriction, they have passed absolutely beyond the control of the Dominion government, and should those lands fall under any default in title, they would revert to the provinces. There are certain instances as we all know where a title becomes defective and property reverts to the Crown, in which case, in every instance, it reverts to the province. The administration of lands after registration is controlled by the provinces, therefore it seems to me that if you are going to have these regulations established by any government it should be the provincial government and it is a strange thing that our provincial righters on the other side of the House should ask us to alienate from the provinces certain rights which should go to them. We heard a great deal of this at the time of the Autonomy Bills and it seems a strange thing indeed to ask that we should take away the right of the province to legislate in this matter.

I do not think that the objection suggested by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Wm. Roche) that certain men in public life had bought coal lands is of much weight. It is the privilege of every man in his capacity as a private citizen to purchase coal lands to the extent of 320 acres in any part of Alberta or Saskatchewan. I do not see how then, it can be a capital crime if a public man were to utilize his funds in that way.

As to the lack of transportation, I have only this to say to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). He stated that if the existing transportation facilities are not adequate there should be better facilities. What was the position of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and of his whole party when this great railway proposition for the relief of these troubles was suggested two or three years ago ? Where did we find them on that occasion? They tried by every possible means to defeat the proposition that was put forward for the relief of just such contingencies as has occurred on this occasion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what resolution or words of mine is the hon. gentleman referring ?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I have reference to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know what he is referring to, but he has made a statement and I want him to tell me to what words or what resolution of mine he is referring.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. To get at the exact words we will have to quote from the record.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman produce the record at some future time ?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I shall endeavour to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought he would be prepared to do so now as he made the statement.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) took exception to the transportation question being given as one of the great reasons or the great reason for the trouble which has arisen because this was not brought to notice while the strike was in operation. The resolution does not embrace transportation alone; if it is read carefully it will be found to embrace, as well, the scarcity of labour. I think, therefore, that these two points are the two points we must argue if we are to face this matter fairly. It is not the policy of the administration of the land that has given rise to the condition of affairs; it is the condition of labour and of transportation and the lack of capital in the operation of the valuable coal supplies.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). I desire to say a few words with reference to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Alberta Mr. Herron) and the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), I certainly could not understand why the hon. member for Alberta brought forward this resolution until the argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side developed. In the resolution there were embodied two propositions, the first is :

> That in the opinion of this House the coal lands owned by the government of Canada should only be alienated under such conditions, and subject to such control and regulations, as will provide for an immediate supply of coal adequate at all times to the requirements of the people, and at a reasonable price to the consumer.

That is the first proposition of the resolution of the hon. member. But in the course of his speech the hon. gentleman stated

quite pertinently that it would be absolutely unfair to the future operators of coal mines, should the government carry out this first proposition of his resolution. The next proposition of the resolution is that in so far as the alienation of any future coal measures are concerned legislation should be passed :

> For such control and regulation in case of emergency as will in future prevent loss and suffering to the people of the western provinces.

There is no possible way this could be done except that the government should take hold of these coal measures, develop them, and go into the coal mining business. But the hon. gentleman for Alberta declared frankly that it would be impracticable and impossible for any government to carry on coal mining operations. It will therefore be seen that the hon. gentleman has introduced a resolution embodying two propositions to both of which he himself is opposed. As I said, it was difficult to understand why he brought forward this resolution, but we have since discovered that the hon. member for Marquette wished to avail of it to inform the House and the country that the Hon. A. C. Rutherford, the Hon. A. L. Sifton, and Mr. D. C. Cameron had each of them purchased 320 acres of coal lands. We thus find that the reason for bringing forward the resolution was that gentlemen on the other side wanted to make some campaign capital out of it for themselves. But the hon. member for Marquette did not tell the House and the country that under the coal mines' regulations it was the right of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) or the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) or any other free citizen of this country to purchase exactly the same amount of coal lands on exactly the same terms as these gentlemen purchased them at. A further and a marvellous reason for bringing forward this resolution was discovered when the leader of the opposition spoke. He wanted to challenge this government on its transportation policy, and he wanted to criticise this government for not having given the Northwest Territories adequate transportation facilities. He was rather indignant that the member for Strathcona should suggest that his own policy on this matter would not compare very favourably with the policy of the government, and he wanted the hon. gentleman for Strathcona to quote his exact remarks in reference to anything which he might have stated that would bear out the contention that the leader of the opposition was opposed in any way to the carrying out of an adequate transportation policy in the Northwest. Why, Sir, the whole argument of the leader of the opposition in this House and out of the House, supported as it was by the loyal opposition, went to show that these gentlemen were in every possible way opposed to the construction of any other transcontinental railway through the Northwest. The leader of the opposition even went further than that ; he not only wanted no more railways built in the Northwest but he wanted this country to take from the Canadian Pacific Railway at a cost of some $38,000,000 that lean and hungry section of its system that runs round Lake Superior ; he did not even tell us how he was going to get from Fort William to Winnipeg, he has not told us yet whether he was ever going to build a road west from Winnipeg to the Pacific Coast. And in face of this, the leader of the opposition says he was in favour of transportation facilities for the Northwest. Why, Sir, in his semi-public-owned and Canadian Pacific Railway owned system of railways he never expected to get beyond the city of Winnipeg, and so under his scheme there would be no railways beyond the city of Winnipeg that would in any way handle the coal for the settlers there. The hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson) does not seem to agree with what I say; the hon. member for Halton, I am glad to say, very seldom agrees with anything I have to say. Now, Sir, the leader of the opposition and other speakers have attempted to ridicule the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. To my mind the amendment includes the two main reasons for the difficulty we have in the Northwest to-day : one, the transportation problem, the other the labour problem. You can argue this matter as long as you wish, but in face of the very interesting speech of the hon. member for Strathcona you cannot get away from the fact that the only reasons you have for the scarcity of coal to-day in the Northwest are that there are labour difficulties and that there are not adequate means of transportation. The hon. member for Strathcona might have gone further. It is well known that in the Peace River Valley there are enormous measures of even better coal than have yet been opened up in the Northwest, while further west in British Columbia are equally extensive areas of good domestic coal which will be opened up by the Grand Trunk Pacific. There is an abundance of coal to supply the people of the Northwest. Settle the labour problem, settle the transportation problem, and all your difficulties are removed. The amendment says nothing else than that these difficulties have arisen because of labour disputes and because of lack of transportation facilities. Does not the amendment then fully cover the situation ? Regarding the transportation problem, I think this government is doing its duty in that respect in face of the opposition we have had from hon. gentlemen opposite. Last year when the branch line Bill of the Grand Trunk Pacific came before the Railway Committee there was almost a solid

phalanx of hon. gentlemen opposite to oppose it. The hon. gentleman from Halton (who does not agree with what I say) was one of the most enthusiastic opponents of the branch line clause of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. Why, Sir, if he had his way he would not allow the Grand Trunk Pacific to build a single branch line. He wanted to limit that railway to keeping within at least thirty miles of any other railway there, so that I am not surprised that he does not agree with what I have to say. With regard to the labour problem, the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) very wisely kept away from it. I am of the opinion, and I say so freely here, that it is a problem with which this government or some other government will have to deal; it is a problem that has to be settled in some way. It is intolerable that present conditions should continue in this country, and if the House in its good judgment will accept the amendment, I think it will be the duty of the government to take such steps as will implement it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, almost every phase of the question under discussion has been considered, but there are a few matters connected with it that are of such great interest to me and so congenial to my disposition that I would like, even at this late hour, to ask the indulgence of the House for four or five minutes. The resolution moved by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) is a very important one. His desire to remove for the future the possibility of the occurrence of such difficulties as those which have arisen in the Northwest is to be appreciated by every member of this House; but it is a good deal more difficult to find the remedy than it is to put down the grievance on paper in the form of a resolution. The assumption in the whole of this debate has been that warfare between capital and labour is a matter of easy settlement—that whilst in older countries like England, where industrial difficulties exist, though not so numerously as they do in this country, they are difficult of settlement, yet in this new country, this great undeveloped country, the government, under extraordinary circumstances, should have been able to step into a crisis and make a settlement at a few hours' notice. The whole contention in this debate has been that these extraordinary conditions have been due to the negligence and incompetente of the present government. The leader of the opposition asked this question: If Mr. King settled the dispute at a late hour, why did he not settle it at an earlier hour?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not put it just that way. I asked why was he not sent there earlier, since when he was sent there he was able to accomplish something?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If Mr. King did settle the strike, why was he not sent earlier, and perhaps he could have settled it earlier? Mr. Speaker, my experience of industrial conflicts is that there is only a certain time when they can be settled by outsiders. Both sides will continue in the conflict until they practically exhaust themselves and are driven to the conclusion that after all conciliation and consideration are better than fighting each other to the bitter end; and Mr. King was too wise to step into the breach until the proper time arrived. A year ago there was a strike in the city of Nanaimo which lasted four months, causing a loss of over $2,000,000 in wages and very serious inconvenience for many months afterwards. The people said: 'Why does not Mr. King come and settle the strike'? I say it is the business of the conflicting parties to settle their own differences. As a matter of fact, neither of them wanted Mr. King. If Mr. King had insisted at that particular time in participating in the dispute, he would have been repelled, and it would have been impossible for him at any other time to make a settlement. But he left them to fight it out; then they were willing to receive Mr. King, a settlement was arrived at by conciliation, and terms were made that have been operating ever since. The hon. membr for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), endorsed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), thought it was a humiliating thing for this country that Mr. King should have to go and interview John Mitchell before an industrial dispute in this country could be settled. Strange to say, the hon. member for Marquette, in the same speech, thought it was not unreasonable that the Prime Minister should take the opinion of the president of the United States upon matters that might affect the policy of the government. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for this government to prevent international trades unionism. Why, the hon. gentleman's suggestion is that individual liberty ought to be controlled; it is a suggestion that men have no rights; and underlying it is the suggestion that the rights of combination should be destroyed—that men apart from the state should have no control over their own domestic affairs. The question of compulsory arbitration is a big and complicated question, and up to the present time in any country of the world a pure experiment; but I want to say this to the House, that there is a human right in individuals and associations to adopt the weapons of defence in their possession. Men have a right to say just as they have a right to combine, 'We refuse to labour on terms which are unreasonable and unsatisfactory to us.' Do the opposition say anything about the rights of employers in this matter? They hold that Mr. King should not have been permitted to interview John Mitchell, but they consider it a reasonable thing that capitalists of the United States should have coal mining interests in this country. When Mr. King came to Nanaimo a year ago, he

was met at the very threshhold of the trouble by an American who was the superintendent of larger coal mining interests than those of Lethbridge; and when he met the superintendent of the company, he said: 'I must first telegraph to the president of the company, who is in control of this company, before I can cosider this Canadian question.' Do hon. gentlemen opposite say anything about that side of the question? I feel myself that a national union in this country, capable of dealing with and settling its own affairs, is desirable; but the right to combine carries with it the right to combine with any part of the world, and is just as much a right of labour as it is of capital, and if hon. gentlemen want to cut short the rights of labour in these international interests, they ought to be equally prepared to cut short the rights of capital in international interests. If the labour leader in Canada has no right to intercede in an affair of this kind, in association with a man in the United States, then why should United States capital have the right to come into this country and control the industrial conditions that have brought about industrial strife?

I believe in conciliation, I believe in compulsory arbitration and I am trying to speak, as if I were a man who was earning his living every day in a coal mine as I did for many a year. I believe in compulsory arbitration, but this parliament cannot compel the public to have forced upon them the settlement of their own disputes without you educate them into that state of opinion. The late Minister of Labour, two years ago, it must be known to hon. members of this House, was anxious, partly at my instigation, to adopt the principle of compulsory arbitration in this country on railways. I discussed it with him and got him into the position of making an experiment with the railways. He brought in a Bill which was read the second time, discussed in this House, printed, sent out broadcast and put in the hands of the railway men and railway companies with the object of making compulsory arbitration possible in the settlement of disputes on railways. There is not an enterprise in any country wherein the public interest is affected to anything like the same extent as it is on railways. If there is an enterprise at all in connection with which the state ought to protect the public against the union man and the employer it is the operation of railways where life is at stake to such an enormous extent. The late Minister of Labour brought that Bill before this House, it was read the second time, discussed, printed and distributed and the railway labour unions of Canada to a man opposed the bringing into force of compulsory arbitration. They said: We have our weapon of defence; it is the strike; we protest against parliament saying we shall not refrain from work if we like. If I were working for a living I would advocate compulsory arbitration. I think the public in this country and in every country have an interest that is supreme and one which is beyond the organization of capital or beyond the organization of men and unions. If you take the combined value of the capital of this country and the combined interest of the unions—and I am a trades union man—you will find that the public interest preponderates in value and importance as compared with these two combined interests. If that is so the public interest has a right to protection and I would say to capital and to the trades unions: You must take into consideration the rights of the third party who do not control your capital and who cannot control your union before you enter into a conflict that will make the third party suffer. That is what was done as a result of the Lethbridge strike. At the present time we have the principle of conciliation.

Surely the present government ought to get some credit from members of the opposition for the legislation passed in this House providing for the settlement of labour disputes. I have heard a great deal of criticism from members of the opposition in regard to the operation and working of the labour bureau. I contend that an impartial consideration of the records and history of the labour bureau ought to be satisfactory to the members of the opposition as well as to the members of the government party in this House. I contend, Sir, that the administration, by an intelligent man like Mackenzie King, the deputy Minister of Labour, of the legislation that was brought into existence by this government has done sufficient for the domestic interest of Canada in settling disputes as to make it reasonable that the members of the opposition as well as the members of the government should appreciate the good work of that department. I want to say, Sir, that the people of Lethbridge appreciate that, the people of Valleyfield appreciate that, the people of Nanaimo appreciate that, and the people in several other mining sections of the country appreciate the labour department. If that department is to be effective it ought to have the honest support of every man in this House whether he agrees with the government which brought it into existence or whether he does not. I intend this session, when the proper time arrives, to show to this House just exactly what has been done by that department. However, I was going on to say that there is a Conciliation Act, there is a disposition to intercede between the parties, correspondence takes place under the authority of the state between the two factors in any trouble where the public interest in affected and the machinery has been put in operation effectually and to good purpose. I would

strongly recommend to the minister in charge of the department to see whether or not that authority can be extended. I think it can be done. It may savour of the principle of compulsory arbitration but I think the minister should say that capital and labour must permit the government to seek to know their business and to conciliate their differences before they are permitted to bring about a strike. That would be a tremendous step in the right direction. The government should say: You cannot strike until we have had an opportunity of knowing just exactly what you are striking about. It is right that we should know that. They may be at liberty afterwards to do as they like, but the great object in industrial troubles is to get the two parties together to consider their differences. What is done at the end could, in my opinion be done at the beginning. By what it may be fair to call a practical experiment—by compelling the parties to conciliate their differences, or to inform the department of the nature of the differences between them before they are permitted to strike. That is what would be called compulsory conciliation or compulsory arbitration.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is very plain to me although it may be comical to the hon. gentleman. I do not expect him to have a very clear view of the question, but it is very clear to every sensible man in this House. It is just exactly the same as the operation of the common law of this country. In regard to any difficulty that occurs around the streets the law insists that such differences shall be known and that the public interest shall not be affected by them. Every one will admit that such a provision would be a long step in advance towards the adoption of a satisfactory conciliation Act in this country. Personally, I do not believe that public sentiment would accept the principle of compulsory arbitration. What does it mean? You compel people to arbitrate but you cannot compel a man to work for a company if he does not want to. I mention these matters because, although I am in favour of the principle, I think we ought to know them. If you have an arbitration board which decides that the Lethbridge Coal Company shall give an advance of ten or fifteen per cent and the company finds that it cannot operate its business at a profit how are you going to compel it to operate its mine? These are serious matters that must be considered in the settlement of this question. I would advise the government to go slow in this matter—to seek to improve the present Act, which is of a great benefit to the country, and strengthen its operation. If this is done, I believe it will lessen the troubles that exist. But thoses troubles exist everywhere, and, though we do everything we can we may still expect to have industrial conflict. I do not think, as I have said, that the public—and when I speak of the public I mean the people outside of combinations of capital and combinations of labour—would at present support the principle of compulsory arbitration. That would be a tremendous step. I know it operates now in New Zealand and has done so for years. But I know also that there is tremendous discontent, both among the employers and among the men, with the result of awards of this arbitration board. In this country we feel that men have a right to dispute the power of any person to compel them to work. The disposition in this country is to develop rather along the line of individual and associated liberty. We have asserted the principle that a man has a right to refuse to work so long as he does not attempt to prevent others from working. And that is where I differ with the union. I say that when a man refuses to work, he should not object to another man, however simple he may be, who comes forward and wants to take the place which he had refused to hold. I want to make that statement clear before this House. I want to use whatever influence I may have in this country in favour of what is fair and reasonable. I know that the contrary has been tried—and it is a pet theory with certain labour leaders in the United States—by the enforcement of the sympathetic strike. But they do not succeed with it, and have never succeeded with it. And in England, where the experiment is seventy years old, they have never succeeded in the sympathetic strike. The people there believe that, while a man has a right to leave his employment, another man has an equal right to take his place if he voluntarily comes forward to do so. And if the union wishes to have influence with the public it will have to carry on its affairs on lines of justice in a business like way and with fair regard for the public interest. I say that such instances as the Hamilton strike are a disgrace on the part of some parties seeking to boycott the public because the public do not believe as they do. I believe that the men who created that disturbance were men not officially associated with the unions in Hamilton or with the operating companies, but were men who had a peculiar interest at the time in having some fun at somebody's else's expense.

Now, this coal strike in the Northwest was a very serious affair. I have considered it from every standpoint as a member of this House and a man who feels the responsibilities of public life, and, I think it is the duty of the government to do all it can to improve existing legislation for the settlement of these disputes. I believe that if they attempt it they will succeed.

But I want the opposition to understand and remember that we may have any amount of reform in this country and we shall still have strikes. They have dealt with these matters for sixty years in England and they still have strikes there. It may be that they have no strikes in New Zealand, but they have disturbances and opposition to the decisions of the Board of Arbitration. I hope that the government will strengthen the power of conciliation that has been placed in the hands of Mr. Mackenzie King, who has done such noble work, and will put him in a position to do greater good still.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I had not intended to speak at this late hour of the evening, but it seems desirable that I should say a few words. First, let me thank the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) for the very kind words he has spoken of the Department of Labour, of the work performed by that department and of its able deputy minister, Mr. Mackenzie King. No words of praise too strong could be spoken of this officer for the many valuable services he has rendered our young country since he was given the high position of deputy Minister of Labour. Under his administration speaking from my own special knowledge, many important labour disputes have been settled. If we read the statistics of the Labour 'Gazette, we find that in the last four or five years he has settled no fewer than forty strikes. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) stated a minute ago, that Mr. Mackenzie King should have been called upon early in March to settle this coal strike in Lethbridge. I may say in answer that at that time the people of Canada hardly knew there was such a strike. It was only when the strike became acute that the services of Mr. King were required. But they could not have been offered earlier because, as we know, Mr. King had been sent to England to promote legislation there in favour of the labouring classes, legislation to prevent the fraudulent importation of immigrants. On his return I told Mr. King that cold weather prevailed in the west and that he might be called upon at any moment to offer his services as deputy minister to carry out the Conciliation Act in this case. A message was sent to the miners at Lethbridge—I state this to show the leader of the opposition how delicate are the functions of the deputy Minister of Labour and how impossible it is to step in at any moment in case of a difficulty existing between employers and employed—and, even though the strike was in an acute stage the services of Mr. King were politely declined. It was only at the last moment, when public opinion became insistent, and when telegrams began to come in from the Northwest, and especially from the Lethbridge district, that employers and miners accepted the services of the Lab-

our Department. The moment Mr. Mackenzie King went to the Northwest armed with the powers of the Conciliation Act, which Act we owe to Sir William Mulock, and spoke to the parties engaged in the struggle that moment, a settlement was in sight. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) says that it is a pity that our country should have been for a time at the beck and call of John Mitchell, the leader of the miners' organization in the United States. I am not here to say what should be the personal relations between Mr. King and Mr. Mitchell, but I say, speaking as Minister of Labour and on behalf of Mr. King on the floor of this House, that there was no communication whatever between the government or the deputy minister, and Mr. John Mitchell. As I explained the other day, Mr. King went to Lethbridge, and after certain pourparlers had taken place between the employers and the miners, the miners, among whom there are many Americans belonging to the International Union, wanted to refer the question to Mr. Mitchell. Mr. King, and also Hon. Mr. Scott, the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, thought that, in order to save time at that very critical moment when cold weather was prevailing in the Northwest, that they should follow the committee appointed by the strikers in order to get, as soon as possible, the answer that they would give after consulting their leader. But these gentlemen were not in contact with Mr. John Mitchell. They simply awaited the deliberations of the miners' committee. And the moment the committee of miners said that they accepted the settlement, accepted the clause drafted by Mr. King—and it is only fair to state that if this strike is settled, it is due to the drafting of the clause by the deputy minister—Mr. King and Mr. Scott returned to Canada. But we had no communications direct or indirect with John Mitchell.

Now, the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) spoke of the principle of compulsory arbitration. I am not here this evening to defend or uphold that principle. We know that compulsory arbitration exists today in New Zealand, but from the little I have read I gather that it is still a debatable question in New Zealand as to whether it is successful or not. I agree with my hon. friend that after the strikes and riots that have taken place in Canada at Buckingham and at Hamilton, and after that terrible strike which took place at Lethbridge, it is the duty of this parliament to study that question seriously, to place it above politics, in order to find a remedy if possible. What did we see not long ago in this fair Canada of ours? Almost at the very doors of this parliament, after the Department of Labour had offered its services to the contending parties under the Conciliation Act, we found armed men engaged in a

riot in which three or four were killed. I say it would be a crime for Canada to allow such things to take place as took place in the month of October last without endeavouring to prevent them.

I hope this question will come up again during the present session. The papers in regard to the Buckingham strike have been asked for and will be brought before the House. I expected that they would have been brought in before to-day. I suppose that the trials now taking place on the other side of the river may have had something to do with the delay. I hope that the question will be discussed again during this session, and that every member of this House will give the Department of Labour his support in trying to find a means of settling these conflicts arising between employers and employees. It is true that under our Conciliation Act we can do much. But the question is always a very delicate one, especially when both parties do not agree to ask for the intervention of the Department of Labour. The Act has so far accomplished some good. I regret that the parties at Buckingham did not see fit to accept our services; had they done so it would have prevented the bloodshed. But I say that the time has come when this parliament must take this question up seriously and deal with it, whether by compulsory arbitration or by compulsory investigation. Compulsory investigation has accomplished some good. In the case of the telegraphers' strike which occurred in Montreal a few years ago a settlement was procured under that Act by the Department of Labour. I thank the hon. member for Nanaimo for the compliment he has paid to the Deputy Minister of Labour. I think that during the last few months Mr. Mackenzie King has rendered very valuable services, not only to the labouring classes of Canada, but to other classes as well. The legislation which he obtained from the parliament of Great Britain during its present session is appreciated not only by the labourers, but by the capitalists of this country. His intervention in the Lethbridge strike, and the settlement which he procured of that alarming difficulty, proves that his services are needed every day in the week and every hour in the day.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. the Postmaster General (Mr.Lemieux) invites the co-operation of the opposition in dealing with the difficult problem of the conflicts between capital and labour. Well, the opposition are ready and desirous to render every assistance in their power to the government to meet this serious difficulty. But what remedy has the Postmaster General proposed for overcoming it? What remedy does this amendment propose? No remedy at all. It is purely an allegation and a denial of certain facts. Now, I think that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) was not quite up to his usual ability in the remarks he made to-night, and was not as logical as usual. He started out by telling us that the leader of the opposition contended that the government should not have allowed nine months to elapse before sending the Deputy Minister of Labour up to Lethbridge to settle the coal strike, and the hon. member for Nanaimo went on to defend the lethargy of the government in that regard, saying that the psycological moment had not arrived when the parties to the contest would have accepted the intervention of the Department of Labour. By that he implied a condemnation of compulsory arbitration, though later on he declared that he was in favour of that principle. He contended on the one hand that the psycological moment could only arrive through influences over which the government had no control, and on the other hand he contended that the governmet should make the psycological moment and step in before the strike took place.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They could make it before the fight began.

Mr. SPROULE. You can hardly settle a dispute before it began that is rather an Irish bull than English logic.

As regards compulsory arbitration, I remember reading an interesting article in 'Everybody's Magazine,' I think for October, referring to compulsory arbitration in New Zealand and showing that there is less difficulty between capital and labour there in reference to the settlement of strikes or otherwise, than in any other country, compulsory arbitration is there practically every thing that can be desired, and the relations between capital and labour are the most amicable existing in any part of the world, and yet, my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) says that compulsory arbitration would not have accomplished much in this strike because they had not worn themselves out first.

I was rather amused at the speech of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre). He gave an advertisement of how much coal there was along the Saskatchewan valley, hundreds of miles away from where the coal was needed. There were immense quantities of coal and all that was required was to have the coal where it was needed for fuel. It reminded me of a story of an Englishman who met an Irishman driving two head of cattle into Calgary. The Englishman asked him what he expected to get for them, and the Irishman replied : that he would get about $25 for the smallest one and about $30 for the other. The Englishman said : 'Well my friend if you had them in Liverpool you would get about $35 for the smaller and about $50 for the larger.'

'Yes,' the Irishman replied, 'and if I had the lakes of Killarney in Hell, I could sell

the water for $10 a drop but I have not it there.'

That is about the kind of logic we have heard, there was lots of coal in Strathcona, that is not within hundreds of miles of where it is required and there was no means of getting it there.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. How much further is it from Lethbridge to Saskatoon, one of the points complained of than it is from Strathcona to Saskatoon ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, I might ask the distance between Killarney and the other place, and keep just as close to the subject under consideration.

A word with reference to the resolution and the amendment to it. What does the resolution propose? One would imply from the reasoning of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and those supporting him in this House were rather contending against the interests of labour. There is not a word in the resolution nor in the arguments advanced from this side of the House that would imply that, nothing but a desire to find some solution that would do away with the differences between capital and labour and prevent them in the future. The resolution says :

That in the opinion of this House, the coal lands owned by the government of Canada shou d only be alienated under such conditions, and subject to such control and regulations, as will provide for an immediate supply of coal adequate at all times to the requirements of the people.

That is the first part. Does any one quarrel with that, that they should be so guarded in that way by either legislative provision or regulation ?

And at a reasonable price to the consumer; and that in respect of coal lands already alienated, legislative provision should be made for such control and regulation, in case of emergencies, as will in the future prevent loss and suffering to the people of the western provinces, through lack of fuel supply.

That is all, it is with regard to coal lands already alienated that that might be done. What is the amendment to that ?

That the recent difficulties in relation to supply of fuel in the northwestern provinces did not arise from any defect in legislation.

That is all, a pure denial or negation of fact, if such a thing is logical at all. That is what they provide as a remedy for the difficulties that existed for nine months between capital and labour and the poor people in that land who required fuel so much. Let it be remembered by the people of the Northwest where many are now almost freezing that that is the only remedy the government in this crucial moment can offer for the troubles that have arisen. It is a fair illustration of what occurred once before at another grave cricis in the history of this country when some one came forward and asked the Minister of Finance to propose a remedy in the interests of the people to prevent the dumping of goods from the United States into Canada to the detriment of the labour and manufactures of this country. The minister said that the government is only like a fly on a wheel; it can do nothing, the great wheel will move around and the fly has no power to stop its motion. That is exactly the same policy that the government is now pursuing, the policy of laissez faire, like flies on a wheel. They have no remedy and they have only suggested a denial of an allegation of an implied fact. He told them to go home and work harder and eat less and this I suppose implies about the same remedy, to work harder and use less coal.

The second portion of this speaks only with regard to coal lands already alienated, that there should be some legislative provision, if possible, to prevent these troubles occurring in the future. Is there anything wrong about that ? I do not think there is, but they are not willing even although they were able to provide by legislative enactment to give them power to make regulations to prevent this in the future. That is what the amendment says, if an amendment it may be called, and in my judgment it is only by a great stretch of poetical license that it may be called an amendment to the resolution.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Knowles).

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Adamson,	Law
Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Aylesworth,	Lemieux,
Beauparlant,	Loggie,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Boyer,	McCraney,
Brodeur,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Bruneau,	McKenzie,
Burrows,	McLennan,
Caldwell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Carney,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carrier,	Martin (St. Mary's),
Cash,	Meigs,
Crawford,	Oliver,
Demers,	Parent,
Derbyshire,	Pickup,
Desjardins,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Ratz,
Dubeau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Emmerson,	Ross (Cape Breton),
Fielding,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Finlay,	Savoie,
Finlayson,	Schell (Glengarry),
Fisher,	Schell (Oxford),
Fortier,	Sinclair,
Gauvreau,	Sloan,
Geoffrion,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Girard,	Smith (Oxford),
Gladu,	Stewart,
Hall,	Telford,

Harty,	Tobin,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tolmie,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Turgeon,
Johnston,	Turriff,
Kennedy,	Walsh (St. Annes),
Knowles,	Watson,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright (Renfrew),
	Zimmerman.—77.

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Jackson (Elgin),
Ames,	Lake,
Avery,	Lennox,
Barker,	Lewis,
Bergeron,	Morin,
Blain,	Perley,
Borden (Carleton),	Pringle,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Chisholm (Huron),	Roche (Marquette),
Christie,	Schaffner,
Clements,	Smith (Wentworth),
Cockshutt,	Sproule,
Daniel,	Staples,
Elson,	Stockton,
Fowler,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ganong,	White,
Gunn,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson
Herron,	(Lennox & Adding.),
Hughes (Victoria),	Wright (Muskoka).—39.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition
Messieurs	
Bickerdike,	McLean (York),
Black,	Bristol,
Bole,	Barr,
Brown,	Brabazon,
Bureau,	Macdonell,
Calvert,	Taylor,
Campbell,	Bennett,
Carvell,	McLean (P.E.I.),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Martin (P.E.I.)
Clarke,	Marshall,
Conmee,	Crockett,
Copp,	Brabazon,
Costigan,	Monk,
Delisle,	Paquet,
Dyment,	Lancaster,
German,	Lalor,
Gervais,	Forget,
Gordon,	Clare,
Grant,	Osler,
Guthrie,	McLaren (Perth),
Greenway,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Hunt,	Worthington,
Lavergne	Léonard,
(Drum. & Arth.),	
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Lovell,	Boyce,
Macpherson,	Seagram,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Porter,
Martin (Wellington)	Cochrane,
Miller,	Ward,
Pardee,	Kemp,
Parmalee,	Northrup,
Paterson,	Haggart,
Sifton,	Tisdale,
Templeman,	Foster,
Wilson (Russell),	Armstrong.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. BARR. Had I not been paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) I would have voted against the amendment and for the resolution.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all reports made by the superintendents of experimental farms in Canada, regarding the results of experiments made during the past season, to test the value of fish scrap, produced at the government reduction works at Canso, Nova Scotia, as a fertilizer.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing the following data : (1) The name of the present homesteader on southeast quarter, section 12, township 30, range 2, west of fifth meridian; (2) date of his entry: (3) by whom it was made; (4) where was it made; (5) who was the first to make homestead entry therefor; (6) by whom was the first entry cancelled; (7) who was the next applicant, and what was the date of the application; (8) the names of any other applicants, if any, for this homestead, and the dates of applications; all correspondence in regard to this quarter section.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a return showing : (1) The water-powers and location of same, along the Trent canal waterways, still in possession of the government of Canada ; (2) those along tributary waters under the same control; (3) the water-powers that have been leased, or otherwise disposed of; (4) the terms in each case; (5) the nature of the title in each instance.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence, relating to the adoption and the application of section 9 of the Act of 1885, amending the Consolidated Revenue Act of 1883, now subsection 4 of section 148, of chapter 34, of the Revised Statutes of Canada; this Act treating of two-year maturing spirits in bond.—Mr. Robitaille.

For a copy of all orders in council, agreements, contracts, reports, telegrams, letters, and other documents, relating to any agreement between the government, or any department of the government, and Mr. W. A. D. Lees, or any other person or persons, for fencing a part or tract of land near Fort Saskatchewan, in Alberta; and all such documents and papers as aforesaid, relating to the maintenance of such fence.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a return showing : The quantity of oil from the wells of Memramcook and Dover sold and delivered to the Intercolonial Railway between the 1st of January, 1904, and the 31st of March, 1906; such statement to set forth in detail the dates, quantity, price and total value of each of such shipments. And further for a similar statement giving like information in respect of all other oil purchased from or through the agency of the New Brunswick Petroleum Company, being the output of other wells than those herein above specified.—Mr. Barker.

For a return showing : All sums paid or credits given by the Record Foundry Company, of Moncton, in respect of purchases from the Intercolonial Railway of scrap iron, copper, babbit metal, lead, sheet lead, and scrap metal of every description, between 1st January, 1904, and 31st March, 1906 ; said statement to further show date and amount of every such transac-

tion, character, quantity and price per pound, of material purchased, and whether and in what instances the same has been offered to public competition or sale by tender.—Mr. Barker.

For a copy of all writs, forms and instructions issued and used in and for the purposes of the elections for the constituency of London, in the year 1905, and for the elections for the constituencies of East Elgin and North Bruce, in the year 1906.—Mr. Barker.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up, to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resolutions of the Minister of Agriculture, and then the tariff resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 11, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) to amend the naturalization Act.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Bill (No. 23) respecting a certain treaty between Canada and Japan.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Manufacturers Bank of Canada.—Mr. Kemp.

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

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the North Western Trusts and Loan Company.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Explain.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. VERVILLE. The object of the Bill is to establish an eight hour day upon all public works throughout the country. It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the Bill at the present time, they will be discussed on the second reading. The Bill as it stands has no effect on wages to be paid on public works.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF CANNED FOODS.

House went in committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to pass an Act to provide for the further supervision and inspection of canned food products, meats and fish, and for the appointment of inspectors for the enforcement of the Act.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The resolution is of course couched in very general terms, and therefore it would be expedient for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to give us some more definite information as to the scope of the proposed legislation.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I think perhaps I ought to explain the reason for the introduction of this measure. It is not entirely a new departure but if it is enforced, as I hope it will be if it is adopted by parliament, it will be an entirely new departure in our trade in certain Canadian products. We are all familiar with the agitation that arose in the United States last summer, as a consequence of certain revelations about the meat packing establishments in Chicago. The House is aware that in Canada we have a somewhat similar trade, but under very different conditions. At the same time, in consequence of the revelations and the feeling on the part of people not only in the United States but elsewhere with regard to the condition of affairs in certain packing houses in that country some uneasiness was felt in regard to our own packing establishments. I therefore appointed an officer of my department, one whom I considered to be well qualified, to make an investigation into the condition of the meat packing establishments of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is the officer ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. W. W. Moore, of the cold storage branch of the department. He is a very efficient, businesslike officer who has been a long time in the department, and I have had occasion at various times to employ him for work outside of his ordinary routine duties, and in such work he has always been very successful. His report on the meat-packing establishments has already, this session, been referred to in this House. It deals pretty exhaustively and in detail with the character, the management and the equipment of individual establishments. We have not a great many

of such establishments in Canada, and therefore Mr. Moore was able to visit and report upon, I think, every one of them. When reference was made to this report before, I felt, having read it very carefully, that there were some passages in it, dealing with individual establishments, which it would be hardly fair to those concerned in the business to make public, and therefore I said in general terms what I now wish to repeat, that this report showed generally a very satisfactory condition of the meat-packing establishments in Canada. It pointed out that the conditions in Canada are very different from those in Chicago. We all know that the establishments in Chicago are of great size, that they are massed together in certain parts of that great city and are almost a city in themselves, that they are largely worked by foreign elements in the population, and that their methods have been very unsatisfactory as regards cleanliness, sanitation and the supervision of the products. In Canada, on the other hand, these establishments are scattered all over the country, and are in what I may call thoroughly sanitary and hygienic surroundings, with plenty of open space and air around them and abundant opportunities for disposing of their refuse, so that no such conditions would be likely to arise in Canada as have arisen in Chicago. I also found that most of these establishments in Canada are run by reputable firms, and that the owners look after the business themselves. They are not in the nature of a great trust, and the character and the reputation of the men in charge are in themselves almost a sufficient guarantee of the methods of their business. I also found from the report that the work people engaged in these establishments in Canada are of a very high class, most of them having worked for a long time in them, and therefore men of standing in the community as employees. I found also that in a general way the cleanliness and supervision of these establishments were all that could be desired. Here and there some little slackness existed in regard to sanitary convenience ; but the moment the attention of the proprietors was drawn to these slight deficiencies, a pledge was given that they would be remedied, and I know as a matter of fact that they have been remedied. Any criticism that could be levelled at any of these establishments was so slight that I can say with absolute confidence and truth that the state of our meat-packing establishments in this country is satisfactory, both as regards their surroundings and methods from a sanitary point of view, and as regards their products. Still, there was the fact that there had been no supervision or inspection of these establishments, with the result that there were some little delinquencies here and there. This in itself would be a sufficient reason perhaps for establishing a system of supervision and inspection; but there is another reason why a law of this kind should be not only put on the statute-book, but enforced. In consequence of the revelations in the United States, a great deal of attention has been directed by European governments and peoples to the character of the foods they are importing, not only from the United States, but from other parts of the world. We all know what a large proportion of her food England imports. Germany, France and Belgium also import very considerable quantities. This is not a new thing. Fifteen years ago Germany absolutely prohibited the importation of American meats. At that time some cases of disease in Germany were traced to the eating of pork affected by a minute insect called the trichina, and the laws and regulations of Germany as to the home production were made very severe. It was said, I am not prepared to say with what truth, that pork infected with trichina had been imported into Germany from the United States. The result was that Germany prohibited the importation of that article from the United States. The United States government felt that they could not permit that prohibition to continue, and they worked out a very elaborate machinery for the inspection and marking and ticketing of all animal products exported from the United States. I am not going into the details—I have them all in my department—as to the vast sums of money which the United States government spent on this inspection and as to the vast figure which that trade assumed—a figure which it could not have reached at all had it not been for their very thorough and careful supervision over the trade.

As a result of the recent excitement in the United States the Congress has passed a most drastic law going into every detail of inspection, supervision, and marking the meat products exported from that country. Since the Chicago revelations the governments of European countries have been investigating more closely than ever the character and sanitary condition of the food products imported. Communications have been directed to my department from England and other countries abroad asking what were the laws of Canada in regard to this matter. The British government sent an officer to the United States to report on whether it would be possible in future to buy United States canned and other foods for the supplies of the British service. Municipal organizations in England, the London county council and other similar bodies have passed very stringent regulations as to the supervision and sale of these foods to the consuming population. All this indicates that it is necessary for us to do all we possibly can to inspire the confidence of the markets of the old country in the articles which we export, for if we do not comply with the regulations in force in these markets we would be at a great disadvantage, especially in comparison with

our greatest competitor the United States. The United States has applied the provisions of the law regarding its export trade to all interstate trade. This affords an additional safeguard to the export trade because one of the difficulties of the law which applied only to the export trade was the suspicion that inferior articles intended for internal use might slip through and be exported to the discredit of the country exporting them. In view of the great precautions taken by the United States it behooves us to do at least as well as they have done. I do not think I need dwell further on the reasons for the introduction of this Bill. There already exist a couple of Canadian statutes bearing on this subject, one called the General Inspection Act (chap. 99 R. S. C.) which provides for inspection, but that law is voluntary and has never been carried into effect; it is of such a general character that it would not meet the necessities of the present case. We have also a law (chap. 105 R. S. C.) applying to goods sold and offered for sale in Canada alone. The provisions of this Act are brief and I intend to incorporate them in this Bill, with a more extended application. Those concerned in the canned goods trade in Canada seem to realize the importance of such a law as I now propose, and although it has been known to them that we purposed introducing a measure of this kind we have had no complaint; in fact they seem to welcome such a law.

It is intended that the provisions of this Bill shall apply to all canned food products. It will apply first of all to canned meats, and canned fruits and vegetables, and canned fish; it applies also to all meats not canned, such as bacon and ham, poultry meat, and sides or quarters of the larger animals. There are two main divisions of this Bill—although many of the sections apply generally. The provisions in regard to meats and canned meats are a little more drastic than are the provisions which apply only to fruits, and vegetables, and fish.

Mr. SPROULE. What if they put them up in any other form than in cans ?

Mr. FISHER. The words of the Act will cover cans or bottles or any similar package. The recent popular excitement has been chiefly directed to meats and canned meat, but I have received representations which lead me to believe it is quite important we should have a supervision over and inspection of other kinds of canned goods. As to the meats, the proposal is that we should have inspectors who should inspect the animal before it is killed, the meat before it is put up in the can, through all its processes to the final sealing of the can. Should there be any suspicion as to the contents of the cans we take power to have them inspected after they are sealed. The intention is that all such meats and canned meats shall be marked as having been inspected by the Canadian government inspector and that no goods of such character may be sold for export or interprovincial trade without that mark.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that include fish ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I will speak of that later. In regard to fruits and vegetables the canning is done in a large number of small establishments scattered all over the country and it would be very onerous to undertake specific inspection and marking of every can or package. We are therefore providing for the supervision and inspection of the canning establishments and we give power to our inspector to close these establishments if they are not sanitary, or if they are using any articles which are not fit for human consumption. We also provide that the label shall not in any way misrepresent the contents of the can, and that the name of the packer and probably the date of the packing shall be put on these packages in such a way that the canner shall be traceable and held responsible for the contents of the can. My reason for not undertaking to say that such can shall be marked by the inspector showing that it has been inspected is that there is such a large number of canneries engaged in that business, many of them small. It would be almost impossible—in fact, I think it would be quite impossible, in practice—for us to have the inspectors present in all the fruit and vegetable canning establishments in Canada so that they could say that they had actually seen the goods packed and they were all right. But, having these establishments open for inspection, having them regularly inspected as regards cleanliness and sanitary arrangements, and, in a general way fairly frequently inspected to see that the products they are using are in good order when they are put up, would, it seems to me, be sufficient to accomplish the object aimed at.

In regard to the fish, while I have not yet decided, and do not propose in the Bill which I shall introduce this afternoon if I can reach that point, to put it on the same basis as the meats, there is very fair ground for difference of opinion as to whether the fish should be classed with the meats instead of being classed with the fruit and vegetables. It is true there are a considerable number of fish canneries—considerably more than are devoted to the canning of meats—but I suppose there are not so many but that inspectors could be appointed to deal with them. It would be a question whether it is advisable and necessary. On the whole, I thought that provision for the inspection of canneries as to their cleanliness and sanitary condition, with as frequent inspection as possible of the fish they use for canning to see that it is in proper order when put up, together

with the marking of the cans—to show the nature of their contents—a heavy penalty being provided for a false description, and the name of the person who is responsible for their packing, as well, probably, as the date of packing, that this would be sufficient to accomplish the object with regard to these fish products. I say, however, that that is a question on which there may be some difference of opinion, so that I should be glad to be guided by the consensus of opinion on that subject.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Bill cover cheese and butter also?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In the investigation that the minister carried on did he find that the law in the United States required the date to be put on the cans? I did not know that that was required.

Mr. FISHER. It is not required under the United States law to which I have referred. But that law does not cover fruit and vegetables, it applies to meat products only. But I think, from the information I have been able to collect through the representations made to me from various quarters—largely, I confess, in the form of verbal communication from those in the business—and what I have observed of the expression of opinion of consumers in Canada, that opinion is to the effect that it would be advisable to have some supervision and inspection over the fruit and vegetable canners and their establishments as well as over the meat canners and their establishments.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask if the information that the hon. minister has obtained throughout the country is to the effect that goods kept in cans for say twelve months deteriorated seriously, or are they not practically in the same condition as when first canned ?

Mr. FISHER. The information that I have gained on that subject is very varied. I think that most of it is an expression of opinion merely. I do not think that I have been able to get at the facts. At the same time I found a rather general prevalence of feeling on the part of the people that they do not want to buy old canned goods. I am not prepared to say that that feeling is well founded. It may be that canned goods that are four or five years old are as good as those put up yesterday. I have no facts on which I can state anything with regard to that. But, as I say, I find a generally feeling prevalent amongst consumers against the purchase of old canned goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think I can answer the question. It is a great drawback to the canning industry to date the goods. In early years that was done. But it was found that the purchaser always wanted to buy new goods, although the goods five or six years old are just as good as the newly-packed if they are properly kept. My opinion is that a law making the dating of the goods compulsory would be a great drawback to the business. I think the minister is right in saying that the name of the article should appear. We all put that on now, and also the name of the packer. I would ask if it is the intention to have the goods inspected while in process of canning?

Mr. FISHER. The inspection of the process will be possible at all stages. The Bill gives the inspectors authority to enter at any time any establishment where canning goes on and to examine the goods at any stage of the process.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister mean that there will be actual inspection or only liability to inspection?

Mr. FISHER. I tried to explain that, as far as meats were concerned, there will be actual inspection. But as to the others there will be occasional inspection both as to the condition of the establishment and as to the quality of the goods. As to the meats, I am prepared to provide that they shall bear a mark showing that these goods have been inspected by Canadian government inspectors and approved. But in the case of fruits, vegetables and fish—assuming that it shall be ultimately decided to class fish with these others and not with the meats—the cans will not bear such a stamp, because that would mean that they could not be put out unless the inspector were present and saw the whole process. I want to make it clear that the intention is to treat canned meats a little differently from fruits, vegetables and fish. As I have said, the fish might be classed with the meat, but the proposition of the Bill is that they should be classed with fruits and vegetables for inspection purposes.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Is there any reason why the difference should be made between the fish and meats?

Mr. FISHER. I explained a few minutes ago that there were a much larger number of fish packing establishments than meat packing establishments. The provision of the Bill with regard to meats is that the inspector shall be practically present all the time in every packing house. If we were to do that in the case of all fish establishments in Canada it would increase the difficulty of administration and would add very considerably to the expense. I doubt —I have not decided upon the point, and ask the opinion of the House, and especially of such gentleman as my hon. friend from Vancouver City (Mr. Macpherson), who understand the conditions of the trade—that it is advisable to extend this inspection to fish. I am in doubt whether it is necessary to go to that extent, but if that is the consensus of opinion, then we shall

have to provide for it instead of classifying fish with the other goods as at present.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many inspectors will be necessary to look after this department ?

Mr. FISHER. I think perhaps two inspectors for every meat establishment. It would depend on how they are run. A large establishment such as that of Davis in Toronto, or of Laing in Montreal, which runs night and day, might require more than one man to look after it.

Mr. FOSTER. Who bears the cost of inspection ?

Mr. FISHER. I think that will be borne by the government. It is to be borne in mind that this Bill is introduced in the interests of the public at large, and not in the interest of the industry, although the industry also will benefit by it. The operation of the Bill will undoubtedly benefit the reputation of our goods abroad as well as at home, and these goods form a very important part of our export trade.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. How many establishments are now packing meat ?

Mr. FISHER. Without knowing exactly, I think between fifteen and twenty. Fruit and vegetable canneries are much more numerous. I think fish establishments also are much more numerous than meat canning establishments.

An hon. MEMBER. About sixty.

Mr. MARSHALL. How many inspectors will be required to inspect fruits and vegetables ?

Mr. FISHER. I will put on enough to carry out the provisions of the law.

Mr. MARSHALL. My company is operating some thirty factories, and I inspect these factories myself. I think two inspectors would be sufficient to inspect all the fruit and vegetable canneries, I may say, west of Montreal.

Mr. FISHER. That is a very satisfactory piece of information.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think the packers will be pleased to know that this Bill has been brought in. We are just as anxious as the public generally to have a rigid inspection made of canned goods. This is a move in the right direction.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that in the United States the question was considerably debated as to who should bear the cost of the inspection, whether the government or the canneries. Does the minister remember whether in the end the government or the industry bore the cost of inspection ?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman refers to one of the chief difficulties in the passage of the measure. President Roosevelt was very insistent that the industry should carry all the cost ; but the protest on the other side was so great, and the argument so strong that the question was finally decided in favour of making the government bear the cost. It was argued that the inspection was largely for the benefit of the public, of the consumers of canned goods, and would also benefit the export trade, and for these reasons the government decided to bear the cost. I may say to my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wm. Marshall) that I appreciate his remarks. My officers and myself have carefully studied this question, and we felt that the packers, both of meat and of fruit and vegetables, will be glad to see an Act of this kind passed, and we feel sure that we can count on their assistance and co-operation in enforcing it. This is new legislation in Canada, and though I have studied it a good deal along with my officers, I shall welcome the assistance of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in perfecting the details of this measure. I hope it will be thoroughly threshed out. A Bill of this kind cannot be made law without treading on toes of some people a little, without hampering some of the trade practices which have been in existence. But I am quite sure that the trade itself will realize that it is being benefited as well as the public, and that it will co-operate with us in enforcing the Act.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman—perhaps he has already given the information to the House—whether there has been any demand for this legislation, or any complaint against the canned goods, or the way they are packed. I ask this question because I believe they already had inspection laws in the United States when these scandals occurred last summer in regard to the meat factories. I have not heard anything against our own packing establishments. I am not aware of any demand having been made for this legislation.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was not here, or that he did not listen to the earlier remarks I made, because I gave the reasons why regulations seemed to be necessary. It is true that they had regulations in the United States before the scandals occurred in Chicago, but these regulations affected only the export trade. The investigation there disclosed a condition of affairs which is one reason why this Bill proposes to include interprovincial trade as well as export trade. It was said, and I think said truly, that while in Chicago the federal inspector looked very closely after the goods that were tagged or marked for export to foreign countries, a great deal of what they rejected and refused to mark for export was put upon the home market and that actually animals which the federal veterinary inspectors had examined either

before or after slaughter and had found to be diseased and which they had ordered to be destroyed and put into the rendering vat were cut up and put into cans or were made up into hams, sides, sausages and other things for the home market. The scandals in Chicago were of two different characters. One was due to the general filthiness of the whole establishment and of the methods and the low character of the employees which induced an unsanitary and disgusting condition of affairs in the yard and in the establishment as well. The other condition arose by reason of the use of diseased meat. The old laws before this present one were established in the United States in 1891 by reason of protests on the part of Germany against the importation of diseased pork into that country and there was actual prohibition of it at one time. As a result of that difficulty the United States passed most drastic laws and regulations in regard to their export trade, and the federal authorities were charged with the administration of those laws and regulations. But, it was the municipal and state authorities who were charged with the regulation and inspection of the home trade. The federal inspector might reject articles which the municipal or state authorities might pass. As a matter of fact the federal inspection was very efficient. I think that on the whole the federal inspection all through the United States, in Chicago as well as elsewhere, was very thorough and efficient. It was a most elaborate machinery and an enormous sum of money was spent every year upon it—I have the figures in my department ; I do not remember them at the present time—but it was all directed to the export trade, I suppose, because the laws were passed in consequence of the difficulty between the United States and Germany. They did not protect the home trade and as a matter of fact it rather hurt the home trade because, whether it was the carcase of an animal, some sausages, canned veal or canned chicken, articles which the federal inspector, under an efficient administration of the law, rejected might easily pass the slacker and less efficient inpection of the municipal or state authorities. The result was that the strict inspection of the export trade hurt the home trade and resulted in the people of the United States being supplied with articles which their own laws saved and protected Germany, England and France from having imposed upon them. That is one of the reasons why it is necessary for us in a Bill of this kind to make the law apply to the home trade as well as to the foreign trade. The new law in the United States does so apply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand you are doing that altogether.

Mr. FISHER. Not altogether.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You are applying it to the export trade and to interprovincial trade. Is the restriction to these particular features because of policy or doubt as to your power ?

Mr. FISHER. It is partly because of doubt as to our power. I think it would probably trench on the provincial and municipal authority in regard to sanitation. When we make it apply to interprovincial trade I do not think we are intrenching upon any prerogatives of the province. There is also another reason and that is that already in Canada there is a very considerable municipal inspection in cities in regard to the supply of their own people—an inspection of their own abattoirs, butcher shops and things of that kind which we do not want to undertake unless it is necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether or not the hon. minister has been advised by the law officers of the Crown that there is doubt as to his power to include this.

Mr. FISHER. I had a discussion with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) on this point and I think I am safe in saying that he approved of the provisions of the Bill and that he doubted the advisability, even if we had the power, of going any further. I would not like, offhand, to quote exactly what he said, but the Bill was drawn after a discussion with the Minister of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister will perhaps procure further information as to that and let us know later ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will not what he proposes tend to bring about the very evils that he says have arisen in the United States ? For example, if you have an inspection of meat products and you establish a high standard for that which must be exported or for that which must be sent to another province, is not the tendency of that to send inferior products into the market of each particular province ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there is no doubt of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, then, there might be a good deal of doubt as to the wisdom of the proposed legislation in that regard. The idea as a whole is a good one.

Mr. FISHER. In one regard what the hon. gentleman has pointed out is correct, but under this Bill the objection would not apply. We have a provision in the Bill that any article which is condemned by the inspector shall not be allowed to be sold but shall be destroyed under the supervision of the inspector under the regulations to be

promulgated by authority of this Bill. In the United States diseased meat which had been condemned for the export trade was used for the home trade under this Bill. All of this diseased meat will be destroyed and not allowed to be put into anything else. Also any establishment which our inspector has to deal with as being an establishment for the export trade will come wholly under the provisions of this Bill and will be under our inspection and authority because of the danger that there might be of substitution of one article for another. Therefore we would expect that any establishment which dealt with the export or interprovincial trade should be open in every part to our inspection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know very much about the practical conditions of the business. The hon. minister has no doubt investigated these. Is the interprovincial trade so absolutely distinct from trade within a province that you would find it possible to carry out what the hon. minister has suggested ? For example I suppose that a packer of canned meats sells to a wholesale merchant, is that the ordinary course of business ?

Mr. FISHER. Very often, not always.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the wholesale merchant may sell these goods for consumption in Ontario or he may send them to Quebec for consumption there. Are you not placing some restrictions upon the business when you require that he must buy a certain portion of these goods, if that is the idea, under conditions that he may not export them from the province but must sell them to persons for consumption within the province. The wholesale merchant who buys a quantity of these goods may want to sell them anywhere in Canada where he can find a market, and it would seem to me essential to the carrying out of his business that he should have that opportunity. But if the intention of the Bill is as I understand it, he will not be able to do that.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes, he can buy it for export or interprovincial trade and then he can sell where he likes. If he were to buy what was only intended for sale in the province he would be hampered, but I do not think that in practice any wholesale merchant would buy the goods except under conditions that he may sell them wherever he wants to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there is to be any practical difference between the two the difficulties to which I have alluded will arise. But if in the result a wholesale merchant must buy all his goods inspected to the standard of export or interprovincial trade there will be no difficulty ; otherwise there will be the very serious difficulty to which I have already alluded.

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt whatever that the wholesale merchant or any one buying in large quantities will buy goods up to export standard. The point is that the Bill is intended to cover the inspection of factories and not to extend to local butchers. In a city such as Ottawa there are many butchers. The city of Ottawa, I believe, provides certain rules and regulations for the slaughter houses. We do not want to do that for the city of Ottawa, and there are a number of other things in that way that relate to purely local trade. There is, however, a provision in the Bill that the minister may have authority under exceptional circumstances, where it seems to be necessary, to inspect what may be otherwise local establishments. I do not think that ought to be availed of frequently. I shall just instance one thing that was given to me as a possible reason for it. We have here Ottawa and the city of Hull just across the river. These two cities are in different provinces and there are slaughter houses and abattoirs in both cities. A slaughter house in Hull might be assumed to be operating solely for that province, but we might have a very shrewd suspicion that its products were being sent to Ottawa to be sold in another province. We take power under the draft Bill, if such suspicion arises and it is thought necessary in the interest of the general administration of the Bill, to take such an establishment as that under the operation of the Act. I point this out to show the reason for the limitation to export and interprovincial trade; it is due to the fact that these municipal authorities have their own regulations which are purely under provincial control and with which we do not want to interfere.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do I understand that this Bill is to be limited solely to interprovincial and export trade?

Mr. FISHER. To interprovincial and export trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The inspection applies to carcases of beef for example or of pork. The wholesale merchant buys these let us say, for sale, from the proprietor of the slaughter house, the abattoir. Is the inspection dependent upon the intention of the wholesale merchant to sell these outside the province or within the province?

Mr. FISHER. No, that would depend altogether on the nature of the establishment. As a matter of fact we know the establishments in the meat trade that are dealing in a large way in interprovincial or export trade; these establishments must come under the operation of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. May an establishment not be supplying both trades?

Mr. FISHER. Then it comes under the operation of the Act as regards the whole of its business. An establishment may be

purely local and then under ordinary circumstances we would not undertake to inspect it, but if at any time we thought there was any suspicion that the products were being sold other than locally we would inspect the establishment and we have authority under the Act to do so. If we inspected it at all, we would inspect the whole establishment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot understand how you are to tell whether or not the wholesale merchant will sell within the province or out of the province. He may not know himself, when he buys the goods, where he will sell them. He may buy intending to sell in Toronto but may receive a telegram from Montreal or Winnipeg which will induce him to sell in one of those cities. How are you to define in advance whether a purchase is for interprovincial trade or for home consumption? I wish to ask the minister whether the revelations in the United States on which he places emphasis as an inducement to pass this legislation have in any way or materially affected the Canadian trade? That is very important for us to know.

Mr. FISHER. In a certain way they have in the fact that in England there has been aroused a suspicion against all canned goods, and there is no doubt from the reports from the English markets that people there are buying fewer canned goods than they used to, and they lumped all canned goods together. In fact it is hard for an English consumer to know where they come from. That has limited to a certain extent our trade in England; it has limited seriously the American trade and the fact that the English people, in the first place the government and in the second place the municipalities there, have been inquiring from us as to what our laws were in regard to this trade, would show that they are seriously aroused upon this question. Resolutions have been passed by municipal councils and by various public bodies in England. I have the regulations which have been issued already in consequence of this feeling. Some English municipalities have adopted regulations by which they are going to restrict very materially the sale of canned goods in their municipalities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do the municipal regulations to which the minister has alluded relate to some inspection which is to take place under the municipal authority itself or do they relate to the necessity of inspection by the government of the country from which the product comes?

Mr. FISHER. Most of those I have seen relate to inspection on the spot by the municipality, but they do not all. The English government has been inquiring as to what are the regulations or laws in the countries from which the goods come, and we have had from our own agents in England other inquiries of a similar character. There were also inquiries from Switzerland and Germany as to what our laws were. Only the other day France intimated that they were going to prohibit the importation of meats from the United States because the law which passed Congress last summer does not provide for a miscroscopic inspection of meats. That was a mistake. The old law, which did provide for microscopic inspection, is still in existence, and I have no doubt the United States will satisfy France in regard to that. But that is an indication of the acuteness with which the laws in the different countries from which these different articles come are scanned. If we have good laws and good inspection here, the municipal inspectors will be much more likely to accept our goods, and not view them with the same suspicion that they do goods coming from a country which has no such inspection. In regard to the point alluded to by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) I am not prepared to give all the details as to the wholesale merchant's method of purchasing. I think that in the general course of trade the difficulty he points out could not arise, but I will endeavour to get definite information from my officers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the inspection apply to products put up in barrels ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I may say that the barrels are tight, not like apple barrels.

Mr. LALOR. I hope the minister will very seriously consider the question of requiring the label on each can to give the date of the packing of the goods. This would be a very serious hardship to dealers. It would not affect the canner, who usually ships the goods in the year in which they are packed ; but they are shipped to all parts of Canada, and the retail merchants have the goods on their shelves perhaps for several years. If the goods deteriorate with age, there would be some reason for that provision, but canned meats and vegetables are just as good when packed for a number of years as when they are first put up, and that requirement would cause very serious inconvenience to the dealers throughout the country. I quite agree with Mr. Marshall, the general agent of the Canadian canners, that they will back up the minister in this legislation. It is a step in the right direction, and I believe the canners will do all they can to facilitate the carrying out of the law. But, as a canner, I hope the minister will seriously consider the question of the date on the can. I think it would be a very great mistake.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that I have not undertaken to decide upon that point ; but what he says himself seems to me to rather indicate that the label would do no great harm. If canned goods are just as good four or five

years after they have been canned as they are at first, the fact that they were canned four or five years before they were purchased ought not to hurt their sale. I know there is a strong prejudice among the purchasing public against goods which they know to be old. Whether that prejudice has any foundation in fact I am not prepared to say; but I think there is a demand among the purchasing public for the date to be put on the can, and we will have to try to reconcile that with the interests of the retailers and the canners if they are disposed to object to it. I have thrown out the idea that that is one of the things which the public are asking for, and I am willing to be guided by the general consensus of opinion in the House in regard to the matter.

Mr. MONK. Since the Chicago revelations I have not myself very much confidence in canned meat even if it bears the stamp of government inspection, and I would like to ask the minister if he has made a calculation of what the administration of this law is going to cost us. I also asked him whether he had any formal demands for the enactment of a law of this kind, in the way of complaints from foreign countries or from within our own country in regard to canned fruits and canned meats packed in Canada. He said he had already given that information, but it seems to me that the committee is not yet fully informed upon that question. Have any public bodies, trading corporations or representative commercial bodies, asked for the enactment of a law which to my mind is going to cost us a great deal of money? My hon. friend has spoken of what has taken place in the United States. I do not know as to that. Probably congress, upon the representations made by Germany to which my hon. friend has referred, enacted a law regulating the trade in packed meats from the United States to foreign countries as well as the interstate trade. I do not think the jurisdiction of congress would go any further. I do not think it could regulate trade within a state.

Mr. FISHER. The old law did not regulate it within any state, but the present law does.

Mr. MONK. I do not exactly see the analogy. If we have jurisdiction on this subject, I do not see that we are confined to interprovincial trade, as congress in the United States is confined to interstate trade; and if we enact a law on this subject, I think it should apply to all trade in canned goods, whether it takes place from province to province or within a province or abroad. My own belief is that people will use canned goods coming from Canada upon their reputation, and not upon what may be marked upon them by a government inspector. In France, they will not take the canned goods of Canada or the United States on the faith of the inspection made by the country of production; they will be governed alone by their own inspection. I do not think the object of the inquiries from municipalities or commercial bodies in England was to obviate inspection when our goods reached that country. We are entitled to know before we can appreciate the necessity for such a law at the present time, what representations were made to the minister. An army of inspectors will be necessary to properly apply the law, its enforcement will be very costly, and before we commit the country to that expense we should know whether or not such legislation is absolutely necessary. The fact that gentlemen connected with the canned meat industry have proclaimed that they are quite ready for inspection shows in itself that there is no great necessity for that inspection. It seems to me that the reasons which the minister has given us to-day are not sufficient to warrant us in putting the country to the expense that will be entailed by the enactment of such a law.

Mr. FISHER. We have made an estimate of the cost of enforcing this law and while we cannot of course pretend to accurate knowledge until we have had some experience, yet we propose to ask for $60,000 for a year. I think that will cover it on the basis of our present trade, but of course if the trade developes largely it may require more. Speaking from memory, the export of the goods which will be affected by this law amounts to something over $20,000,000 annually, and the home trade is also a very large one. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) quite frankly that no board of trade in Canada has appealed to me for an Act of this kind. I do not think they have watched the trend of events as closely as we have been able to do, and probably their interest has not been stimulated by these same reports which naturally come to the department of government connected with the matter. I may instance that a well known pork packer informed me some little time ago that had there been a system of government inspecting and marking in Canada he would have been enabled to open up a large trade with Germany and Switzerland in Canadian bacon and hog products, but in the absence of inspection and marking he could not do so. This is one of the things which has drawn my attention to the necessity for such a law. As a matter of fact I may say that France did accept the United States marking. It appears that in the new Act of congress, passed last summer, there was no special reference to microscopic investigation, but there was such a provision in the old Act which is not repealed by the new one, and when France learned this she accepted the marking. Had this system not been satisfactory to the French authorities they would have ceased accepting the American market which they have

been doing for the past twelve or fourteen years. I want to say emphatically that in view of what has taken place in Chicago, if Canada does not provide some system of inspecting and marking her export meat products we will lose the trade in those products which we have to-day, and the United States will be the gainer. It may be that we will be forced in the future to do with regard to fruits, vegetables, and fish, what we now propose to do in regard to meats. If we are obliged in the course of events to take such a course I certainly would not hesitate to ask parliament to do so, because I think this trade is too important to be imperilled by any remissness on the part of government and parliament to provide the necessary machinery in this respect.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding the minister to say that an establishment carrying on business for the export or interprovincial trade cannot carry on the same business for home consumption? If that principle were applied to the fruit canning establishments it would materially circumscribe their operations, because I believe there are few factories in this country which will not as readily prepare goods for home consumption as for export.

Mr. FISHER. I do not for a moment suggest that we should forbid an establishment to cater for both trades; what I said was that if they did cater for the export or interprovincial trade their whole establishment would be subject to inspection.

Mr. SPROULE. And their whole product as well?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. It is gratifying to know from the minister that his reason for proposing this legislation is not the same reason which called for stringent inspection of meat products in the United States, because he tells us that his inspector has gone throughout the length and breadth of Canada and has not discovered anything like the conditions which were found in Chicago, but on the contrary that the Canadian canners carry on their business in a most satisfactory manner. We may congratulate ourselves that the reason for enacting this law is in order that our meat packers, our fruit and vegetable packers, and perhaps our fish packers, may foster their export business which is in danger on account of the revelations in the United States, and the possibility of the consumers in foreign markets confounding Canadian products with the products of the United States. Therefore, we must consider this Bill entirely from the standpoint of whether we are or are not justified in going that far. But what I rose particularly to ask the minister was as to the information which he says, came to him from the packers of fruit and vegetables to the effect that they were in favour of this legislation. I presume he has had representations made to him both by the meat packers and by the fruit and vegetable packers. He states, as I understand him, that he does not intend to have this legislation, so far as inspection is concerned, apply to the fish packers.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) misunderstood me.

Mr. KEMP. Well, perhaps the minister would explain that point. And, perhaps, also he would state what representations have been made by the packers.

Mr. FISHER. I have not had any representations made with regard to the fish packers. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) did not quite understand my explanation. This Bill has provisions under which every carcase or part of carcase and package of canned meat shall bear a stamp to say that it has been inspected by a Canadian government official. That means that we shall have an inspector in every establishment of that kind in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. Including fish canneries?

Mr. FISHER. No. I stated that that provision does not apply to fish. In grouping them, I have put the fish with the fruit and vegetables. This Bill will open the factories to inspection, both as to the factories, and as to the products found in them. But we do not propose to affix to every can of fruit, vegetables or fish the stamp indicating that that particular package has been inspected by a government official. I stated, that, so far as fruits and vegetables were concerned I approved of that. As to the fish, I said that it was open to debate whether the fish should be treated the same as the meat or the same as the fruit and vegetables. I think now I have explained the point fully.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I cannot quite see the reason for this line of demarkation between the fish and the meats. I speak on behalf of the salmon packers of British Columbia. Last summer after the unfavourable report had come from the city of Chicago regarding the canned goods there, all canned goods became a drug on the market in London. I am in a position to state that, for some weeks, positively there was not a case of salmon moving on the old country market. This was simply the reflex from the investigation that the Americans had carried on in Chicago. The old country people, if I may say so, shied at anything contained in a tin can. Now, so far as that is concerned there is no cleaner product on the market, no cleaner product on the shelves of the merchants of the world, than the canned salmon of British Columbia. But that must be made known to the public, particularly to consumers in the old country, who simply took it into their heads that canned salmon should be placed in the same category as canned meats. My opinion is that we

should give the consuming public the guarantee of the government upon each can of salmon just as upon canned meats. I would almost go further; for the principal industry of the province of British Columbia—one of the greatest provinces of the Dominion—is canned fish. We must do all we possibly can to prevent that industry receiving a black eye. Last summer during the trouble in the old country, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked that the fisheries commission which was then sitting in the west, should make a report to him so that that report could be sent to the old country and given as much publicity as possible, to convince the people that canned salmon is a clean product. The Fishery Commissioners made that inspection and their report, on being sent to the old country, had an excellent effect. The people of the old country have the idea—and I think we have it too—that when the government put their seal upon a product of that kind, that product must be right. I would urge upon the Minister of Agriculture the absolute necessity, in view of the concrete case I am giving, to put the fish canneries upon the same footing as the meat packing establishments in this respect. While the report of the Fishery Commissioners had a good effect, and while the sale of salmon started again, still, it has not been, and is not to-day, what it was. Our salmon—I mean the sockeye salmon which we pack for export—is all packed within the short period of six weeks. Moreover, the canneries are in groups. We have the Fraser river canneries, the Skeena river, the Naas, and Rivers Inlet. There are also canneries on the Island of Vancouver. All these could be inspected quite easily and cheaply for the short time during which the work of canning goes on. As showing the importance of sound legislation on this subject, I may say that last year, we sent from the province of British Columbia no less than $7,500,000 worth of canned salmon. Should this become a drug in the market, it can easily be seen that a blow is struck at the very roots of one of the strongest industries we have.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I desire to say a word in reply to the objections made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). That hon. gentleman seemed to doubt the practical utility of the Bill which the Minister of Agriculture proposed. The government bears a responsibility in this matter, and it has its own power of initiative; it should not await the demands of any special class of people before it takes action to give protection in relation to so important a subject as food products. It is wise for the government to introduce such a law as is now proposed, even though some details of its working may arouse objection. The first practical utility of this law is protection to the manufacturers. I am personally interested, as are my family in the packing business. This proposed law would be a great protection to the manufacturers. There are legitimate manufacturers, who find it exceedingly difficult to keep in line of competition, for, while they use first-class material, others use the refuse material from the butcher shops which they buy at one or two cents a pound.

I know there are some packing houses who use their strippings and sell them as meat at an original cost of six or seven cents a pound. Unscrupulous manufacturers utilize these butcher leavings destined for the refuse heap, and worth two cents a pound, and thus compete illegitimately with honourable packers who sell a genuine product at seven cents a pound. We have not so far had any cause for dissatisfaction in the operation of our pure food law. It seems to me that this law is a good one and we should not wait until the necessity for it has arisen, nor we should not wait for such scandals to occur as were disclosed in the packing houses of Chicago. Another objection was made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in regard to the microscopic examination which has been proposed on goods going into France. I must say that France is the most careful country in the world in the selection of its foods. I know, for instance, that some of our Canadian butter has difficulty in entering France on account of the close inspection to which it is subjected, and some of my friends in Montreal have been appointed by the French government to look after the packing of butter, and see that it is packed in accordance with the French law regarding foods. Where goods are subjected to the microscopic test there is no objection to their going into France. This legislation would be a reliable protection, not only to the consumer and to the manufacturer in Canada, but to the world at large, if this stamp was put in a prominent place on the box so that it could be easily seen by the purchaser. In the line of canned meats I know certain people who use decayed vegetables. That is done more often in making apple jelly. There is an inspection law in force, and on certain specified days inspectors are required to visit factories where apples are used. Some of which are not in a fit state for consumption. I know that sometimes notice is given by telephone of the approach of the inspectors to the factory, and decayed apples have been carried into a back room, and as soon as the inspectors have departed these apples are brought back and turned into apple jelly. There are other things to which I might call the attention of the minister. For instance, he might turn his attention to the colouring matter used in vegetables, such as beans and tomatoes, &c. Some colouring matters are used in these vegetables which, if they were analysed by the government, would certainly be found ob-

jectionable from a hygenic standpoint. The minister might also find that some reform was needed in the use of muriatic acid which is used for soldering cans. Sometimes this acid falls into the tin, and as it is a poison, it is the cause of the cases of poisoning of which we read after people have been eating canned goods. Through a defect in the soldering of the tin the acid penetrates and poisons the goods. I would say to the minister that if he wants to get a few pointers in regard to packing houses and the need of inspection he should read Thomas Lawson's book that has been published recently, somewhat on the same lines of the book entitled the 'Jungle, or the Mysteries of Packingtown.'

Mr. MONK. I am sorry my hon. friend from Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille) has not given me support in my demand for information. I take the position that before we pass a Bill of this kind we ought to have some clear proof that it is needed. I would like to hear from some of the gentlemen connected with the packing industry, some statement to the effect that the packers themselves desire this law, either for the promotion of their trade or for their own protection. If they have expressed a desire for such a law, I would look favourably upon the measure. But so far as we know there has been no representation made to the minister by the packers as a body in favour of this legislation. No commercial body has asked formally for it. Another point to which I have drawn the attention of the committee was that there has been no complaint in regard to our canned goods at all. We are here to pass laws that are asked for, that are required to cure some grievance or some evil. There is no evil at present in regard to our packed goods, and if what my hon. friend from Quebec county has said is true, even inspection does not prevent fraud, it did not in the States. The minister says that he expects to spend $60,000 this year under this law, and in view of the fact that there is no demand for it of any kind, I think that money might be spent in some more useful manner. He has spoken of $60,000. Well, for the first year he may get on with that amount, but my own impression is from experience that it will require more than twice that sum to carry out an effective inspection. It seems to me therefore that before the minister came to this House and asked us for this considerable amount, it was incumbent on him to show this legislation was demanded, that it was necessary in order to foster our trade. I do not think he has given any evidence of that.

My hon. friend from Quebec county has spoken of France. I must say that unless the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to show us clearly that in France where they are so particular, so minute in these matters, they have declared that they would accept American inspection of canned meats and absolutely do away with their own inspection I cannot accept any such statement. Everybody knows that the inspection of eatables—of alimentary articles—in France is carried on with extreme care, with great minuteness, and I do not think that there is any article, any canned meat, however it might be certified by foreign governments, that would escape inspection and careful analysis in France under any circumstances. Therefore, whatever our inspection may be here I assume that it will not save our packers from inspection of their products in foreign countries. Will it ensure the taking of our canned meats in preference to those of the United States? If it does, well and good, but the minister has given us no evidence of this. I do not offer these observations to the committee for the purpose of factious opposition. It is good legislation: I am in favour of it, but I have more experience than my hon. friend from Quebec county and I hear the tramp of the army of inspectors we will have to name—a very large army if we put through this legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) who has just sat down. I have an idea that this work can be done for $30,000. I am speaking more particularly of fruit and vegetables. We put up our pack in about eight weeks. It is not necessary to have men running through the country when the factories are not in operation. If I understand the hon. minister correctly the idea is to have the inspection going on during the process or while the goods are being packed. That will only last about eight weeks. When the hon. minister speaks of $60,000 as the estimated cost for one year he names a sum which is ample. I think that $30,000 will do. The vegetable factories are very close together and one man could inspect a number of them. I must say that this proposed legislation is a move in the right direction, provided the Bill is not made so severe that it will cripple us. That is the reason that I am anxious to see it before I say very much about it. The proposition in regard to the date on the label is one which may have very serious consequences. We are using labels which were printed two years ago. The date would not be on such labels. If you did not put it on the label you would have to put it on a special label which would add to the cost of the goods. For the reason mentioned by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) the retail men would be the men who would suffer. The buyer from him would want new goods packed last year. I still think that the move is a move in the right direction. It is not going to be an expensive one. While as a packer I realize that it will put us to some inconvenience, my idea is to try and improve the goods. This is a great industry and such

legislation as this will help some of the factories to get out of the sloppy way in which they are conducting their operations and which is certainly injuring their business.

Mr. STOCKTON. It seems to me that we cannot judge properly of the things that are proposed to be remedied by this Bill until we see it, but if I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) correctly the proposed legislation is more in favour of the foreigners and inhabitants of the provinces other than that in which the packing establishment is placed. If I understand correctly there are two branches of this subject, first, the promotion of the export trade in food products of this character, and, secondly, which is quite as important, the protection of the health of our people. If I understood the minister correctly the latter subject is entirely ignored and the health of our people in the province especially where the factory is located is entirely ignored or overlooked by the proposals which have been laid before the House.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) who has just sat down I would say that the reason of the application of the Bill being confined to the export and interprovincial trade was because of what I believe to be the constitutional difficulty of dealing with purely municipal matters in the different municipalities within a province. I also pointed out earlier that in addition to the actual constitutional difficulty there was not so great a necessity for extending the operation of the Bill to trade within the province as there might otherwise be, because common butcher shops in cities, as a general rule, are dealt with by municipalities themselves. They have full power to deal with them and do deal with them, but they cannot deal with the larger question that this Bill deals with. So far as the protection which we are not giving to the people of Canada, but which we are giving to the foreigners is concerned, I think that is more in theory than in fact. Most of the packing of the country is done in fairly large establishments. Nearly all of these establishments deal with interprovincial and export trade. If they do that, by the provisions of the Act, all their processes and all their establishments would be subject to the operation of the Act and there would be no part of their establishment set apart and withdrawn from the provisions of the Act in which they could provide food for the locality or the province in which they are situated. I would like to say a word in regard to what my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said. It seems to be very hard to persuade him of the necessity of this Act. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) has answered him pretty largely and I would also in so far as the fruit and vegetable canners are concerned, say to him that although I have not had any official representation on behalf of an organized body of vegetable and fruit canners, my gauging of their opinion was pretty correct. I got information informally from my officers and from various communications and meetings with people interested in the trade and what I have said has been fully confirmed by a gentleman who is so largely engaged in the trade and who is so thoroughly conversant with all those who are engaged in it as the hon. member for Elgin who sits just behind my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier and whose opinion probably he would be more willing to accept than mine. I would refer him also to my hon. friend from Vauconver (Mr. Macpherson) who speaks with authority as the representative of a constituency where a great deal of fish canning is carried on and where it is evident from that gentleman's remarks that the fish canners and the people who are concerned in that trade would be very glad indeed of a Bill of this kind being passed in parliament. Again, I think I have been able to fairly gauge the feeling of those engaged in the trade as well as that of the public at large without these official representations and demands which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier seems to think I ought to have before I undertook to propose any such legislation. I confess I am a little of the idea of my hon. friend from Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille) who says that the government would be rather remiss in their duty if they did not take time by the forelock and do things at this time as a matter of foresight and of guarding against difficulties in the future trade of our country.

It was only yesterday that my hon. friends on the other side of the House severely criticised us because we had not entered into the coal industry for the purpose of providing coal under exceptional circumstances in the west. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) I think used somewhat strong language in regard to the delinquencies of this government for not having risen to the necessities of a peculiar and incidental and purely temporary condition of affairs. Here is a condition which is not temporary, which is sure, as sure as that the sun rises after the night. If we do not do something of this kind the consequences will be serious as I have explained already but I shall reinforce what what I have said by one or two extracts from letters from our agents in England. Mr. Harrison Watson, of the Imperial Institute, London, had been visited by an official of the city of London, who wanted to find out what Canada was doing in the way of meat inspection, because their attention had been drawn to this subject, they had seen about the Chicago difficulties and wanted to know our system as they were preparing drastic regulations in the London market as to the inspection of all food products going into those markets from the outside.

It seems that the most pressing matter is in connection with the inspection of meat and what the officials particularly want to know is the nature of the Canadian government inspection and supervision over the hogs, bacon, hams, &c.

Mr. Harrison Watson was obliged to say that we had not any. He says further :

I mentioned in another letter that some Canadian bacon had been showing distinct signs of tuberculosis was recently seized and has attracted attention to the subject.

It is an unfortunate affair, we have not a report about it yet, but under our existing arrangements with our lack of inspection a side of bacon affected with tuberculosis could go forward to London and be discovered there and you can readily understand, I think even the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) can understand, what a black eye that occurrence would be to our Canadian trade, especially if it was practically impossible that anything of that kind could occur in bacon or ham from the United States. I have another letter here from a Glasgow firm who are large importers of Canadian food products. They write to one of my officers about inspection of meat in Glasgow.

If it is allowed to go on, it will stop the sale of Canadian meat in Glasgow and therefore the importations from Canada must cease, unless you are prepared to see to it that your meats are all carefully inspected, both ante-mortem and post-mortem.

That is what they think we have to do. These people are largely engaged in the Canadian food products trade and they are very anxious about their own trade, fearing that their trade will be stopped unless we do something.

We feel that the danger to Canadian trade is so great that it will injure us and Canada very seriously and we feel that our business is at stake.

Here is another communication of a similar character. This is from Mr. Harrison Watson again.

From our conversation——

That is, a conversation with the official of the London county council.

—I judge that the officials are under the impression that there is already in the Dominion a more systematic government inspection and control regarding packing houses than actually exists and it certainly would be to the advantage of Canadian trade that such matters should be placed on a thoroughly satisfactory basis. The official gave me to understand that as far as they had proceeded the examination of Canadian goods——

You see they are examining our goods and others going into the country.

—had yielded fairly favourable results, but he referred to one instance where a seizure had been made of Canadian bacon which revealed distinct signs of tuberculosis, and this was probably the reason for his asking for the nature of the inspection relating to hogs mentioned above. As a proof of the action which the Canadian authorities are taking in these matters, I showed him a copy of the report of the Inland Revenue Department (bulletin 125), on potted meats and Bologna sausages. This created a good impression, but the official pointed out that it did not contain any evidence of examination for the presence of bacteria.

There can be no doubt that the Australians and others are going to make a great effort to capture an increased share of the trade in meats, provisions, &c., and in order therefore for Canada to benefit it will be advantageous for Canadian packers to show that their methods are not only quite up to date, but thoroughly free from the blemishes which have been the cause of the severe censure passed on American methods.

There is another letter in which it was stated that the official said he was going to communicate with the High Commissioner for Canada and through him draw the attention of the government to the necessity of our providing some inspection here to prevent an absolute stoppage of our trade in these articles in Great Britain. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) would agree with me that even the slight danger of a stoppage of our trade in these articles with Great Britain would justify a much larger expenditure than that which I have indicated, even if my hon. friend is correct in his prognostication that it is going to cost double what I have said. I have stated what we have estimated the cost is likely to be. If the suggestion of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) was carried out and we undertook to apply to fish products the same inspection that we are imposing on meat products under our Bill, it would cost rather more; if we are going to apply the same inspection to the fruit and vegetable products it would cost still more. What I have suggested as being likely to cost $60,000 is such meat inspection as I have indicated and a less rigid inspection in regard to fish and vegetables. If the consensus of opinion of the House is that these latter articles should have the same inspection as is proposed for meat I would have to revise that figure and I wish to say frankly that I think it would be justifiable if the House wishes it to be done. But if it is done, I will have to ask for a larger sum of money. I feel very strongly that the matter is of such importance that any expenditure of this kind is justifiable to save and to safeguard the trade.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am not quite satisfied with the explanation my hon. friend (Mr Fisher) has given with respect to this Bill. If I understand him correctly the government would put its stamp of approval upon a side of bacon that would pass muster in London, Liverpool or Glasgow, but if the bacon would not pass it

would have to be consumed by a Canadian. I should think that we are no more proof against tuberculosis in Canada than they are on the other side and my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is looking at this question entirely from the dollars and cents side. I think the public health of this country is just as important as even the dollars and cents. I cannot understand my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) making the argument that a constitutional question arises in connection with this matter. I think that my hon. friend had better refer this matter to the Department of Justice to see if that constitutional question cannot be avoided so that we may not only have the inspection to protect the export trade of Canada to foreign countries, but that we may also have an inspection to protect the public health of the people of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) caught an explanation I made in regard to that a while ago in answer to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). If any carcase or package of this grade of goods is condemned by an inspector for export it will be destroyed and will not be allowed to be sold for any other purpose. In regard to the general remarks of my hon. friend, I will only accept them as an endorsement of the general principles of the Bill and a request that we should go even further than we propose to go, which would no doubt add somewhat to the cost of the administration and cause greater difficulties. I explained that already butcher shops and the smaller establishments in the city, which are to-day under municipal inspection and supervision, would then be brought under the operations of the Act, and that that was hardly necessary, as the present municipal inspection seemed to be fairly efficient.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman asked for suggestions from this side of the House in reference to the Bill which he purposes presenting. In the first place, I want to congratulate him on having come to my way of thinking; I will prove conclusively before I sit down that he has done so. My hon. friend from Elgin thinks this work can be done for $30,000. When he thinks that, it is if it were administered by a Conservative government. But when the Minister of Agriculture talks about from fifteen to twenty meat canning establishments being in operation to-day and requiring one or two inspectors for each, the $30,000 would be used in these factories alone; so that I think that before we get very far, we shall find that it will take $100,000 or $200,000 to put this law into operation. The suggestion I have to make to the hon. minister is to have an amendment made to the criminal code to cover this matter. We have on the statute-book to-day an Adulteration of Food Act, and the government under that Act are sending their inspectors around the country to get a great many samples of food products manufactured in Canada, and they find that about three-fourths of them are adulterated; but they do not go any further, but let the factories go on manufacturing these adulterated food stuffs, which are probably more injurious to health than the canned goods of the country. Why does the government not enforce that law? Let them have an amendment made to the criminal code providing that every article of food manufactured in Canada, whether it be spice, coffee or canned goods, shall bear the name of the maker, and if it is found to be deleterious to public health, he will be imprisoned for a number of years. If that is done, it will give Canada a reputation not only at home but abroad. The hon. gentleman talks about inspecting every side of bacon that is manufactured. Does he not know that a great many of the manufacturers of bacon do not kill the hogs themselves, but buy them from the farmers throughout the country? Under these circumstances how is the inspector going to tell whether a hog is sound and free from tuberculosis or not? Even if he were present when the hogs were killed, he probably would not be able to tell. But if you have an amendment to the criminal code providing that the manufacturer of bacon and hams shall be imprisoned for a term of years and have his business closed if his product is found to be injurious to health or has been manufactured from meat that is diseased, I do not think we shall have to spend $50,000 or $60,000, or any sum of money to have pure meats sold. In my opinion the hon. gentleman purposes appointing an army of inspectors, to have two at every meat factory, and others to run around to the canning factories and the butcher shops. We do not know how far this is going to extend; but if he will make an amendment to the criminal code, we can have the present machinery applied without any expense, and the people will immediately conform to the law and see that nothing is turned out of our factories that is not pure and good. Why does the government not enforce the law that we have on the statute-book to-day, administered by the Inland Revenue Department? That department is finding that all kinds of adulterated goods, even to spices, pepper, ginger, mustard and soda, are being sold to the people of this country; that adulterated breakfast foods are on every breakfast table, and sold in every grocery shop in Canada; and they never trace these goods back to the manufacturer, but let them go, and wink at the offence. Now, I wish to show how the hon. gentleman has come to my way of thinking. In 1886 I moved this resolution in this House:

> That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter.

I stated that I had secured the services of a Canadian then living in Chicago to go through the butter factories there and find how this oleomargarine was made :

A man in Chicago recently showed a 'Tribune' reporter what Chicago butter is made of. It was taken from a box branded 'Wauwatosa Dairy,' that weighed nine pounds, and cost $1.50, or 16⅔ cents per pound. It had a little pure butter in it, but nine-tenths of it was composed of lard, cracklings, pieces of intestines of hogs, short pieces of bristles and hairs, and pieces of pork. This man, S. H. Long, of 251 South Water street, stated that the men who made this bogus stuff didn't care what kind of offal they put into it. If a hog died of cholera, so much the better. They could buy the carcase cheap, and it would make just as much butter as a healthy carcase.

A Canadian friend of mine, who went through the Chicago butter factories corroborated every statement here. He said he saw hogs that had died in transit taken there and thrown into the vat—feet, hair, intestines and everything.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The tail ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The tail and all the scrapings of the slaughter house were put into the same vat, a pressure of heat was put on, and whatever fat was in it was forced out of it and manufactured into butter. It was to prohibit the importation of that stuff into Canada that I brought in this resolution. My hon. friend the present Minister of Agriculture sat on this side of the House and I sat on the other side. One of his colleagues spoke as follows in reference to this stuff :

I went to Chicago last fall buying supplies for my lumber camp. I had always bought butter, but on this occasion the dealer asked me why I did not buy this article, oleomargarine or butterine. I said I did not think it was fit for people to use, and he replied : You are entirely mistaken ; try it. I tried a sample. I tasted it and examined it, and I made up my mind it was equal to good, fair butter, and I bought a large supply for one of my lumber camps in Michigan. To tell you the truth of the matter, I had always taken in butter before, but the men always complained that the butter got strong, but since this particular occasion there has not been a single complaint against this oleomargarine. They have used it, and of course they did not know it was oleomargarine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JACKSON. So long as they did not know it, and so long as they thought it was good butter, and if it was not injurious to health, I do not see why they should not use it. My opinion is that the government, instead of putting an excise duty on the article, should reduce the excise so that it could be manufactured in this country. The general public cannot tell it from butter, and it can be used by the poorer classes.

Mr. LENNOX. Who said that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Jackson, then a member of the House. The present Minister of Agriculture spoke as follows :

Mr. Speaker, anxious as I am to see the agricultural interests, and especially the dairy interests, of the country carefully guarded—and I say this as representing one of the greatest dairy counties in this Dominion, the county, according to the last census, which made the second greatest amount of butter of any county in the Dominion—still I do not want to see the dairy interest guarded at the expense of any other interest in the Dominion. If any person chooses to put upon the market an article which is not hurtful in itself, and which is properly stamped and shown to be such an article, if it does compete with the producers of butter it will be merely an extra stimulus to them to make a better article with which this spurious article cannot compete. But I do not believe it would be right or wise for this parliament absolutely to prevent all the people in this country from producing an article which in itself is not hurtful, and which, at the same time, would be stamped so as to show its true nature.

Further on he said :

But if these articles are consumed so that the public know what they are buying and if the oleomargarine or butterine——

Such as I have described as having been made out of these dead hogs and bristles and scrapings of the floor——

—if they are composed of materials which are not injurious to the health of the consumer, I do not see why the production of these articles should be forbidden in this country.

In those days the Minister of Agriculture did not care if the people of Canada were fed on oleomargarine ; to-day he does not care what the people of Canada are fed upon but he says : we must export a pure article to foreign countries. If the minister will accept the suggestion I have made and amend the Criminal Code so as to make it a criminal offence for any man to produce any impure food product under the penalty of imprisonment, then we will have purer goods going to foreign countries and purer goods sold in Canada than we will have under this Bill with its army of officials.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has interjected such an argument into this discussion. I know his sentiments towards me personally and towards the government, and I know he can never get away from the political venom which largely animates him and and which has characterized him during the years he has had a seat on that side of the House. I sometimes hope that the tremulous emotion which affects his voice when he addresses this House comes from a kindly heart, but when I hear his words I only recognize the venom that possesses his whole soul when he talks politics, and I cannot think it anything but ludicrous instead of effective. The hon. gentleman has suggested an amendment to the Criminal Code, but he evidently has not considered the case because such an amendment would

not provide in any way for the condition of things which it is proposed to meet by this measure. He knows perfectly well there are Acts of a similar character to this on the statute-book, and were it not for his desire to propose something different from what the government proposes—it matters not what the government proposes or how good a measure it may be he always has something else to substitute—he would not make such a ridiculous proposition. I am glad to recognize that on the other side of the House with the single exception of the hon. gentleman—from whom I confess I never expect anything better—this Bill has received fair treatment and has not been assailed with that kind of political tactics which the hon. member for Leeds does not seem to be able to get away from in his conduct in this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I must point out to the Minister of Agriculture that there are others than the hon. member for Leeds who do not agree with the minister in this matter, and who think that he should treat such a question a little more seriously. To accuse an hon. member of this House of political venom is no answer to the sound objections made to this Bill or to the criticism of the minister for his manner of introducing it. I protest against the way in which the Minister of Agriculture has dealt with the very sound objection advanced by the hon. member for Leeds. The Minister of Agriculture seems to think that no matter how serious the subject may be before the House, all he has to do to strengthen his position, is to accuse some member on this side of political venom because he exercises his right of criticism. The minister has been pretty well treated by members on this side of the House who when they thought he was right were manly enough to say so. But that is no reason why the Minister of Agriculture should accuse a fellow member of political venom, who undertakes to show the weakness of the proposition which he submits to the House. The Minister of Agriculture should apologize to the members on this side of the House who have assisted him to-day in putting this Bill of his into shape. I do not know whether he would call their remarks political venom or oleomargarine, or good butter, but whether or not he should treat the gentlemen on this side with proper courtesy. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Stockton) raised a very important point in regard to the result of this legislation, but the Minister of Agriculture took good care to skate wide of it and to give no answer. But if a member on this side of the House does not swallow holus bolus every proposition which the Minister of Agriculture submits to parliament, then he is to be personally attacked by that hon. gentleman. Well, at the risk of being found fault with by the minister, I am going to say that the objection taken by the member for St. John is a very serious one. I am as anxious as any one in this House can be that Canadian exports shall bear the stamp of verity and that they shall be sound and perfect, but at the same time I am anxious that the legislation which we pass in this House should secure for our own Canadian fellow citizens food products of the very best kind also. Now, as a result of this legislation, if any manufacturer should make goods that he believes will not pass the inspection for export the chances are that these goods will be dumped on the Canadian market and the choice goods will be sent to the consumers in foreign countries. Of the two propositions—and I am not wedded to either—I must say that the proposition of the hon. gentleman from Leeds to make it a criminal offence to put up for sale goods not fit for human food, is a better proposition than that of the minister which protects the consumer in the foreign market, and which gives no protection whatever to the consumer at home. And, if we are going to begin to protect anybody, I think we had better begin at home and protect the Canadian citizens first, or, at all events, not ignore their health and their rights.

Mr. GANONG. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had an admirable chance this afternoon to be honest with himself, with this House and with the country. When the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) placed before him some of his former utterances he might at least have said: These are simply in line with my former principles and my former promises. At one time I was a free trader; behold me now with the present tariff: At one time I was a prohibitionist; behold me now;—and so in regard to every suggestion.

I desire to refer briefly to some remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) referring to the fish canning industry. He did not suggest at all that this Bill was desirable on account of poor salmon having been packed in British Columbia. So far as I know there has been no complaint of that kind. His idea, if I understood him, rather was that the government inspection would be a guarantee to the foreign market that the fish were in proper condition. But the fisheries along the British Columbia coast and those along the Atlantic sea-board are not at all in a similar position as regards the possibility of inspection. The great canning industry in British Columbia, which is principally salmon canning, is largely in the hands of about twelve or fifteen concerns—and I am not too sure that they are not in combination; efforts have been made to that end. So, these are quite large establishments, and an inspector could be kept busy in each cannery. But, on the Atlantic sea-board, we have a different condition. In my own county there are probably ten

institutions that do more or less canning. And these canneries are right in line with the ideal set forth by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his public addresses in 1897. We all remember that he deprecated having large factories but upheld as ideal these little cross road concerns. I think there are some people in my county who, perhaps, do not can over one hundred cases of sardines a year. There has been no complaint with regard to these goods. We have three canneries canning lobsters. And my hon. friends from the north shore of New Brunswick, from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island know that along these coasts there are probably a hundred canneries. What good would an expenditure of $60,000 do in the inspection of that number? We have canneries enough along these coasts to call for an expenditure of $200,000 if they are to be inspected in any true sense of the word. My contention is that, so far as the fish business of the Atlantic coast is concerned there is no reason to put the fishermen to this trouble or the county to the expense in this matter. There is no claim in regard to canned lobsters that they are not good, and the same is true with regard to the other fish that we can, including haddie, clams and sardines. This $60,000 that the minister proposes would not go very far in the inspection of our canneries. One inspector would not be enough in a county like mine because the canneries are so widely scattered. It would be impossible for an inspector to cover Deer Island, Campobello, White Head and Grand Manan, and do very much work of inspection. In fact, it seems to me that, if the minister intends to do this work well, he will need a school to educate these inspectors. He may possibly be able to use the same men to inspect in turn, fish canneries, meat packing establishments and fruit establishments. I should have very strong objection to the Bill if it is made applicable to the fish canning business, for I think it would be objectionable to the canners along the Atlantic sea-board however desirable it may be to those along the Pacific coast. I believe it would involve very great cost to the country and that the country would get no commensurate return.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). Would the minister please tell us what guarantee the stamp of the government upon these cans will carry with it? As I understand it, each can will be stamped to indicate that the product has been inspected by a government official. Suppose that, in a shipment of these goods to the old country, either through connivance or otherwise, there has been no proper inspection, and, when put on the British market the goods are thrown back on the hands of the seller will the government assume responsibility?

Mr. FISHER. That would not be expected in a case of this kind. The mark is a guarantee that the government has done its best to inspect the goods and to make sure that they are of proper quality, but nothing more than that.

Mr. BARR. If the inspection for the foreign market and the home market are to be different, will there be different stamps for each?

Mr. FISHER. There will be only one government stamp.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister intend to bring under the operation of this proposed law, frozen meats or frozen fish put up in this country by foreigners and intended for export? What I have particularly in mind is the exportation of fish by Americans operating in Canada. Last summer, I am told, hundreds of tons of fish, a large proportion of it from as far west as Lake Winnipeg, went through Canada to the United States, the export being carried on by American firms. I know that this business is carried on extensively on the great lakes. The fish are put in ice, and shipped out of the country, but the fisheries are carried on by Americans and the supply is intended for that country. Would this inspection apply to frozen meats sent out in that way?

Mr. FISHER. I take it that the law would apply to anybody in Canada putting up a certain class of goods, no matter whether he was a Canadian, an American, a German, or of any other nationality. As to frozen fish, the Bill does not contemplate dealing with that. It deals with meat.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not fish meat?

Mr. FISHER. Not as interpreted under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid the minister has been as unfortunate in his classification as Mark Twain, who said that they put ham and eggs together because they were twin brothers though they came from different localities. The Minister says that fish is not meat. But if it is not meat, I do not know what it is.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 33) to provide for the further supervision and inspection of Canned Food Products, Meats and Fish.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ontario). Before you leave the Chair, I would like once more to bring to the attention of the government the position of the Department of Public Works. It is I think more than three weeks since the Prime Minister informed the House that the resignation of the Minister of Public Works had been placed in his hands, but that he had withheld that resignation from His Excellency for reasons which seemed good to him; also, that he had sent a communication to the minister who is absent, to which, at that time, he had received no reply. So far as the minister's absence may be induced by illness, I have not heard any official announcement in the House, although it has been rumoured privately that he was not in very good health. I do not make any comment upon his absence, if it has been induced through illness, but I wish to comment on the fact that we are continuing day after day without any official action being taken to fill the vacancy. The Department of Public Works is an important one, it is one which, under the constitution, should be filled by a minister responsible for that department. At the present time there is apparently no minister in charge of the department save my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, upon whom, for the time being, the duties attendant upon that department have been apparently imposed. We are also somewhat in the dark with respect to the status of the Minister of Public Works as a member of this House. We do not know whether any further communication has been received from him in regard to his resignation; I assume not, because otherwise no doubt his honour the Speaker would have communicated that fact to the House. I think the situation should be cleared up a little, and that the Prime Minister should announce to us whether he has received any communication from Mr. Hyman, and what that communication is, and how long he proposes to hold the resignation in abeyance. If a situation of that kind can occur with respect to one minister of the Crown it can occur with respect to more than one, and we might eventually have the government of this country carried on with half a dozen portfolios vacant for the reason that the Prime Minister did not think it convenient or expedient to submit resignations to His Excellency the Governor General. Mr. Hyman, by the resignation which he has handed to the Prime Minister, has divested himself, of responsibility for the administration of the Department of Public Works. Until that resignation has been acted upon I suppose that in one sense at least he is constitutionally responsible, although he is not in any way attempting to discharge the duties of the department and has absented himself from the House for reasons which I have mentioned. That is one matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the government, and as to which I would like some statement from the Prime Minister.

There is another matter to which I have already alluded. I mentioned it in the debate upon the address, but the Prime Minister said at that time not one word with regard to it. He said he would deal with the serious portions of my remarks but not with those which he did not regard as serious. One matter which I brought to his attention was the circumstance that for about nine months there has been a vacancy upon the bench of the Supreme Court of- Nova Scotia. A question was placed upon the order paper with regard to that, and on the 28th of November the question was asked :

On what date was the Hon. D. C. Fraser appointed lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia ?

To which the Minister of Justice replied that he was appointed on the 27th of March, 1906. I asked :

What is the reason for the delay in filling the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, occasioned by the appointment of Mr. Fraser to the lieutenant governorship?

The answer given by the Minister of Justice was as follows :

The appointment of a successor to the position on the bench previously filled by Mr. Fraser is still under consideration.

That, I may observe, does not seem to be any answer to the question. The question I asked, and to which I think the House has a right to be informed, was as to the reason of a delay for some nine months in filling the vacancy when there are gentlemen at the bar of Nova Scotia perfectly well able by their experience and their legal ability to discharge the duties of a judge of that court with eminent satisfaction to the public. The third question which I asked was :

When will the vacancy be filled ?

To which the Minister of Justice gave no reply other than this :

I deem myself safe in saying that the administration of justice in the province has not suffered in the meantime. No complaint in that behalf has been made, and notwithstanding the vacancy, there are six active judges of the Supreme Court of the province discharging all the duties of the court.

If that is a good answer for a delay of nine months, it might be almost as good an answer for a delay of nine years. It does not seem to me to be any answer at all, and it is rather trifling with this House and with the country to give a reply of that kind to what I considered a very proper question. I am not so sure that the administration of justice in Nova Scotia has

not been interfered with to some extent by this vacancy. I have been told by reputable members of the bar of Nova Scotia holding a high position, that the vacancy has been alluded to on more than one occasion from the bench of Nova Scotia within the last three or four months, and that delays which have taken place in the administration of justice in that province have been stated to be occasioned by the fact that the bench is composed at present of six judges instead of seven. Notably my attention has been called to one case when the chief justice of that province dismissed the grand jury for several days for the reason that he was otherwise engaged, and the statement he gave as a reason for the necessity of doing so was that the bench of Nova Scotia was without the services of the additional judge. Under these circumstances it seems to me that some explanation should be given of the reasons which have induced the government to keep this office vacant for so long. The Minister of Justice alluded in the House not long ago to certain rumours which appeared in the press with regard to a judgeship in the province of British Columbia. I am not disposed to discuss that matter now, but I may say that it is long delays of this kind, in some instances at least, attended with intrigues, that have created suspicions in the minds of the people. It is most unfortunate that these suspicions should arise, or that any such rumours should prevail as those which apparently have been current in the western part of this country.

Then there is one other matter to which I would like to allude, and that is the fact that during many months the office of Solicitor General has been vacant, and we have no explanations from the government as to the causes which have led to that result. Why is it that this office, recognized by the constitution, constituted by a statute of Canada many years ago, remains vacant and that the government have not the slightest excuse or reason to afford to the House up to the present time for that condition of affairs beyond the laughing excuse of the Prime Minister, suggested by myself, that there is such an abundance of material on the other side of the House that he is unable to make a choice. I do not think that a statement of that kind, while it may serve for the moment, is one which should be called upon to serve for any great length of time. If that office is not necessary, if we can go on month after month and perhaps year after year without filling it, then, it is desirable that the office should be abolished, that it should not be made use of for purposes of political expediency and that parliament should have no excuse offered for this delay in filling an important branch of the public service. I think the House is entitled to some statement from the Prime Minister in regard to the matters that I have just now mentioned.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER I will very cheerfully comply with the requests of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) as to the different matters to which he has called my attention. As to the first, which is by far the most important, I am sorry to say that I have no information to give to my hon. friend to-day in regard to Mr. Hyman. At the opening of this session some three weeks ago you, Mr. Speaker, informed the House that you had received the resignation of Mr. Hyman as a member of this House. The reasons why Mr. Hyman thought it advisable to offer his resignation are well known. Since there had been aspersions as to the manner in which he had been elected in the last election in London he thought it due to himself not to retain any longer a seat which might have been tainted with corruption. As far as that is concerned, for my part, I think the action of Mr. Hyman was reasonable and satisfactory. The reason that no action has been taken on the resignation is that unfortunately Mr. Hyman had not complied with the condition of the statute, as I understand, he had not taken the precaution of having his signature attested by two members of parliament. At the same time that Mr. Hyman offered his resignation as a member of the House he also placed his resignation in my hands as a member of the cabinet. I informed the House then that while I thought the reasons which had induced Mr. Hyman to resign his seat were quite adequate the same reasons did not exist why he should resign as a member of the cabinet. Unfortunately it is a matter of notoriety that Mr. Hyman had to leave the country and go south to another climate in consequence of the condition of his health. I am sorry to have to say that Mr. Hyman is in a very poor condition of health, so poor that I know that the letter which I wrote to him asking to withdraw his resignation and allow me not to place it in the hands of His Excellency has not yet reached him. His physician has given absolute orders that he should receive no communications whatever, that he should be absolutely free from all kinds of trouble and not be allowed to transact any kind of business and that is the reason why up to the present time I am not able to give my hon. friend the information he now seeks. I am sure that when my hon. friend and hon. members of the House know that Mr. Hyman is in such a condition of health that he is not permitted by his physician to attend to any kind of business they will find no fault that no further action has been taken upon the resignation which he intended to have accepted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this is the first we have learned of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not say that it is the first time but it has been more or less a matter of notoriety. I simply confirm the fact that up to the present time my letter addressed to Mr. Hyman has not yet been placed in his hands.

In regard to the other matter—the delay in appointing a judge to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia—my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) stated some time ago when he was questioned upon the subject that in so far as he knew the administration of justice had not suffered. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) gives new information. He has reason to believe that the administration is suffering and that it therefore becomes imperative upon the government to attend to this duty. If so the Minister of Justice will take note of what my hon. friend has said in reference to it.

In regard to another matter—the appointment of a Solicitor General—I do not think, with all due deference to my hon. friend, that there has been any undue delay in filling that office. My hon. friend says that it is an important one. I agree with him that it is an important one. The vacancy has been created by the fact that the Minister of Justice was appointed to the bench and the Postmaster General was elevated to a seat in the cabinet. That was, if I remember aright, some time early in the summer. We were very much absorbed at that time by the duties of the session which at last came to an end. After the session had come to end we scarcely had a breathing spell when we had to be summoned here again in order to attend to grave and important duties. Although I do not take a very important part myself in those duties which chiefly engage the cabinet, still I have to give them some attention. I have been very much engaged in revising the tariff. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has had more to do with that than I have, but in my humble way I have also to keep an eye upon that. We are in the very throes of an important session and I have had no time to give to the important duty of filling the office of Solicitor General. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will accept this as a good excuse, but as soon as we have accomplished one thing we will attend to the other. One thing at a time is a good motto. As soon as we have disposed of one matter there will be no delay in taking up others of which my hon. friend has spoken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can assure my hon. friend that if he had worked at the Solicitor Generalship instead of at his intermediate tariff perhaps he would have accomplished more.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On resolution 5, subsection b:

That the Governor in Council may by order in council—

(b) withdraw the benefit of the British preferential tariff from any British country (other than the United Kingdom) which has received the same, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the general tariff or the intermediate tariff, as mentioned in the said order, shall apply to goods the produce of manufacture of such British country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to call attention to a distinction we draw there between Great Britain and other portions of the empire. We assume that Great Britain, being practically a free trade country, there is no likelihood of any condition arising that would call for our withdrawing this preference, and if such a condition should arise it would be a matter of sufficient importance for us to come to the House and submit it to the House, but as respects the colonies such conditions might arise, by the changing of their own tariffs and therefore we take the power to withdraw the preference from any colony, but not from Great Britain herself; that is a matter for which we would have to come to parliament.

That the Governor in Council may by order in council—

(c) from time to time, in consideration of benefits satisfactory to the Governor in Council, extend the benefit of the intermediate tariff, in whole or in part, to any British or foreign country the produce or manufacture of which have previously been subject to the rates of customs duties set forth in the general tariff, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the rates of duty set forth in the intermediate tariff, so far as they are mentioned in the said order, shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British or foreign country, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions.

Mr. SPROULE. It always seemed to me that if the government could not put in force the preference tariff with one country without incurring the displeasure of some other country and bringing about the result of compelling Great Britain to denounce her treaties, that there is no reason why they should introduce this tariff. I do not understand why they could put in force this tariff any more than the other tariff, and why it would not be as much a violation of that favoured nation clause with reference to any other country as the old one was, I cannot understand. I look upon that whole thing as an effort on the part of the government to gold brick the country, and make the peo-

ple believe they are going to do something wonderful in the interest of the trade of the country, when in reality they cannot say when or where or to what countries this would apply or whether it can ever be put in force or not. There is nothing definite about it whatever, and if that be the case, if there is nothing known with certainty, is it wise to run the risk of disturbing the business of the country by a declaration of that kind and unsettling business by that very uncertainty. It seems to me to be an attempt to lead the people to believe that they are providing something that can be taken advantage of at any time to extend the trade of Canada with other countries in return for substantial benefits; but when we come to ask them to what countries it is to be applied the invariable answer comes: We do not know. If my hon. friend cannot give more information to the House and to the country it seems to me it is very unwise to introduce the system because it must inevitably tend to disturb the business conditions and render people suspicious that there may come sudden changes which would affect them very seriously and in the meantime will prevent those carrying on the trade of the country from launching out as they would if there was greater stability with reference to the tariff for the future.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember whether my hon friend (Mr. Sproule) was here on the last occasion when this was up, when we had a full discussion covering all this ground. I cannot hope to give any better explanation than I then gave. There is certainly something new in this, inasmuch as we have not hitherto had any such tariff column, but there is nothing very wonderful about it, and if the people think there is anything wonderful about it they will have to learn it from my hon. friend. Nothing has been said on this side that would give such an impression; it is a simple business-like proposition which we are desirous of applying when we are able to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister cannot say how far or where, or whether at all or not.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I cannot tell hon. gentlemen anything but the facts of the case. I pointed out fully the embarrassments created by favoured nation treaties. I have no doubt we could arrange at an early day to bring some one country, I do not for the moment care to say which one, within the operation of that tariff, but inasmuch as we would by so doing have to extend it at once to a number of other countries, without any benefit to ourselves in return, we think it wise to leave it as a basis of negotiations, as an intimation to other countries of the limits within which parliament is willing to give us power to make a reduction of our tariff. All these are reductions; parliament asked to give power to make reductions only within limits, not to make increases. Parliament says that for reasons that may be satisfactory to the Governor in Council, reasons supposed to be connected with the advancement of Canadian interests generally, if such conditions seem to arise, the government can reduce on any given article the tariff to the limits of the intermediate tariff and no more. I do not think there is anything in that which is very dangerous or anything which is revolutionary; we do not pretend there is anything wonderful.

Mr. SPROULE It is because I happend to be present and listened to all the explanations the minister gave that I made the observations I have made.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid my hon. friend's case is hopeless.

Mr. SPROULE. Because there did not seem to be anything in the situation which would justify this departure from well-known tariff lines. In 1897 the present minister was warned over and over again by Sir Charles Tupper that the putting of that tariff into force would inevitably create difficulty and trouble. He contended as vigorously then, more vigorously than he does to-night, because he does not contend to-night that they are absolutely sure of their ground—

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes, I do.

Mr. SPROULE. He was then absolutely sure, yet notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding his statements that he understood the situation, we were confronted with the danger in a short time and we destroyed our trade with one of the most important countries with which we could have trade relations to-day just because of that. If that tariff could not be put in force without creating that danger, is there any more reason for believing that this tariff can be put in force without creating the same danger? I do not think there is, and I have not heard anything from the hon. Minister of Finance to justify any other conclusion. Is it not, then, the part of unwisdom to keep tampering with something which there is no certainty about, but which, if put into operation, may destroy our trade to a much greater extent than we can derive any benefits from so doing?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken when he assumes that anything we did in 1897 operated to the disadvantage of Canada. All that was done at that time was done undoubtedly in the best interests of Canada. That which my hon. friend says we were warned against as a most difficult and dangerous affair was the instrument whereby we brought about the denunciation of the Belgian and the German treaties.

Mr. SPROULE. What good did that do to Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. If it did not do any good to Canada, why did my hon. friend year after year vote in this House for resolutions asking for the denunciation of those treaties?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not remember any such resolution ever being proposed in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. The government of that time, of which my hon. friend was a zealous supporter, were arranging for that very thing at the colonial conference which assembled here in Ottawa. He knows that a resolution was passed at that conference asking the British government to put an end to the German and Belgian treaties, and every colonial conference and colonial government sought the same thing. But it all came to naught, and nothing was done in that direction until this government took the step which my hon. friend says was a troublesome and dangerous one. There was no trouble. There was a doubt which we, as the representatives and advocates of Canada, were bound to give Canada the benefit of. There was some room for argument. Able men held that those treaties did not apply to Canada. If there was a doubt on the subject at all, it was the business of the Canadian government to claim the benefit of that doubt, and to put forward the best argument possible in support of the contention that those treaties did not and should not apply to Canada, and one of our ministers went to England to uphold that view. When the imperial government came to the conclusion that that was not the right view to be taken, we of course were bound to submit; but did it follow that it was not our duty to put up the best case we could for Canada? Then what followed? The British government said to us: Your contention is not sound; we have to hold that these German and Belgian treaties do apply to Canada, and that you are bound while these treaties last to give the German zollverien and Belgium not only favoured nation treatment, but the best treatment you give to the mother country. But while the British government took that ground as a matter of law and treaty obligation to foreign powers—and I need not say that the British government in all transactions of that nature do give a pretty generous interpretation to Great Britain's treaties with foreign powers—they realized that, Canada having taken the step she did, and having given a preference which was at that moment actually in operation to the products of Great Britain, they could no longer resist the movement which they had resisted so successfully for many years. At the same time that they gave us notice that we would be obliged for the time being to recognize those treaties as binding upon Canada, they gave notice to Germany and Belgium that at a date mentioned those treaties should cease to exist, and they did cease to exist. And by that Act of 1897, which the hon. gentleman misunderstands, we accomplished what the whole empire has regarded as a great step for the colonies to take, enabling them as it did for the first time to establish preferential trade relations between themselves and the mother country.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I have quite as clear a conception of that Act as the hon. Minister of Finance. He addressed a somewhat similar argument to Sir Charles Tupper, who warned him as to what would happen if he persisted in the course he was taking. Sir Charles Tupper, in the judgment of the Minister of Finance, like myself, was so dense that he did not understand the question; and when the Finance Minister said, we have made this offer, and every country in the world that desires to do so can take advantage of it, and declared that there was no possibility of the construction being put upon it which Sir Charles Tupper claimed would be put upon it, he was as positive and emphatic as he is to-night. Notwithstanding that, a very short time served to show that it was the Finance Minister and not Sir Charles Tupper who was so dense that he could not understand it. The hon. Minister of Finance has made the statement that several times I voted for resolutions in this House asking the British government to denounce those treaties. I have no recollection of any such resolution being voted on in this House, and I will ask the hon. minister to tell me where they are.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps I should qualify that statement. I was speaking generally of the record of the Conservative party as manifested from time to time in seeking the denunciation of these treaties. It may be that no direct vote was taken upon the subject in the House. It may be that the matter was so generally accepted that there was no necessity of taking a vote upon it. But I repeat that at more than one colonial conference, certainly at the one held in Ottawa, a resolution was passed asking that the German and Belgian treaties be denounced. It is a matter of public notoriety that for many years the advocates of preferential trade in this country and in other colonies found their hands tied by those treaties, which Lord Salisbury described as 'those unlucky treaties.' It was the desire of the Canadian government, with the approval, I am quite sure, of my hon. friend, who was one of their prominent supporters, that those treaties should be denounced. They were denounced in 1897, under the circumstances I have described, and as the direct result of the policy brought down by this government.

Mr. SPROULE. The only difference between the Conservative party and the pre-

sent government with regard to those treaties was this. The Conservative government desired to have England amicably arrange her treaties with other countries, so that her colonies might arrange special preferential treaties with her, whereas the present government compelled England to denounce the treaties by presenting a gun at the head of Germany; and when they unwisely did that, by the advice of the Finance Minister, and put England in a dilemma of having to choose between one of her most important colonies and Germany, she was obliged naturally to stand by her colony, and display unfriendliness towards Germany which we have felt the effects of ever since. A most valuable trade was growing up between Canada and Germany, which the trade and navigation returns of Germany to-day show, would have grown to large proportions; but that trade was cut off, and we have made an enemy of Germany, as a result of the indiscretion of the Finance Minister and his friends. The Finance Minister says it was the aim of the Conservative government to get Britain to denounce these treaties, but if the photogravures displayed in the Railway Committee room indicate anything, it was the present Finance Minister and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and another minister who were conducting affairs and not the Conservative government. I say this government acted unwisely in creating trouble with Germany. And not content with that they are now trying to gold-brick the people by leading them to believe that they are giving them some wonderful extension of trade while in reality it amounts to nothing at all. When we ask with what countries the government hope to make these satisfactory trade relations the answer is: We don't know. If they know nothing about it; if they have taken a leap in the dark, why should they deceive the people of the country and render uncertain the trade of importers and manufacturers who fear that at any time a change may come which will destroy their business, and which will cause them to proceed with greater caution in transacting their trade than if they had a permanent tariff to rely on.

Mr. FIELDING. I must ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to get right with regard to the past as the best means of getting right with regard to the future. The hon. gentleman says the conference was composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Minister of Finance and another minister, which shows that the hon. gentleman has failed to understand the point I made. I will not say that the hon. gentleman is dense; he imported that word into the debate, but I will not be so rude. I will simply say that I did not make allusion to any conference at which the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance were present. I said it was a conference held in the city of Ottawa years before this government came into power and presided over by Lord Jersey. If my hon. friend will send to the library—

Mr. SPROULE. I remember it very well.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman remembers it very well then why confuse it with the conference at which the Prime Minister was present.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman was referring to the London conference.

Mr. FIELDING. I said distinctly that I referred to a conference held in the city of Ottawa; there could be no mistake about it. It was held in the time of the late government, I think in the year 1894. It was presided over by a distinguished gentleman who was sent over by the imperial authorities, and it was attended by the ministers of the Conservative government. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will go to the Railway Committee to-morrow morning he will find portraits of the gentlemen who were present—

Mr. BERGERON. That is no proof; a good many have their pictures there who were not at the conference.

Mr. FIELDING. The picture represents a number of gentlemen who were here at that time, but they were not all admitted to the council chamber.

Mr. HENDERSON. Can the Minister of Finance explain how the onlookers happen to have front positions in the picture.

Mr. FIELDING. While the picture commemorates that very important event it does not purport to be a picture of the colonial conference; it is a picture of a gathering held in the Senate chamber to do honour to the distinguished visitors—

Mr. BERGERON. It is a fancy picture.

Mr. FIELDING. No, except that some handsome portraits in it might justify that impression. I want to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that it is historically beyond question that for a number of years Canada desired to terminate these treaties with Germany and Belgium and efforts towards that end were made (in all good faith I am sure) without success. The end of it was that these treaties were not denounced until as a result of the Act of 1897. I have already explained how that came about: The imperial government differed from our contention as to the meaning of the treaties, but the moment they announced that decision they took proceedings to terminate the treaties. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says we have quarrelled with Germany and he blames us. I want to tell my hon. friend that in that contention he has not the support of the gentlemen who sit around him. I

have the means of knowing and I do know that the policy this government pursued in its relations with Germany has had the confidence not only of this side of the House but of many hon. gentlemen on the other side who have so assured me. And the best evidence that this statement is right is, that while my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) and one or two others occasionally allude to this quarrel with Germany as something which reflects upon this government, up to the present moment no one has ever ventured to put on the order paper a motion which would challenge the policy of the government in that respect. And it is wise they should not do so. In our relations with a foreign country it would be deplorable if we had to take the view that one party thinks one way and the other political party thinks another way. All we did with Germany was to vindicate the honour and the independence of Canada. It was not in 1897, but 1898 on the termination of the Belgian and German treaties that our difficulties with Germany arose, and what did we do. We simply declared the rights of the people of Canada—and that Canada was voicing the spirit of the empire—to make such arrangements as they thought fit with any other colony and with the mother country. It was purely a domestic and family affair. And because we asserted that right Germany undertook to penalize our trade and thereupon we hit back in the form of the surtax. I venture to say to my hon. friend that in the opinion of the members of this House—with one or two exceptions and these hon. gentlemen I think have not studied the question well—there is no Act of this government and this parliament during the last ten years which has found greater favour in the eyes of the whole of Canada than that Act by which we declared the right of Canada to make her arrangements with the mother country irrespective of what any foreign country might think.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance has not stated the whole case. No one ever raised any question upon that contention which the hon. gentleman has put forward so forcibly to-night. What Sir Charles Tupper did argue in this House was, that it was not competent for this government to grant any privileges to Great Britain without also granting them to Germany so long as these treaties remained undenounced. I can well remember the answer given by the Finance Minister to Sir Charles Tupper when in tones more strident even than those which he has used to-night, he said: 'The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says we cannot do it; my answer to him is that we have done it.'

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly that is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and the customs officers of this government throughout the country were occupied for weeks and months afterwards in paying back the customs duties which had been unlawfully exacted. And when the Minister of Finance and his colleagues went to argue the same unarguable question before the British government, the British government told them just what Sir Charles Tupper had told them. Well, the treaties were denounced and then followed what has been detailed by the Minister of Finance. For neither Canada nor any country could, in the face of a solemn treaty, do what the Minister of Finance said Canada was entitled to do. The Minister of Finance was taught that lesson by the imperial government. But he was taught something more. After the treaty had been denounced the British government concluded a treaty of exactly the same character with the German government and that treaty applied to the whole of the British empire with the single exception of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Surely—was that exactly what the Minister of Finance expected.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well he never told us so at the time, and although Lord Salisbury in his despatch to the British ambassador at Berlin declared the treaty to have been denounced in the interests of the British empire as a whole, nevertheless this government made no remonstrance when the new treaty was concluded with Germany, and which left Canada absolutely out of its scope. So far as the official correspondence which was brought down shows, no protest was ever uttered by this government from first to last against that. I said in the House at the time, and I say again, that, if that treaty were denounced in the interest of the whole empire, this government should have lifted up its voice in remonstrance against the making of a treaty which excluded Canada from the benefit of a low German tariff which was applied to all the rest of the empire. And I should think that, as a matter of logical deduction, that statement would commend itself to every member of this House. But the Minister of Finance has endeavoured to get away from the point at issue by talking about the colonial conference of 1894. And I think that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was justified in stating, that in view of the picture which hangs in the Railway Committee room, these hon. gentlemen should be held responsible for everything done in that conference.

Mr. FIELDING. Not for the picture.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, not for the picture. They paid for that out of the

funds of the country, I imagine, and cannot be held personally responsible for it. But any one looking at the picture would imagine that Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister, and his colleagues, were subordinate figures to fill up the background, while the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Sir Richard Cartwright were the gentlemen actually engaged in conducting the affairs of that conference.

Mr. BERGERON. Some of them were not there at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) reminds me, they have even gone to the extent of making prominent in that picture some gentlemen who were not at the conference at all. However, let that pass. What I would submit to the Minister of Finance, and what he and every hon. member of this House ought to be prepared to concur in, is that legislation by order in council, whether with reference to tariffs or anything else is undesirable in the main and should only be resorted to when it is absolutely necessary or when there is some very pronounced and strong reason of expediency which would commend it to the House.

The fact is that the Minister of Finance proposes that the government shall be allowed, for example, to apply to British countries outside the United Kingdom, any one that it may choose of three different tariffs. As the law stands to-day certain of these are entitled to the benefits of the British preference. Under this proposed tariff, this government can apply by order in council, either the general tariff or the intermediate. Or, take the countries outside the British empire. To these the general tariff is applicable ; but the government propose to take power to apply to them by order in council a lower tariff. And for what reason do they ask this power ? If there were good reasons for this, I would be prepared to concede it at once. But what does the Minister of Finance say on this subject ? His proposal is that the Governor in Council may by order in council—

—from time to time, in consideration of benefits satisfactory to the Governor in Council, extend the benefit of the intermediate tariff, in whole or in part, to any British or foreign country.

Now, obviously, this implies negotiation; it implies the consideration of benefits. If these benefits are made apparent to the government, it can, within six months—for that is about the time between sessions of parliament now-a-days—submit to parliament what it proposes with regard to a lower tariff. This possible delay of six months at the outside is the only possible excuse or justification for the proposal of the Minister of Finance. Is that sufficient justification for this House to resign its functions of legislation with regard to so important a matter as that ? I venture to think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance cannot give any other reason. I submit that there is no reason of necessity or expediency which can justify the parliament in handing over to the Governor in Council power to do that particular thing. It tends, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said towards instability. If the government propose, in consideration of benefits received, from a foreign country, to apply to that country the intermediate tariff, what earthly reason can be suggested why parliament should not exercise its function of considering and discussing whether or not these proposed benefits are of a character to justify parliament in applying to that country the intermediate tariff ? Is not that the function of parliament, has it not been the function of parliament these six or eight hundred years, to deal with matters of that kind ? But, as it stands at present, the government can spring that tariff on the business men of the country, any one of the three tariffs, without discussion in the public press ; without consideration by parliament, and after a secret debate among themselves around the council board. I venture to say that that is not a desirable condition of affairs. If any reason could be suggested why delay of six months would be injurious to the country, I would not say a word against this proposal. But I have not heard a word to that effect. The government asks power to make this arrangement with foreign countries without consulting parliament; although, within six months, or seven months at the outside, parliament could consider the matter and reach a determination, and, if that determination were favourable, the arrangement could be brought immediately into effect. Then, shall we, the representatives of the people in parliament, wnether on one side of this Houses or on the other, abdicate our functions in that regard and make the cabinet of this country the sole judge of these matters, with power to bring their will into effect and spring these changes upon the business men of the country without the slightest opportunity for that healthy public discussion both in parliament and in the press which is so essential to the working of our institutions and is so absolutely vital under the form of government which we enjoy ? I venture to think that the Minister of Finance is bound to give to the House some reason which will indicate why it is necessary to place the making of the tariff in the hands of the Governor in Council, with sole power and discretion to say whether or not that shall come into force, whether in whole or in part, whether with regard to one or more countries, and without public discus-

sion. This seems to me to be the main point with reference to the new tariff and one which the government ought to meet with some seriousness, giving to the country some reason why, in their opinion, it is necessary for us to legislate in this way in advance. For, if it be necessary, we might as well pass an Act declaring that the tariff shall hereafter be such as the Governor in Council shall from time to time by order in council direct—we might as well abdicate our functions in whole as in part, and it is to that end, apparently, that the Minister of Finance has introduced this measure with regard to the intermediate tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. Let me first say a word in answer to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) whose memory, when he ventures to criticise this side of the House, is not so good as it ought to be. I stated that the policy of the Conservative government was to denounce these treaties, and that steps to that end had been taken at the colonial conference. As I said, I spoke from recollection. I have since sent for the documents. I find that at that colonial conference Sir Mackenzie Bowell made a long speech, a large part of which dealt with the difficulties created throughout the empire by these treaties. The document goes on :

So strong was the feeling of the people of Canada upon this question that the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, during the session of 1892——

That included my hon. friend from East Grey, I believe—

Mr. SPROULE. I was here then.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

—on the motion of Sir John Abbott, premier, unanimously adopted the following address to Her Most Gracious Majesty :

Here follows a long address on the commercial relations with the empire. I shall not take up time to read it all, but will give one sentence at the conclusion :

The Senate and House of Commons, therefore, humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the provisions referred to in the treaties with the German Zollverein and with the Kingdom of Belgium.

And the hon. gentleman voted for that.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not proved in the House of Commons at all. I did not take part in the conference. But what I said with regard to that was that I had no remembrance of voting on the question of insisting upon the imperial government denouncing those treaties, but that the desire of the Conservative party was to go to the imperial government and, in an amicable way, ask that in making treaties with foreign countries she would give us an opportunity of dealing with her and her other colonies as we desired.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever the hon. gentleman meant to say, this is what he voted for. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in his speech at the conference, said :

So strong was the feeling of the people of Canada on this question——

The very question we have been talking about, the Belgian and German treaties.

—that the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, during the session of 1892, on a motion of Sir John Abbott, then premier, unanimously adopted the following address to Her Most Gracious Majesty.

I will read the whole of it if my hon. friend desires. It is a long address arguing the question, but this is the essence of the whole thing. The prayer of a petition is usually set forth at the end and it is like the postscript of a lady's letter, it contains the most important part. The concluding passage of the memorial is this :

The Senate and House of Commons, therefore, humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the provisions referred to in the treaties with the German Zollverein and with the Kingdom of Belgium.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the provisions mentioned there ?

Mr. FIELDING. We all know what the treaties with Belgium and Germany were.

Mr. BERGERON. But what is meant by the word 'provisions' ?

Mr. FIELDING. The provisions of the treaty, the whole treaty, and nothing but the treaty.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to read the whole thing so that we may understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry my hon. friend obliges me to read it: it is pretty long.

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty :

Most Gracious Sovereign, we Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, humbly request that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to take into consideration the position of Canada in respect of certain important matters affecting its trade relations with the empire, and with foreign nations.

Your memorialists desire in the first place to draw attention to certain stipulations in the existing treaties with Belgium and the German Zollverein, ordinarily referred to as the 'most favoured nation' clauses which are extended to other countries whose commercial treaties with Great Britain contain a 'most favoured nation' clause, and which apply to British colonies. By article xv. of the treaty with Belgium, entered into in 1862, Canada is compelled to admit all articles, the produce or manufacture of Belgium, at the same, or at no higher rate of duty than is imposed upon simi-

lar articles of British origin. And in the treaty with the German Zollverein, entered into in 1865, it is stipulated that the produce of those states shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom or any other country of a like kind, and that the exports to those states shall not be subject to any higher duties than the exports to the United Kingdom.

Your memorialists consider that these provisions in treaties with foreign powers are incompatible with the rights and powers subsequently conferred by the British North America Act upon the parliament of Canada for the regulation of the trade and commerce of the Dominion ; and that their continuance in force tends to produce complications and embarrassments in such an empire as that under the rule of Your Majesty, wherein the self-governing colonies are recognized as possessing the right to define their respective fiscal relations to all foreign nations, to the mother country, and to each other.

And because we argued that, because we argued that these treaties were inconsistent with the privileges of self-government extended to Canada, the hon. gentleman says that we did a foolish thing.

Your memorialists further believe, that in view of the foreign fiscal policy of increasingly protective and discriminative duties, it is clearly adverse to the interests of the United Kingdom, and of each and all of its possessions, that the parliament of the United Kingdom, or of any of Your Majesty's self-governing colonies, should be thus restricted in the power of adopting such modifications of its tariff arrangements as may be required for the promotion of its trade, or its defence against aggressive or injurious methods of foreign policy.

Your memorialists desire also to point out that the immense resources of the Dominion in its facilities, and its lumber, require for their profitable development the largest practicable extension of its markets, more especially in countries whose native supply of such productions is limited, while its rapidly developing manufacturing industries demand large and increasing supplies of raw material, to be mainly supplied by countries which are extensive consumers of the productions of Canada. Your memorialists believe that among the countries with which such an interchange of traffic takes place, the British empire holds the highest rank in amount, and from its diversity of climate and productions affords the widest prospect of rapid and practically limitless increase, while the trade of the Dominion with the United States is second only to that with the British empire, and its development and extension are of great importance to us ; though, from the similarity of most of the products of the two countries, it is probably not susceptible of so great an expansion as might be effected in the interchange of traffic with the empire.

Your memorialists earnestly desire to foster and extend the trade of the Dominion with the empire, with its great neighbour, the United States, and with other countries throughout the world, wherever opportunity offers; and believe that by mutual concessions, and the adoption of measures for the rearrangement of trade relations between the various portions of the British empire, and between the empire and foreign nations, important and lasting beneficial results may be attained, and that to the way of the attainment of these great objects the continuation of the restrictions imposed upon Canada and other portions of the empire by the so-called favoured nations clause creates an unnecessary and unjustifiable obstruction.

The Senate and House of Commons, therefore, humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the provisions referred to in the treaties with the German Zollverein and with the Kingdom of Belgium.

And for that address the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who was in the House at the time, I have no doubt gave his vote. So much for that. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition rather feels it his duty to help his friend, the hon. member for East Grey, in the suggestion that what we did at the time was something wrong, something objectionable. We are here to maintain that, that which we did in 1897 was right. We were bound to put forward to the British government the best argument we could. We were bound to put forward every argument found in that address to show that the application of these Belgian and German treaties to Canada was inconsistent with the fiscal liberty which was granted to these colonies in years gone by. In presenting that view we simply repeated the argument, in effect, that was presented in that document. Now we were not absolutely sure that it would be upheld. My contention is that we were bound to make the argument for what it was worth. But we know this : we have the satisfaction of knowing that though we took the position of advocates of Canada, and made the best arguments it was possible to the imperial government, though we failed to get that argument confirmed, though, as anybody might have realized from the beginning, in a grave question of that character there was a possibility of a difference of opinion, still it was a case where our defeat on that point was a victory for Canada and for the empire. Although the British government did say that they could not concur in our views, that they felt, as a matter of honour and good faith with the nations of the world, that they were bound to hold that these treaties did apply to Canada, and that for the time being we were bound to give Belgium and Germany the same treatment as that which we were willing to give to the mother country, though for the moment the imperial government said that these treaties applied and that we must give these terms to Belgium and Germany, so strong was the public opinion of Great Britain, created by the Act of the parliament of Canada granting this preference, that forthwith the imperial authorities denounced these treaties, and that which my hon. friend from East Grey had sought in vain, that for which he had voted in this House, that which colonial conferences had sought for in vain, that which

the great colonies of the empire had sought for year after year in vain, was brought about and accomplished through the Act of this government in the year 1897.

So much as for the past. Now, as to the future, my hon. friend says that we are asking extraordinary power for the Governor in Council. Well, we had that discussion the other night. I pointed out by several illustrations that the power which the Governor in Council will take as respects any given article is to reduce the duty by two, three, four and perhaps, in a few cases, by five per cent. Is that a marvellous power? The Governor in Council, under our system, must be clothed with very considerable powers. The Governor in Council is to-day clothed with very considerable powers in various matters. The Governor in Council may reduce the duty on any article without coming to parliament at all. Extraordinary power! Revolutionary power! Well, it has been on the statute-book of Canada for years and nobody felt that there was anything very alarming about it. The Governor in Council can abolish a duty without coming to the House at all. Extraordinary danger! Revolutionary power! It has been in our statutes for years and probably if I did not refer to it some of my hon. friends would not be aware of it. No harm has come of it and it has worked well. The Governor in Council has power to-day to impose export duties upon a considerable number of articles without coming to this parliament at all. Extraordinary power, revolutionary, dangerous, is it? Nothing dangerous about that. It was put there for a good purpose. It was put there as a standing notice to foreign countries that under certain conditions prompt action might be taken in cases in which it is considered necessary that the Governor in Council should act. Nobody is hurt by it. It is on the statute-book and the probabilities are that nobody will object to its being continued there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what section of the Act is the hon. minister referring?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give the number. It is in the Act respecting the levying of export duties on certain wood products.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of what year?

Mr. FIELDING. It is in the tariff of 1897, but I think we took it from a previous tariff. I think it has been there for fifteen or twenty years. At all events it has been there for ten years in our own administration and I think it came to us from a previous tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman referring to the section in regard to combines?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am referring to the clause which gives power to the Governor in Council to levy duties on certain wood products, nickel ores and metals. It was put upon the statute-book as it was anticipated that conditions might arise in our dealings with our friends to the south of us which might make it desirable that we should have that power. However, the fact is that under the former government this power was given to the Governor in Council, parliament continued it under the present government and it is only right that he should have it. My hon. friend's argument would almost assume that the government are asking power to levy any sort of duties they like upon anything they like. That is not what we propose at all. We have in the general tariff a duty, say for the purpose of my argument, of 30 per cent and we have under the British preference a duty of 20 per cent. There is the highest and the lowest margin. We can tax the goods of certain countries and if we apply the general tariff, the goods pay 30 per cent. We apply the British preferential tariff in a proper case and the goods pay 20 per cent. What is there revolutionary in declaring that in certain cases the duty shall be 27½ per cent on some of these goods.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What objection is there to permitting the government in the ordinary course to make this arrangement with a foreign country, bring that down to parliament within six months and have it discussed.

Mr. FIELDING. Because we think it is much better that the country should know the limits within which we contemplate negotiations, and it is for the very reason of stability to which my hon. friend referred. If we take unlimited power to negotiate—you could have that power without any special Act of parliament—but if we say that we are going to enter into negotiations with foreign countries for extensive reductions of the tariff there will be created that suspicion, anxiety and lack of stability which are undesirable in business matters. But if we say that if at any time, for reasons satisfactory in the judgment of the government, we shall apply this intermediate tariff, we let the country know at once the limits within which we can act. If a man is interested in having a low tariff he knows that all we can do under that is to make 2½ per cent, or a little more than that in some cases, of a reduction in the duty. If a man is interested in keeping up the tariff, as a manufacturer might be, it is well that he should know that there are limits to our negotiations. He says: The worst that can happen is that I may suffer a diminution of 2½ per cent or a shade more. We know exactly what the risk is and we think the risk on either side is not a very serious thing considering that we have 30 per cent under general tariff and 20 per cent on some article from Great Britain. Where is there anything revolutionary in saying that in some cases we may admit that article at 27½ per cent?

Mr. BERGERON. Is not that holding the manufacturer by the throat?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I think, however, that you would hold him by the throat if you created the impression that we were going to enter into negotiations to make reductions the nature of whch he cannot guess at at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After listening to the heated remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in reference to our trade with Germany, I cannot help but enter my earnest protest against the continuance of our present relations with that country. I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of a large number of people in Canada and especially of the agricultural classes when I say that our trade relations with Germany have proved to be one of the greatest mistakes in Canadian history. I may expect, Mr. Chairman, to be called unwise and unpatriotic by the hon. Minister of Finance, as I was last session of parliament, but I do not need to apologize for my patriotism and I do not need to wave the flag every time to remind the people of my patriotic spirit. At that time the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said that he was sorry for the incapacity of the hon. member for Lambton and he wound up his remarks with the words: May the Lord forgive him. If there is a man in this House who needs forgiveness for his sins of omission and commission it is the Minister of Agriculture. Year after year we have been urging upon him the necessity of giving to the agriculturists of the Dominion some aid in reference to getting their products on the different markets of the world in a proper condition; yet this government have been neglecting their duty in that particular and paying no attention to the efforts being put forth for the benefit of the farming industry of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in thundering tones last session, told us that if there ever was anything that was benefiting the farmers of Canada it was the preferential policy. He said that British purchasers went to market and asked for Canadian cheese, butter and other products saying: We want to buy from Canada because she has given us a preference. I ask: Was there ever a more false idea given to the people of any country? The hon. Minister of Customs will not deny the fact that there is not one out of every hundred in the British islands who knows anything about the preference. I would ask that hon. gentleman to point to one single instance where the products of the farm had brought in the markets of the British isles one-half penny more on account of this preference than they would have brought if that preference were not on the statute-books of this country. Does the English housewife go to the shopkeeper in Great Britain and say that she is willing to give a cent a pound more for butter or cheese or flour simply because Canada has granted a preference? I cannot believe that there is any man who will advance any such argument.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend opposing the preference?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am speaking with reference to our trade relations with Germany and if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will take into consideration the position of our trade with Germany as compared with that of other nations, I think he cannot help but believe that we are in a most humiliating position as far as these trade relations are concerned.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend did not answer my question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) at the last session, after vilifying me for the position I took on that question, assured me that the proper time to bring this matter up was when the tariff was up for consideration and therefore I feel that this is the proper time to bring it before the House. With all due respect to these gentlemen I do not think that any of them should deal with that question, it is a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to deal with. The crying need of Canada to-day is an active, aggressive Minister of Trade and Commerce who will push forward the products of this country into the markets of the world. I do not by this reference wish to speak disrespectfully of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce but I do say that the time has come when in the interest of the trade of this country when the Minister of Trade and Commerce should be compelled to assume added responsibility. To my mind there is not a department in the government of Canada which has such an opportunity of benefiting the great mass of the people of Canada as the Department of Trade and Commerce. Never was there a time in our history when there was so much to do and so little done. I sincerely hope that this government will give their most serious consideration to the development of our trade with foreign countries.

Let me call to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the position of the press of Canada with reference to this question. I have here quotations from articles from papers in different parts of the country with reference to our present trade relations with Germany. For instance the 'Weekly Sun' on April 25th makes these remarks:

> The Dominion government did not improve its position by what was said during the debate on Canada's trade relations with Germany in the House of Commons Monday, and briefly summarized in our parliamentary report. The ministers raised a lot of side issues with the object of obscuring the real question, and in-

stead of seriously defending their course, sought to distract attention by a vigorous waving of the old flag.

What are the plain facts in regard to the question under discussion ? Canada's products are practically shut out from the second largest importing nation in the world. This country is in a worse position in the German market than is the United States, and one that is inferior to that held by any other part of the empire with the exception of New Zealand.

I might quote from the 'Hamilton Spectator', but I shall go on to an article from the Canadian manufacturer which is as follows :

It was an unfortunate entrance into the world's politics, a result of which is the snarl in which we now find ourselves with Germany.

Take the Montreal 'Gazette' of April 28th, in winding up an editorial on this matter it says :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier once admitted that the preference was given for sentimental reasons; Mr. Fielding and some other Liberals have repeatedly justified it as a reduction of customs taxation. The truth of the matter is that it was a splurge, decorated with the tinsel of a mountebank and attended by the improvidence of a spendthrift. Its solitary triumph has been to put one considerable industry practically out of business and to hamper the development of others. It may have been useful in rehabilitating the Liberal reputation for loyalty, but it came high at the price. It will disappear just as soon as Canada has a government which realizes that its duty is to frame its tariff policy in the interests of Canada and Canada alone.

I might go on—

Mr. FIELDING. Could my hon. friend find some from the 'Mail' ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I might go on with further newspaper comments but I shall just quote a few remarks from the speech of the Governor General in Toronto which will at least call to the attention of the government the necessity of better trade relations with the German empire. His Excellency, in Toronto on November 29, made use of those words :

If the rate of growth in the settlement of the Northwest proceeds at its present pace it can only be a question of time before the farmers of the Dominion will look to the markets of the orient as an outlet for their produce. I would consequently suggest to you that you should take care that you do not teach the orient to imitate occidental ways by closing their own doors against a trade on the increase of which your prosperity may depend.

Although Canada possesses the natural trade route between Europe and the orient, last year the exports from the United States to Japan were $50,000,000, while the exports from Canada, from which nature has decreed that the future exports to Japan from this continent shall sail, was only a beggarly half million dollars, or only one-hundredth part of that which goes to Japan from the more distant ports of the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Canadian food products.

I believe it would be greatly to the advantage of Canada if more active steps were taken than I believe are now being taken to educate the populations of Japan, Corea and China to appreciate the excellence of Canadian food products, for which, I am informed, a considerable demand could with little organization and without great expense, be greatly stimulated.

Gentlemen, if you were to ask me what points have struck me as most requiring the attention of those who can spare sufficient time from the agreeable business of making their fortunes, I would say that the chief requisites of Canada appear to me to be the taking of such steps :

1. As will lay firmly and securely the foundations of a future trade with the orient.
2. As will perfect your system of transportation east and west, and secure to Canada the full benefits of her geographical position.

Might that not as well imply that it was necessary for this country to secure the opening of the German market to Canadian trade. What does the Canadian Pacific Railway report say on November 9th ?

The Canadian Pacific Railway report that while the western wheat crop has been harvested twice as fast as last year the shipments out of Fort William to date have been much smaller than last year.

The reason for the big falling off is that the demand for Canadian wheat in the United Kingdom is much smaller than last year, owing to the big supply of wheat from the Argentine.

What did Mr. Alexander McPhee, the large exporter of wheat from this country say with reference to our export trade ?

Mr. McPhee, of A. McPhee and Company, exporters, of Montreal, has been a visitor in Winnipeg for the past few days.

We should cultivate closer trade relations with the continent. At present Germany, who is a customer for Russian wheat, discriminates against Canada, and this should be overcome. Just how that could be done is a matter for the statesmen to deal with, but it should be capable of solution.

He closed his remarks by saying :

Trade between the United States and the continent is increasing rapidly, and is decidedly in excess of her trade with Great Britain, heavy as that is.

Last month only ninety vessels sailed from the United States Atlantic ports to Great Britain, while 126 vessels sailed from the same ports for the continent.

All these quotations go to show the necessity of this government cultivating better trade relations with the German empire. Canada to-day is estimated to have 700,000 farmers and the products of these farms amount to $500,000,000. Germany with its 60,000,000 people among the brightest and most intelligent races on the globe, with its expanding trade, reaching to all parts of the civilized world, with an importation of $1,340,178,000, Germany with its exports of $1,111,800,000, Germany importing over

$200,000,000 of agricultural products and the Dominion of Canada able to send to that country only a little over $800,000 worth while against our total exports of something over $1,000,000, the Argentine Republic is sending into that country $48,000,000 and Australasia is sending in $28,000,000. I might go on and show you the exports of the other nations of the world to Germany, while Canada is one of the smallest exporters to that country, the second best market in the world. Canada's share of that $200,000,000 was $896,739, and this has a surtax against it. I believe that next year we will not send anything like that amount. Canada's total exports to Germany are $1,872,000. Let us compare these figures with the exports of other countries. I have here the Statistical Abstract of the World from which I take these figures of the imports into Germany in 1902 :

Austria-Hungary	$165,000,000
Belgium	46,000,000
Denmark	17,000,000
France	72,000,000
Italy	44,000,000
Netherlands	46,000,000
Russia	180,000,000
Finland	3,000,000
Spain	17,000,000
United Kingdom	132,000,000
Argentina	48,000,000
Brazil	27,000,000
Chile	21,000,000
Uruguay	3,000,000
Venezuela	2,000,000
British India	51,000,000
China	6,000,000
Dutch East Indies	21,000,000
British Australasia	28,000,000
Egypt	10,000,000
British West Africa	10,000,000
British North America	2,248,000
Guatemala	5,000,000
Mexico	2,000,000
United States	212,000,000

Let us look at the trade of the little Argentine Republic and compare it with ours; let us see what trade she is doing with Germany to-day in spite of the fact that she is over six thousand miles from the German market. In 1904 the Argentine Republic, with its 5,000,000 population, showed imports of $187,000,000 and exports of $264,000,000. In the same year our imports amounted to $259,000,000 and our exports to $213,000,000. The population of the Argentine Republic in 1891 was 3,400,000; in 1894 it was 4,900,000. The Finance Minister tells us of the wonderful prosperity we are having, but when we look at other countries we find that they have greater prosperity. In 1891 the imports of the Argentine Republic were only $67,000,000; in 1904 they were $187,000,000. Its exports in 1891 were $103,000,000; in 1904 they were $264,000,000. That country in 1904 exported $150,000,000 worth of agriculture products—83,000,000 bushels of wheat, 1,000,000 quarters of beef, 93,000,000 tons of flour, 396,000 bales of wool, 3,000,000 frozen sheep. When we take into consideration the small population of that country, we cannot fail to appreciate the wonderful growth and development of its trade. For ten long years this government have been bungling and mismanaging the affairs between Canada and Germany, and from what I can see the breach is widening. We were told last spring to keep quiet and wait. I might well make use of the words of the right hon. leader of this House in his speech on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway project—'time would not wait, the floodtide of fortune was upon us.' I may tell the Finance Minister that the floodtide of the commerce of the Dominion of Canada is crying to get into the markets of the world, and if he will consult the principal exporters of the Dominion of Canada to-day he will find that they are anxious, very anxious, to get into the German market. The English language was stretched last session to find words to show contempt for those who would dare to say that our trade with Germany was gone owing to the mismanagement of this government. This session I looked anxiously to the remarks of the Finance Minister on the tariff for some favourable reference to our differences between Canada and Germany, but not one word of encouragement has been given to the people of Canada, and they may expect to go on as they are without seeing any improvement in our trade relations with Germany. How much longer are our people to bear this burden ? The Finance Minister, instead of attempting to smooth matters, is trying to widen the breach. He takes a crack at the silks and neckties coming from Germany, and at the same time he would try to lead the people to believe he is to do everything possible to assist trade. He practically admits that during the last ten years these German goods have been filtering through the British market and coming to Canada under the British preference, and he now says that he is going to compel the British shipper to have twenty-five per cent of work done on these goods before they are shipped to this country. Let us look at the careless manner in which this subject has been treated by this government. Early in March last I asked the government to give me some information regarding the tariff, and to obtain a copy of the German tariff, so that I might give to the exporters of Canadian goods to Germany some idea of what tariff would be charged on our goods going into that country. Time after time I asked for that information, and not until the 20th of July did I receive a copy of the German tariff; and in those pages I defy any one to obtain any definite knowledge with reference to what the exporters from the Dominion of Canada would have to pay on their goods

sent to Germany or the position they would be placed in. I doubt if any government could be more careless than this government has been in reference to this matter. The Minister of Agriculture has shown his carelessness in not pushing this question. The farmers of Canada certainly feel that they have been unfairly dealt with and that he has not been doing the fair thing with them. It is his duty to urge on the other ministers the necessity of opening up markets for our products. The United States on the other hand, opened up correspondence with Germany when they found that the German tariff was detrimental to the progress of their trade. They opened up negotiations with the German government and received concessions whereby they were kept on the minimum tariff from the 1st of March, 1906, to the 1st of March, 1907, and what do you find the United States government doing to-day ? You find it sending to Germany a commission which is being feasted and feted in the principal cities of the German empire, and there is no doubt in my mind that they will come back with more favourable tariff concessions for the United States. There is no doubt that these concessions to the United States will be most detrimental to the trade of this Dominion. Why does not our government receive the same consideration for the goods of Canada in the German market that the United States has received? It is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to see that these markets are open, and it is the duty of the government to see that we have a representative in all foreign countries with reference to our trade. The day is coming when we shall realize that one of the most important subjects affecting our country will be proper trade relations with the nations of the world.

The minister will probably tell us that we have Mr. Preston in the orient looking after the interests of this country, but who is Mr. Preston ; he is a man in whom the people of this country place no confidence. It is an insult to the people of the Dominion to send such a representative as Mr. Preston to the orient to look after our interests. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Finance will see to it that our representatives abroad are men of unimpeachable character, not men who have the reputation that Mr. Preston has in the community. In 1904, Canada sent to Japan $37,000 worth of flour only, and last year she sent $60,000 worth. It will take years for the people of Japan to become consumers of the farm products of Canada, but there is Germany ready to take $200,000,000 worth a year of products such as we produce. And Germany has her doors closed against our trade. While we on this side urge the government to open up the German market to us, they by their mistaken policy are driving us year after year further away from the trade of the German empire. In 1904, the United States sent to Japan $1,300,000 worth of flour and in 1905 she sent $1,800,000 worth, as against our flour export to Japan of $37,000 worth. The member for Lisgar told us that the province of Manitoba is capable of producing 500,000,000 bushels of grain and that last year Manitoba produced 115,000,000 bushels. Compare the 73,000 square miles of territory in Manitoba with the 500,000 square miles of Saskatchewan and Alberta and when you consider the hundreds of millions of bushels of grain that will probably be produced in all that territory during the next few years, is it not reasonable to suppose that the people of the west will rightly demand that the markets of Germany shall be thrown open to their products. We may boast of our cities and of our thriving industries, but if it were not for the agricultural wealth of the country at the back of them they would amount to but little. The United States with its vastly growing population will every year consume more and more of its own products in its home market. Then Canada's opportunity will come. Canada, with its rapidly increasing production of agricultural products will require to export more largely, and as Germany takes not only agricultural products but an enormous amount of minerals and timber, we should see to it that we take advantage of the situation and endeavour to get a strong foothold in the German market. In 1895 the United States exported to Germany products to the value of $90,615,000, and in 1905 the exports of the United States to Germany amounted to $234,000,000. Is it not reasonable to expect that if Canada had had amicable trade relations with Germany our exports to that country would be five times larger than they now are. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind but that the United States have taken full advantage of our quarrel with Germany and have increased their trade accordingly. In 1905 the United States exported to Germany 17,000,000 bushels of wheat while in that same year Canada exported to Germany only $750 worth of flour and no wheat. In 1905 the United States exported to Germany $14,000,000 worth of lard, 14,000,000 pounds of bacon, $4,700.000 worth of tobacco, and 19,000,000 pounds of dried apples. The Minister of Finance well knows that Canada has been for years exporting large quantities of dried apples into the German market, but since the date of the German surtax we are practically shut out. Had we amicable arrangements with Germany there is no doubt in my mind but that the value of the products of our agriculturists would have been enhanced to a very great extent. It was estimated a few years ago that the Dominion of Canada produced 20,000,000 barrels of apples and that out of that immense quantity we exported only one and a half million barrels. Had we

been able to export say one-half of that 20,000,000 barrels of apples the wealth of this agricultural country would have been vastly added to. The total exports of the United States to Germany amount to $234,000,000 and the United States imports from Germany $122,000,000 worth of goods. In the year 1905, Germany imported $66,000,000 worth of wheat, $3,000,000 worth of flour and $34,000,000 worth of barley. I only wish I could impress that fact on the Minister of Agriculture. We know that some years ago our barley was able to enter the United States market and that millions of bushels of barley were produced by the Ontario farmers, but that time has passed. The Minister of Agriculture knows that Canada is one of the best barley growing countries in the world, and again I tell him that last year Germany imported $34,000,000 worth of barley. But Canada cannot possibly send a dollar's worth of barley into Germany on account of the surtax against Canadian products.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) tell the committee whether he has any evidence that Germany is willing to enter into these amicable trade relations which he says would be so advantageous to Canada, and whether the hon. gentleman is in favour of the surtax until we are able to make such an amicable arrangement?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a number of men asking questions in this House and that is about one of the most absurd questions I ever listened to. Here is an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House with the whole of the government machinery in his hand, and he does not know and he wont ask, whether the government should take an interest in the opening up of the German market. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should ask such a question. If he will urge on the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance the necessity of trying to open up to us the German markets, as we on this side have been urging for the last year or two, he will do some good for the farmers of Canada. Now, Germany imports annually $11,000,000 worth of rye, and the Minister of Agriculture well knows that in Canada we can provide large quantities of the best rye.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As was well said to-day, the Minister of Agriculture came into this House some twenty years ago a pronounced temperance worker and they tell me that to-day he occasionally takes a glass. I might continue and give a list of the enormous quantities of products which Germany imports, and all of which are produced in Canada and could be profitably sent by us to the German market. Surely a market of $200,000,000 worth of farm products is worth the attention of this government? Germany can live without us better than we can live without Germany. This government think they are fighting Germany; but I want to tell them that they are fighting the Canadian farmers, the Canadian mine owners, the Canadian lumberman, the Canadian manufacturers. The United States can secure concessions by diplomatic statesmanship. Why cannot we do the same? If our trade with Germany decreases, our trade with the United States increases. All I ask is fair trade and fair-play for the people of Canada. With the German market closed against us, the British market is practically the only one open to us to-day, and it is open to every other country on the same terms. This government, Mr. Speaker, are all sail and no anchor. We want to look ahead to the markets of the future instead of restricting our trade. The fact is, the government are intoxicated with the prosperity of the Dominion for which they are only in a very small way responsible. They are afloat on the sea of frenzied finance. They think nothing of spending tens of thousands of dollars for piers and wharfs at which no vessel calls. They think nothing of spending tens of thousands of dollars to build elevators in which no grain is ever stored. They think nothing of spending tens of thousands of dollars in building bridges they have no right to build. They do not hesitate to promote North Atlantic Trading companies to the loss of the country but to the great benefit of their own partisans. They are ready to grant grazing leases to their friends in the Northwest even though thereby they deprive the people of Canada of their just rights in the public lands. But, when it comes to spending a few thousand dollars to develop our trade with the nations of the world they take a very different view indeed. The government are riding on the fast express to-day. You remember, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Drummond's story of the boy who went away from home and made money. When he came back to visit his old home, he came in style and on the fast express. He was too great a personage to enjoy the eatables that were served to him at home, nor could he take pleasure in smoking even the best cigars that the village afforded. Again he went away. But he lost his money and was forced to come home again, and this time he came back in the caboose of a freight train. This government has been spending the money of this country recklessly and extravagantly. The time is not far distant when they will come home in the caboose. They have trampled upon every principle that they advocated in days gone by, and they have tried to humbug the people into a belief that they, as a government, have brought about the prosperity of the country. You remember that, in 1896 they said: Give us the

reins of government and we will open up to you the markets of the United States; we will give you the trade of eighty millions of people and establish the very best trade relations with the nations of the world at large. You remember how they talked that throughout the whole Dominion. Yet, they had hardly assumed power when they began to quarrel with the nations of the world, so that our trade with these countries to-day is very much impeded. I challenge the Minister of Finance to name to this House any important market in which our trade is in a better position than it was in 1895? We have had ten long years of humbug, ten long years of mismanagement of the trade affairs of the country. The Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, indicated his opinion that our trade with Germany was not an important trade. Surely he did not mean that. If he will give careful attention to the matter, he cannot but realize that the German market is the most important market that the people of Canada have an opportunity to develop at the present time. I would like him to explain why it is that the preference we give Great Britain does not win for us better terms in that market than those that are given to the nations of the world at large. The markets of Great Britain are not controlled by sentiment or sympathy, as the hon. minister would indicate, but by the quality of the goods. Were the hon. minister to go up and down the markets of Liverpool, London and Glasgow as I have done, he would find that goods are not bought on sentiment there. Go into any great market of that country and talk sentiment with regard to the goods and they will practically laugh you out of the exchange. I am surprised indeed to hear men in prominent places in this government take the position they do with reference to this matter. If there are differences on this side with reference to some questions, there are vastly greater differences on the other side of the House with reference to most questions.

By our position with Germany, the immigration from that country to Canada is retarded. The Germans are among the most desirable people in the world for any nation to win as settlers and citizens. I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to take a trip through the United States and see how the Germans have been instrumental in developing the manufacturing interests of that country and bringing under cultivation their farm lands. The retarding of the immigration of Germans is of untold injury to this Dominion. In this connection there is one point I would like to impress upon this House, and that is that Germany did not apply the surtax until a long time after our surtax was levied. The hon. Minister of Finance can remember that, in 1897, he gave a preference to Great Britain in our markets of 12½ per cent, and he had Britain denounce the treaty with Germany. In 1898 he increased the British preference to 25 per cent. Germany felt that it was injured by this action and placed us under its maximum tariff. That was not sufficient for the Finance Minister. In 1900, he increased the preference to Great Britain to 33⅓ per cent. Germany, in 1903, evidently believing that the Dominion of Canada was determined to hamper trade between the two countries, placed upon her statute-book a law to levy a surtax against Canada. Canada immediately applied a surtax against Germany. And it was not until the first of March of this year that Germany actually applied the surtax against Canada.

Now, surely, the hon. Minister of Finance does not expect that, if he applies the intermediate tariff to any country he will secure a preference in return. One hon. gentleman has said that this intermediate tariff is a gold brick, and that is a true description. It is an embodiment of political opportunist ideas. The Minister of Finance said it in his budget speech—page 309 of 'Hansard,' in referring to the British preference :

> We think that it has had also a most desirable effect in increasing the interest in Great Britain in Canadian products ; and, though it is difficult to establish it by particular evidence, our conviction is that the preferential tariff has been the means of encouraging the use and consumption of Canadian products in Great Britain.

I referred to this matter some time ago, and I am sure the Minister of Finance will not call attention to that position again. The British market is the only market to which we can send our goods. The British merchant does not buy on sentiment, he buys because of the quality of the goods.

There are a few questions with reference to this preference which I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, and to which I want some explanation. Last session he said that the preference was a family affair with Great Britain. If it is a family affair why have the other colonies received better treatment than we are receiving to-day ? Why does not the whole family receive like treatment ? Why did not the rest of the family demand for this child, the Dominion, fair treatment ? Previous to the adoption of this preferential tariff we were in the position of favoured colonies, now we are not in that favoured position. Why not? Does the Minister of Finance pretend to say that it was any other cause than the position this government took on the preferential tariff that brought about the present state of affairs ? I do not believe he will. I have examined carefully our trade with Germany, and if I had time to go through our reports from Germany which I have prepared, I could prove that some of the goods we are receiving from Germany do not injure many of our manufactures, and that they

are of great benefit to the working men and the farmers of Canada. I might say that goods which are brought from Germany are not very expensive in this country. For instance, we find that we are bringing in from Germany something over $313,000 worth of cheap furs. Every farmer when he buys his fur coat or his fur robe must depend upon it that he is paying a surtax. We are bringing in somewhat over $180,000 worth of toys, and when poor people buy their toys they must remember that they are paying the surtax which this government is applying against those goods. Let hon. gentlemen interrogate the poor people of this country and ask them whether they think it is right that they should pay the extra surtax which this government is placing on German goods ?

There is another thing I want to impress upon the House. The people in general have a false impression of the effect of the preference upon the Dominion. Many think it is of a free trade nature. It is the very opposite of free trade. It restricts the markets for the products of our Dominion, it compels us to trade largely with one country, placing our manufacturers and producers in a most unfavourable position. It closes the big markets and forces us to buy from a smaller one. Is there any business man in the House who will say that if we could send one-third of the products we are now sending to the British Isles into Germany, and the other two-thirds into Great Britain, we would not likely receive a better remuneration for our goods ? I do not believe there is a man in the House who will argue against that position. I expect to get little encouragement from the government side of the House on this question. But if they will look into this matter they will see for themselves that it is most important to the Dominion of Canada. I believe, Sir, as firmly as I believe that this parliament is in session that the day is not far distant when the farmers and the people of Canada generally will demand that the German surtax be removed, that the German market be opened to us, and that our goods may go into her markets on the same basis as the goods of any other country. Not one of the ministers will give a good reason for this surtax, not one hon. gentleman on the government side of the House will give a good reason for levying this surtax. All they will say is that it is hitting back at Germany for something they imagine she has done us. This government was the first to hit at Germany, there is no use of hiding behind any other position. This government will scold and frown down remarks of this kind, but it seems to be their chronic character to scold things that they know should be remedied, and which they seem powerless to remedy. I bring this question before the House because I believe that not a moment should be lost in procuring a settlement on a better basis of our trade relations with Germany. Let us guard carefully the interests of the producing classes of this country, and by so doing the prosperity with which we have been blessed will continue. But let us deal with this question on its merits, in a broad-minded way, don't let us get over-heated in our remarks and condemn hon. gentlemen because they take up this position in a patriotic spirit and for what they believe in the best interests of this Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to say for the purpose of preventing misunderstanding that there is not one single sentence in the speech of the hon. gentleman respecting our trade relations with Germany with which I agree ; and if I understand public opinion in Canada, it will condemn every word the hon. gentleman has uttered with regard to our trade relations with Germany as entirely unjustifiable, unwarranted, and his statements will find no favour among the people of Canada. I want to say further that I have reason to believe there is no considerable number of members in this House who will agree with the hon. gentleman. I want to say that the sentiments he has expressed are calculated to be misunderstood abroad, and if not at once corrected will do harm in any negotiations we may have with Germany. I say this with great respect to the hon. gentleman whose sincerity I do not question. But I am sure he does not speak the minds of any considerable number of the people of Canada or any considerable number of the members of this House. Germany or any other country which may wish to negotiate with us, must do so on the basis that the hon. gentleman does not speak for any considerable number of the people of Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe that I am speaking for a large portion of the people of Canada. This government have been neglectful in their duty for the past ten years. They have been trying, as they claim, to deal with this question and they have made a fiasco. How long are they going to ask our people to submit to be excluded from the German market ? How long are they going to keep the products of Canada in the position they are to-day ? When the Minister of Finance says that my remarks are unjustified and unwarranted, I say he does not realize the position of the trade of this country at the present time. I honestly believe that before many years the people of Canada will demand that the markets of Germany be open to the trade of this Dominion.

Mr. LALOR. I desire to say a few words in reference to the intermediate tariff, and will speak from the standpoint of

a manufacturer interested in trade with Germany. I have listened attentively to the able speech of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), and while we generally agree upon public questions, I regret that I cannot agree with the arguments he has presented on this question to-night. I think perhaps he has studied it from a theoretical standpoint, and not from a practical standpoint, as an exporter and an importer trading with Germany. I believe the surtax that Germany has imposed upon Canadian goods does not affect all lines of goods exported from this country to Germany.

My hon. friend mentioned, for instance, dried apples as being one of the exports of this country. I may say that I am one of the largest, if not the largest, manufacturer of evaporated apples in this country, and I am a large exporter of that particular line of product to the German market. I am exporting that line of goods to Germany just the same now as I have been doing for the last ten years and I am not met with any surtax upon those goods. I explain this in order that my friend may be placed right on that question and that the House may understand it as well.

But, what I am more particularly interested in is the importation of goods from Germany into this country. I am a manufacturer of knitted goods. I am interested in a large concern in the town in which I live; in fact I am the principal stock holder and I am therefore interested from the standpoint of a manufacturer in the import of German manufactured goods into this country. I am very much alarmed—and I have good reasons for saying so—in connection with the intermediate tariff as explained by the hon. Minister of Finance. I noticed his remarks when he was delivering the budget speech and also the hint which was given by him to-night to the effect that there were already negotiations which he did not propose to explain at the present time with a foreign country in reference to the intermediate tariff. I want to say to the hon. minister, and I speak in the way of trying to give advice from my standpoint as a manufacturer of knitted goods, that if the intermediate tariff were carried into effect with Germany in connection with my particular line of goods I believe it would close my doors and I would not be able to manufacture a dollar's worth of these goods. The position we are in is this, and I hope the Minister of Finance will make a note of it and realize the condition we are in in the knitted goods business. The concern in which I am interested is the largest user of worsted yarns in this country. We import more worsted yarns than any other company in Canada. We pay 12½ per cent duty on every pound we import and all the goods we manufacture are made from worsted yarns. Under the preferential tariff with Great Britain we have a protection on these goods of 22½ per cent. That leaves us a protection of 10 per cent on these goods as against the importation of the same line of goods under the British preference.

In reference to the intermediate tariff with Germany, the tariff places the protection on knitted goods at 30 per cent. But, remember that we are paying 12½ per cent upon our yarns. On every pound of yarn that we use we pay 12½ per cent which would simply leave us a protection on these knitted goods as against Germany of 17½ per cent. I do not think there is an hon. member sitting in this House who thinks that we could exist against the competition of Germany under a tariff of 17½ per cent, as against a country that pays perhaps 25 cents a day for the girls and women employed in its factories, whereas, in our factory, we pay all the way from $6 to $15 a week for our help. We simply could not compete with Germany and her cheap labour. Then, they have facilities for making yarns that we have not in this country. They make yarns from the waste of their factories and they have a system by which the yarn must be knit into fabrics even before the yarn is cold. With the yarn that they get for almost nothing and with the cheaper labour that they have in that country, I say that under the intermediate tariff you simply could not compete with them at all, and we would have to close up our factories. Probably it would affect the factory I am interested in almost more than any other factory in Canada because the lines of goods we make are purely German goods, such as shawls, hoods and fancy goods which have never before been made in this country. We have imported the very best and most expensive class of machinery, we have German experts to run that machinery and we are making a success of the business. It is the mainstay of the prosperous town in which I live, but if the intermediate tariff were carried into effect I cannot see how we could possibly manufacture in competition with Germany. I do not understand why it is that knitted goods are placed under a lower tariff than are other manufactured goods. Take clothing, for instance; they have a duty of 35 per cent and woollen goods in general have a duty of 35 per cent, while knitted goods are placed upon a lower scale of duties which is, I think, unreasonable, and I hope that the Finance Minister, before the tariff is fully completed and passes the House, may see his way, in his good judgment, to change that duty and to increase the schedules upon knitted goods in order that we may manufacture as against Germany. I do not find any fault with the tariff as it now stands. I am free to say that if the tariff were just left as it is, even though a duty of 12½ per cent is levied on worsted yarns, I would not find any fault with it. If the tariff is left as it is and if the tariff

against Germany remains as it is we have no fault to find, but I can say in all honesty and sincerity as a manufacturer—and I plead upon those lines with the Finance Minister—that if the intermediate tariff were carried into effect as respects Germany, it would wipe the business in which I am interested entirely off the slate and we would not be able to compete in that line of goods. It applies to many other lines of goods as well as the line in which I am particularly interested, but I speak of the line in which I am particularly interested because I know whereof I speak. I hope that the Finance Minister will not bring into effect the intermediate tariff and if he does I hope, in the interest of our manufacturers, that he will at least increase the duty upon knitted goods in order that we may have a little better basis of protection before the negotiations are carried through for a treaty with Germany or any foreign country. As regards the United States, in so far as our competition is concerned, I do not care anything about that. We would welcome almost free trade with the United States for the reason that they pay just as much wages as we do. Their scale of wages is just as high as ours and it costs them just as much to manufacture their goods. But, when you come to compete with Germany it is a different matter altogether. With their low wages and the facilities they have for the manufacture of the class of goods that are shipped to this country the application of the intermediate tariff would paralize the business in which I am interested.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has gone into a very interesting subject from his own experience and I appreciate what he has said, but he will see at once the embarrassment of the situation. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) complains that we are imposing duties upon Germany and my hon. friend is afraid that we are going to take them off. So, you will see that we have a little difficulty in pleasing hon. gentlemen on the other side. I may say that if I conveyed the impression that we were carrying on negotiations at this moment with Germany with the view of bringing that country under the operation of the intermediate tariff I certainly did not intend to convey such an impression. All I said in the budget speech on that subject was that I hoped we might be able to come to such an arrangement as would lead to the abolition of the surtax in return for reasonable concessions given by Germany. I did not intimate that we had any expectation in the early future of being able to extend to Germany the benefits of the intermediate tariff ; if I left the impression that there are negotiations of that kind pending I did not intend to do so. As regards the surtax, there are certain negotiations looking towards its abolition.

As to the woollen schedule the reason why we have made a distinction between knitted goods and other woollen goods is that we have reason to believe that the knitting industry has been a very prosperous industry, that it is more prosperous than the weaving industry in the wool trade. There are various indications in the quotations of certain large corporations in Canada lately which afford abundant evidence that the knitting industry is at any rate not suffering, that it is getting along well, and that if afterwards we should even reduce the duty a little under the intermediate tariff the knitting industry could still stand it well, I give that as the reason why the distinction is drawn ; we have every reason to believe that the knitting industry has been more prosperous than the weaving industry. I hope that is true of the industry with which my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) is connected. I feel sure that if the time comes when we have to deal with any foreign country, every one of the considerations my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) has urged will be a proper consideration and I can assure him it will receive consideration by the government and that no hasty or rash action will be taken by the government under this clause.

Mr. SPROULE. One word with regard to accuracy, because the minister rather flatly contradicted me and said in reply to my statement that I had no remembrance of such a resolution being voted on in this House and therefore did not believe I voted on it. In answer to that the minister said it was moved by Sir John Abbott in this House in the session of 1892. I cannot find such a resolution moved by Sir John Abbott and on the other hand Sir John Abbott was not in this House at that time.

Mr. FIELDING. He moved it in the Senate.

Mr. SPROULE. He happened to be in the Senate at the time. I see that some kind of an address was sent forward, speaking from memory, I do not think that such an address was ever voted on in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I said I had no remembrance of it, but the essence of my reply was that before anything was done, before any annoyance was provoked with Germany, we desired to clear the coast for Canada's right to make preferential trade relations and for that reason, memorialized the imperial government to get these treaties put right before that. That I think was proper and would not be either exasperating or irritating to any country. What I complained of was that the action of the present government, through the Minister

of Finance, in 1897, invoked a quarrel with Germany by his doing what he was told ought not to be done in view of Lord Knutsford's reply to this House, saying it could not be done. But the minister thought that this could be done and in pursuance of that belief carried out his intentions and brought on the strained relations which since that time have existed between Canada and Germany.

Mr. FIELDING. That was not the cause of the trouble with Germany ; the very fact that we adopted the preference at all was the cause of the trouble with Germany.

Mr. SPROULE. Because it was in violation of the favoured nation clause of the treaty which Germany had with the mother country.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) say that we ought not to have adopted the preference ? It was the adoption of the preference which gave annoyance to Germany.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that under the circumstances I thought it was a mistake to adopt the preference, because we did not first make the coast clear so that we could freely without giving offence, and that is what the late government endeavoured to do, to get these treaties amicably arranged so that the coast would be clear and they might have the right to adopt the preference ; but the present government adopted it without having the right and therefore they provoked the quarrel.

Mr. MONK. I would not for my part like this delegation of the power of parliament to the cabinet to pass without a protest. For my own part I think we should have the right to examine each one of the arrangements which the government might propose to make with foreign countries and to be heard on these arrangements before they were adopted. Here is a negotiation the result of which if carried out may affect twenty industries in my own county and may affect industries in other counties. The theory contained in germ in this proposition is that the government, without hearing the interested parties, without giving those who have the right to be heard here on these occasions a chance to be heard, without having the whole matter fully discussed by parliament, will have the right to enter into one of these arrangements. I am opposed to that. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says that that power already exists by the law. It exists in certain specific cases, the circumstances of which are fully foreseen and where urgency is absolutely necessary, but I defy the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to show one single instance where, in a country governed by parliamentary institutions such as we have, that power is given to the minister. It exists nowhere

and I for my part am very little disposed to trust the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) after what I call the bungle he made of our relations with Germany, there is no other expression. I heard the Minister of Finance to-night taking credit for the whole of that incident. Those of us who were here at the time will remember well that, as the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, Sir Charles Tupper and other members on this side of the House, I do not know if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not do so, warned the government that they were putting us in a false position with Germany, that they had no right to enact that tariff at that time, and should proceed differently. You judge of what people do by the result.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. What is the result ? Before the adoption of that tariff we had the beginning of an excellent trade with Germany. There is an immense prospect for us of trade with Germany. What happened ? Well, we all know it. It alienated Germany, created a hostile feeling against us from that day to this the government have not done a single thing to allay that. The treaty was denounced, my hon. friend takes credit for that, but in this House it was repeatedly maintained that the treaty did not apply to us at all. I heard him say in this House : We have done it, to-morrow we will see all collectors of customs collecting the increased tariff against Germany because we have the right to do it. They had not the right, and as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said, we had the humiliating spectacle of seeing an extra staff of hands put on afterwards to reimburse to the German exporters the money we had taken from them unduly. A hostile feeling was created, and this government is not entitled to the slightest credit for the abolition of these treaties. Why ? Because they maintained they did not apply to us. I heard Sir Louis Davies in this House say that the merest tyro in the interpretation of treaties would have known that they did not apply. Well there is no doubt that the abolition of these treaties had been asked for in England and here for a long time. They were denounced afterwards, not through the action of my hon. friend or his government, they never gave themselves any trouble about it. My hon. friend says that they argued lengthily in England that the treaties did not apply but that it was a doubtful question. Where is the evidence of that ? When did they argue it ? It was not argued, the law officers of the Crown stated without any difficulty, there was no doubt in England at all, that the treaties applied to Canada and they were denounced. After they were denounced negotiations were resumed between England and Germany for the renewal of

our relations with Germany. What did this government do? Where is there a trace of the trouble they took in order to secure this country favourable treatment under the new treaty which was concluded ? I have already asked for the correspondence on that subject. Is there any ?

There is none. They never gave themselves any trouble at all until a new treaty had been finally concluded after negotiations between England and Germany. A new treaty was concluded, and we were left out, because this government had done nothing to see that our future prospects were protected in that treaty. And then the Minister of Finance takes immense credit to himself because he retaliated on Germany. He says that every patriotic Canadian ought to praise him because he retaliated against a hostile tariff. Is that the way the progressive countries of to-day are endeavouring to procure commercial advantages ? He should have entered into negotiations. Of course once there was a hostile tariff against us, it may have been useful for us to show that we had within ourselves the power to respond to it. Since then what has he done ? Is there any correspondence? Have there been any negotiations? Let us see them. He has done nothing. So that to-day the result of all this formidable procedure on the part of the government is that we have thrown into the hands of the Americans an immense trade of which we could have obtained a part if we had been more active in our own interests. And the Minister of Finance, after taking what I consider perfectly absurd credit for all this, which has had such a bad result, has not advanced our trade interests with any other country. Is there any other country? If so, which is it? We have had months of negotiation with Italy—have they led to anything? Has he improved our trade relations with France? Has he done anything to improve our relations with Belgium? Or with Australia, as an hon. member suggests? With what country have our relations been improved, I would like to know? And the hon. minister wants me, for instance, who represents an industrial division, to confide to him, on the strength of what he has done in the past, I suppose, a discretion which I venture to say has never been confined to any government governed by British institutions. Well, I am not prepared to do that; I see a great many obstacles to that. In the first place, there is one thing that strikes me apart from the violation of the prerogative, the most precious privilege that we have, the ancient privilege of fixing ourselves, without delegating to anybody, the rate of taxation. This intermediate tariff seems to me to be the result of great haste. We are proclaiming at once to the world how far we are prepared to go in the way of concession. Is that prudent; is that right? I have always understood that in negotiations between nations for obtaining commercial advantages, you must, so to speak, keep a card up your sleeve; that you must not suggest in advance how far you are prepared to lower your tariff; that that is a matter for negotiation in each case. The Minister of Finance knows that himself. When I first saw this intermediate tariff, I put on the order paper a question which I thought was a reasonable one. It was this : If a nation has against us an average tariff of 3 per cent and we have against that nation an average tariff of 18 per cent, will it be admitted to the advantages of the intermediate tariff? The Minister of Finance answered that each case was to be judged and treated on its own merits. Why then have we declared in advance to all nations how far we are prepared to go in the way of concessions? The United States have no such tariff as that. They proceed as business men in their negotiations, and when they have given as little as possible and gained as much as they can they make arrangements. I am not aware that that or any other great business nation has in advance stated the limits of its concession. I think that is very prudent, speaking generally, because with some nations with whom we might do a great deal of business we cannot possibly come down to the limit of the intermediate tariff, but must stop a few points above it, while in other cases it might be of great advantage to us to go a few points below the intermediate tariff. But we cannot do what we would in either case, because we have bound ourselves hard and fast beforehand. It may be that some European nations have such a tariff, but it is not the case in the United States, and it ought not to be the case here. But that is an outside consideration, although I think it should have its weight. The principal point is this, that it is depriving this House of the right to go fully into the matter and to defend if necessary the rights of our constituents—the right of concluding what is virtually a treaty. The Minister of Finance himself spoke of it as such. It is a treaty to this extent, that if we fail to carry it out we shall place the nations with whom we treat on a hostile footing towards ourselves, as we have done in the case of Germany. That is going too far. I am not prepared to concede that right to the government, because negotiations with nations must necessarily proceed during several months, and parliament ought to keep a strong and retaining hand on the right to regulate the tariff. Let us take an instance. My hon. friends who have spoken before me have pointed out. what is undoubtedly the case, that but for the unfortunate way in which this government has carried on this German affair we might at the present moment be enjoying with Germany an immense trade which is going

to the Americans. In that respect we have worked for our neighbours. Well, there are other nations. I have no doubt that if this government were active and carried on such negotiations as they might—because we may do a great deal without going through the regular routine of official negotiations—they might have taken steps to develop an immense trade with Belgium. There is no doubt about that. Belgium imports every year $75,000,000 worth of wood; it imports, if I mistake not, $100,000,000 worth of grain. In the last year or the year before last Belgium has had upon our exports to that country a tariff of a little more than 1 per cent, while upon what it bought from Germany it has had an average tariff of about 18 per cent. I do not think we need doubt that under these circumstances Belgium will apply to this country for admission to the benefits of the intermediate tariff. Are we going to leave the government, without consulting parliament, to admit Belgium to those benefits? On the other hand, having published to the world what this intermediate tariff is, are we going to refuse this favour to Belgium? If we do, it will look bad. In these matters of tariff between nations there is a great deal of sentiment, and hostility is easily created. The hostility of Germany could easily have been avoided if the government had shown some diligence. If we should refuse to Belgium the benefits of the intermediate tariff it will look very strange indeed, whereas had we negotiated with Belgium apart from this tariff favourable trade arrangements might have been entered into between Canada and Belgium. But if Belgium should claim the benefit of this intermediate tariff and if we refuse to accord it to her, then we have deprived ourselves of the advantage of negotiating for special arrangements and we will alienate that prosperous little country with which we could have developed a very considerable trade. I protest against the government taking this power. I believe that we are not endeavouring as other great commercial nations are endeavouring to develop trade relations with other countries. I believe that our neighbours to the south of us are in that respect immensely ahead of us. I believe that we should have negotiated separately with these countries with which there are large possibilities of trade, instead of thus publishing what is called an intermediate tariff in regard to which the Minister of Finance admits he has made no preliminary special study as to which country he will extend the benefits of it to. When I asked him if a country with a three per cent average tariff or a four per cent average tariff against us would be entitled to the intermediate tariff the Finance Minister replied that each country would have to be judged on its merits. Well, I agree in that, but we should not have said beforehand what we are prepared to do as we have said in this intermediate tariff.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 12, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

INLAND NAVIGATION COMPANIES.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 34) respecting Inland Navigation Companies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very short one. It is based on the same principle as the section in the Railway Act obliging railway companies to grant to members of the Senate and the House of Commons free transportation with their luggage. This Bill might have been brought in as an amendment to the Railway Act, but I do not think the Railway Act covers inland navigation. There are certain companies engaged in inland navigation which receive subsidies from this House and at the same time are not obliged to give free transportation to members of the Senate and House of Commons, and certain of these companies use that lack in the law to seek their personal interest when we have certain Bills before parliament; it is only to protect members of the House of Commons and of the Senate from those companies, I would name for instance the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, which receives subsidies for the transportation of the mails on its steamboats and which at the same time, I am told and duly informed, offer free transportation to certain members on the condition that they would favour their Bills. I have known that myself, not that anything has been offered to me but I have seen it offered to somebody else. Thus I only wish to protect parliament, and the Bill is based on the same principle as the Railway Act which provides for the free transportation of members of the Senate and House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

TRIALS BY MR. JUSTICE MAGEE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Is the government aware that the Honourable Mr. Justice Magee has heard several cases at the different assize courts throughout the province of Ontario, and that in many of them

he has reserved judgment, and that although in some cases over one year, and in other cases over two years, have elapsed since he tried said cases, he has not yet seen fit to render judgment thereon ; and that this delay has operated to the great injury of litigants ?

2. If so, what action does the government propose to take to procure a speedy delivery of judgment on these several cases so reserved?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Representations to the general effect stated in the question have in a few instances been made to the Department of Justice.

2. The Minister of Justice has been in communication with Mr. Justice Magee on the subject.

PAYMENTS TO AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

How much has been paid the American Bank Note Company in each fiscal year since 1897, for services rendered, (a) to the Finance Department ; (b) to the Post Office Department ; (c) to the Department of Inland Revenue ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The answer to this question is contained in the following table :

Year.	(a) Finance Dept.	(b) Post Office.	(c) Inland Revenue.
1896-7.. .. ..$	83,656 15	$ 8,283 00	
1897-8..	44,933 73	27,848 99	$ 17,545 36
1898-9..	49,943 04	46,469 49	15,125 12
1899-0..	54,950 35	48,263 57	33,078 57
1900-1..	54,886 58	46,563 81	20,207 01
1901-2..	85,016 12	49,397 39	26,761 51
1902-3..	99,951 11	50,466 35	27,594 38
1903-4..	129,974 31	57,587 08	42,210 51
1904-5..	134,972 55	59,648 22	34,534 45
1905-6..	159,973 80	70,699 00	39,032 35
	$888,259 74	$465,226 90	$256,089 26

EMPLOYEES OF TRANSCONTINENTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the Transcontinental Commission at Ottawa ?

2. What are their names, positions, salaries and dates of appointment ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Fifty-six persons.

2. Engineering Department—

D. Macpherson, assistant chief engineer, $416.66, July 1st, 1905.

R. F. Uniacke, bridge engineer, $250, October 19th, 1904.

F. A. Drought, draughtsman to bridge engineer, $90, February 21st, 1906.

Chas. P. Disney, draughtsman to bridge engineer, $90, May 21st, 1906.

J. R. O'Malley, stenographer to bridge engineer, $40, August 17th, 1906.

Arthur Mitchell, laboratory clerk, $70, June 23rd, 1906.

A. W. H. Stimson, chief draughtsman, $175, December 9th, 1904.

J. B. Harvey, assist. chief draughtsman, $150, April 1st, 1905.

J. H. Roy, draughtsman, $130, December 10th, 1904.

O. P. Schreiber, draughtsman, $120, October 21st, 1904.

H. H. Balfour, draughtsman, $90, January 3rd, 1906.

S. A. Dion, draughtsman, $70, March 13th, 1906.

J. B. McLaughlin, draughtsman, $70, February 28th, 1905.

J. R. Grant, draughtsman, $55, July 19th, 1906.

P. E. Wright, clerk, $70, January 12th, 1905.

E. Dillon, accountant to chief engineer, $120, October 19th, 1904.

A. B. Macklin, assistant accountant to chief engineer, $90, June 1st, 1906.

C. J. Jones, sec. and clerk to chief engineer, $100, September 7th, 1904.

F. Tory, clerk to chief engineer, $75, April 7th, 1905.

W. S. Fowler, sec. to asst. chief engineer, $85, August 29th, 1905.

W. J. Bambrick, stenographer to asst. chief engineer, $55, September 25th, 1905.

H. Dunlop, Blue print clerk, $45, November 12th, 1906.

Secretary's Department.—

B. H. L. DeMartigny, secretary to chairman, $100, September 27th, 1905.

H. A. Collins, secretary to comm. McIsaac, $100, September 17th, 1904.

J. Neighorn, secretary to comm. Young and Reid, $100, December 17th, 1904.

G. Heidman, stenographer and clerk, $100, October 14th, 1904.

R. Ronan, filing clerk, $100, September 2nd, 1904.

J. O'Malley, messenger, $60, August 29th, 1904.

E. Lefebvre, messenger, $30, December 16th, 1904.

J. B. Jacques, messenger to chairman, $50, March 14th, 1906.

G. A. C. Taylor, car porter, $78, July 25th, 1906.

Accounting Department—

D. Hector, chief accountant, $200, October 31st, 1905.

A. T. Gow, accountant, $150, November 8th, 1904.

R. M. J. McGill, assistant accountant, $125, December 9th, 1904.

W. R. Saults, clerk, $110, November 9th, 1904.

E. L. Parent, clerk, $110, February 13th, 1906.

H. Charland, clerk, $55, March 6th, 1905.

R. Lagimodière, clerk, $85, December 9th, 1904.

R. H. Lang, clerk, $85, December 23rd, 1904.

F. J. Lozier, clerk, $70, November 7th, 1906.

T. L. Babin, clerk, $35, September 7th, 1905.

A. Beaudry, stenographer, $85, January 10th, 1905.

Purchasing Department—

A. L. Ogilvie, purchasing agent, $200, October 12th, 1904.

F. W. White, asst. purchasing agent, $150, December 9th, 1904.

F. S. West, local purchasing agent, St. John, N.B., $150, September 16th, 1904.

H. R. Landry, clerk, $80, January 24th, 1905.

A. W. McLennan, clerk, $60, October 15th, 1906.

Geo. O'Reilly, clerk, $50, January 20th, 1905.

D. J. Leddy, clerk, $50, January 18th, 1906.

J. P. Doyle, stenographer, $60, September 9th, 1905.

Transport Department—

P. V. Savard, transport clerk, $150, August 1st, 1906.

D. G. Stewart, employment agent, $125, January 23rd, 1905.

P. Larocque, stenographer, $75, September 8th, 1904.

Legal Department—

H. Atkinson, law clerk, $208.33, May 1st, 1906.

R. H. Fraser, clerk, $125, December 31st, 1904.

Clarence Black, stenographer, $50, June 1st, 1906.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the sums stated are payable daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly or yearly?

Mr. EMMERSON. Monthly, I think.

YUKON OFFICIALS.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Is the government aware whether all or any of the following named Yukon officials are at present absent from the Yukon territory: Mr. W. B. McInnes, commissioner; Mr. Justice Dugas, senior judge; Mr. Justice Craig, junior judge; Mr. J. I. Hartman, postmaster; Mr. F. T. Congdon, legal adviser to Yukon council; Mr. A. Noel, Crown prosecutor; Mr. J. E. Girouard, registrar; Mr. C. B. Burns, territorial secretary; Mr. Aimé Dugas, clerk; Mr. H. Brown, clerk; Mr. N. Laliberti, territorial librarian?

2. Which, if any, of these gentlemen are absent from the Yukon Territory?

3. What is the aggregate salary of the officials so absent, and who is performing the duties of the absent officials, in each case?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The government is aware that Mr. W. W. B. McInnes, commissioner of the Yukon Territory; Mr. Justice Dugas, senior judge; Mr. Justice Craig, junior judge; Mr. F. T. Congdon, legal adviser to Yukon Council; Mr. C. B. Burns, territorial secretary; Mr. H. Brown, clerk; and Mr. Laliberti, territorial librarian are absent from the Yukon. The government is not aware as to whether Mr. J. E. Girouard, registrar, or Mr. Aimé Dugas, clerk, are at the present time absent from the Yukon. Mr. A. Noel, late Crown Prosecutor has resigned his position. The commissioner has the responsibility as to leave of absence of the officials coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and as to the performance of their duties during absence.

2. Answered by the answer to the first question.

3. Twenty-five thousand dollars. The duties of the commissioner are being performed by Mr. Lithgow; the duties of Justices Dugas and Craig are being performed by Mr. Justice Macauley; and the duties of Mr. Laliberti, territorial librarian, are being performed by Mr. McDonald, clerk of the court.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I beg to state that Mr. J. I. Hartman, postmaster, had to come to Ottawa on account of the death of his wife. He is returning after Christmas.

EXPORT DUTY ON PULP WOOD.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to place an export duty on pulp wood cut in Canada?

2. Is it the intention of the government to put an export duty on pulp made in Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No determination has been come to in the matter referred to.

ALLEGED PROPOSED IMPORTATION OF CONTRACT LABOURERS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH—by Mr. Macpherson—asked:

1. Referring to the following statement in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of December 10, 1906:—'According to a special cable from St. Petersburg, published in the New York 'Sun,' Peter Verieguine, the leader of the Doukhobors in Canada, has arrived in the Russian capital for the purpose of engaging 10,000 Russians to work for two years under contract in railroad construction in this country. He reports that he is authorized to offer free transportation to Canada and repatriation after two years, to 10,000 workmen who will be lodged by the railway authorities, and get forty roubles pay monthly.' Is the government aware that any such person is making any such representations in Russia at the present time?

2. If so, is the government aware at whose instance these representations are being made, or on behalf of what interests any such plan is being proposed?

3. Has the government been requested by any parties to encourage or sanction any such scheme?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government is aware that reports to the effect stated have appeared in the public press.

2. The government is not aware that the representations referred to in the said reports have been made.

3. No.

YUKON MINING CONCESSIONS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. What action, if any, has been taken by the government during the present year with regard to mining concessions in the Yukon ?

2. How many companies have failed to comply with the conditions under which their concessions were originally granted, and what were the names of those companies ?

3. Has notice of cancellation been served upon any company for failure to comply with the conditions of the government grant ? If so, on which companies ?

4. In respect of those companies, which have neglected to carry out the conditions of their leases, and regarding which notice of cancellation has not been served, is it proposed to cancel such leases ? If so, when ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. During the present year the government have cancelled six hydraulic mining leases in the Yukon Territory, owing to the lessees not having complied with the provisions of the regulations and the conditions of their leases. A number of lessees, whose leases have not been cancelled, have been warned that it will be necessary for them in the future to adhere more closely to the expressed conditions of their leases and of the regulations in respect of expenditure in mining operations on their leaseholds.

2. Five companies and one individual. Klondike Government Concession, Limited; Bonanza Creek Hydraulic Concession Limited; Quartz Creek (Yukon) Syndicate, Limited; Messrs. A. B. Palmer, R. H. Palmer, and D. Doig; Messrs. Washburn and Ritchie, also W. H. Scroggie (individual).

3. Yes, on Klondike Government Concession, Limited; Bonanza Creek Hydraulic Concession, Limited; Quartz Creek (Yukon) Syndicate, Limited; Messrs. A. B. Palmer, R. H. Palmer and D. Doig; Messrs. Washburn and Ritchie, and on Mr. W. H. Scroggie.

4. In all cases in which companies fail to comply with the conditions of their leases the same will be cancelled. Cancellation will take place as soon as there is satisfactory evidence before the department of such failure.

YUKON WINTER MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What are the conditions of the present winter mail service to the Yukon ?

2. Have any complaints been received by the government as to the inefficiency of the present service ?

3. Is it true that the Post Office Department has refused to carry all classes of mail matter to Whitehorse, contrary to the wishes of the people of the Yukon ?

4. What are the reasons for refusing to meet the views of the residents of the Yukon in this respect ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The service between Whitehorse and Dawson during the winter months is performed under a contract with the British Yukon Navigation Company. Conditions—three round trips per week when travel is good—or from December to April inclusive—and one trip per week during the period between the close of navigation in the autumn until the road is fit for use in October and November, and one trip during the period in the spring when the travel is breaking up and before navigation begins, or part of April and May. The weight of the mails to be carried on each trip is limited to 700 pounds—350 pounds of which is allowed for the United States mails passing over this route.

2. No.

3. No. All classes of matter are carried to Whitehorse.

4. Covered by answer to question 3.

TAGISH CHARLIE.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Is the government aware that the following paragraph is going the rounds of the United States press :

'Tagish Charlie, the Indian who first found gold in the Klondike creeks, and reported his discovery to white men, was rewarded by the Dominion government in a fashion as unique as it is discreditable to the authorities. In consideration of the public service he had rendered, and on payment of $5,000, he received the privilege accorded to no other Indian in Canada, of purchasing whisky. As poor Charlie avails himself of his privilege by getting drunk nearly every day, and is as regularly fined $25 by the Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, police magistrate, the period of his riches (he is said to be worth $100,000) may be accurately calculated.'

2. Is it true that Tagish Charlie was the original discoverer of the gold deposits on the Klondike ? If not, who is entitled to the credit of the discovery ?

3. Is it true that the government paid $5,000 to Tagish Charlie as a recompense for his discovery, or that he paid $5,000 to the government for the privilege of purchasing whisky ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government is aware that such a report appeared in the public press.

2. It is alleged that he was one of the original discoverers of gold on the Klondyke.

3. No.

THE NEW TARIFF—PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How many delegations have interviewed the government to date in order to have the new tariff modified ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to alter the new tariff ? If so, what items will be changed ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. The delegations have been quite numerous. I could not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) the precise number. But, having regard to the very large number of items in the tariff, the items called in question are comparatively few.

2. If we find, as a result of inquiry, that any matter has failed to receive the fullest possible consideration, and if any mistake has been made, we shall not be too proud to correct that mistake.

FORTHCOMING COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. For what date is the Colonial Conference, or conference between the Imperial Secretary of State for the colonies and the prime ministers of the British self-governing colonies, fixed ?

2. Has the Dominion of Canada been invited to take part in the Colonial Conference, and what is the date of the invitation ?

3. Has the invitation been accepted, and on what date ?

4. How many representatives from Canada took part in the last Colonial Conference of 1902, and who were they ?

5. How many will represent Canada in the coming Colonial Conference ?

6. Who are to be the representatives from Canada at said conference ?

7. Have the Canadian representatives for the coming Colonial Conference been selected ?

8. Has the Imperial government communicated to the Canadian government a programme or summary of questions to be discussed at said Colonial Conference ?

9. What questions are to be discussed ?

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

1. The date of the next colonial conference has been fixed—April 15th, 1907.

2. Yes, May 12th, 1906.

3. It was accepted on October 17th, 1906.

4. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Frederick Borden, Sir William Mulock, Hon. Mr. Fielding, and Hon. Mr. Paterson, took part in the last colonial conference in 1902.

5, 6 and 7. These are matters which have not been decided upon.

8. The imperial government has not communicated the programme of questions to be discussed at the next colonial conference.

9. The questions will be discussed, of course, which are brought to the attention of the conference.

Mr. OLIVER.

YUKON PLACER MINES—MESSRS. GUGGENHEIMER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. How many placer mining claims in the Yukon Territory have been acquired and are now owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, of New York, or any person or persons acting on their behalf ?

2. How many of the placer claims so acquired by Messrs. Guggenheimer are now being operated ?

3. Has the representation work, as required by section 27, chapter 39 of 6 Edward VII., been performed by Messrs. Guggenheimer on the placer claims acquired by them ?

4. Was such representation work done in accordance with the schedule prepared by the Gold Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, as provided in section 27, of chapter 39, of 6 Edward VII.?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. There is nothing in the records of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa to show that Messrs. Guggenheimer, of New York, or any person or persons acting on their behalf, have acquired or are now the owners of placer mining claims in the Yukon Territory.

Mining claims are acquired either by entry or by assignment, and sections 15 and 32 of the Placer Mining Act provide that an application for a claim shall be filed with the Mining Recorder in whose district it is situated, and that the owner of the claim may sell, mortgage or dispose of it, providing the instrument showing such disposal be deposited with the Mining Recorder. All the records of grants and assignments, therefore, are kept by the Mining Recorder for his own particular district, and returns are made monthly to the department at Ottawa, showing the fees collected for grants and assignments.

2. The regulations provide that a person shall do or cause to be done work on the claim each year to the value of at least $200, and shall file with the Mining Recorder an affidavit stating that such work has been done and setting out a detailed statement thereof. It is necessary, therefore, for each claim holder to operate his claim to the extent of at least $200.

3. As there is nothing to show that the Messrs. Guggenheimer are the owners of placer mining claims in the Yukon, of course there is no information as to representation work.

4. There is no information in the department upon which a reply to this question could be framed.

INTER-IMPERIAL TARIFF PREFERENCE—COMING COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government at the coming Colonial Conference to urge upon the imperial government the advisability of

granting preferential terms to the products of Canada in the markets of the mother country, as claimed by the Canadian ministers at the conference of 1902, in their memorandum, dated at London, August 11, 1902, as follows :

'Meanwhile, the Canadian ministers determined to present to the conference a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade, and the desirability of its adoption by the colonies generally, and also expressing the opinion of the prime ministers of the colonies that His Majesty's government should reciprocate by granting preferential terms to the products of the colonies in the markets of the mother country.'

2. Will the said wish be expressed in the form of a memorandum or a resolution ?

3. Will such memorandum or resolution be previously submitted to the parliament of Canada ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Apart from the acceptance of the invitation of His Majesty's government as already explained by the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in answer to a previous question, no action has been taken by the Canadian government with reference to the coming colonial conference.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government, at the coming Colonial Conference, to renew the offer made to the Imperial government at the conference of 1902, in regard to preferential treatment, to wit :

'The existing preference of 33⅓ per cent and an additional preference on lists of selected articles, (a) by further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom ; (b) by raising the duties against foreign imports ; (c) by imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.'

2. What change, if any, is to be made in said offer of 1902, as regards preferential treatment ?

3. Will the government submit to parliament the fiscal proposals it intends to make at said coming Colonial Conference ?

Mr. FIELDING. I must ask my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to accept the answer to the last question as covering this question also.

Mr. MONK. There is a part of this question which is not covered by the answer to the other.

Mr. FIELDING. Which part ?

Mr. MONK. The third question.

Will the government submit to parliament the fiscal proposals it intends to make at said coming Colonial Conference ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will consider that after we have resolved upon them.

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Was the contract for the construction of a post office at Vancouver, B.C., awarded to Messrs. Kelly Brothers & Mitchell ?

2. Was the contract so awarded for a granite or granite and sandstone building ?

3. Has there been any, and if so, what change made in the terms of the contract, and especially what change has been made in the contract as to material ?

4. Of what material is the building being now constructed ?

5. What was the amount of the contract and for what material ?

6. Did Kelly Brothers & Mitchell put in a tender for an all-granite building ? If so, what was the amount of such tender ?

7. Did Messrs. Adams & McDonald put in a tender for an all-granite building ? If so, what was the amount of such tender ?

8. If the material has been changed from granite and sandstone to all granite under the contract of Messrs. Kelly Brothers & Mitchell, has any and what change been made in the contract price ?

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

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Department had asked for two tenders, one for a sandstone and granite building and the other for an all granite building, and when tenders were received had decided to construct an all granite building. A clerical error however occurred whereby selection was made of the granite and sandstone building. This error was subsequently rectified and the contract entered into for an all granite construction.

4. All granite.

5. $434,500. All granite.

6. Yes. $434,500.

7. Yes. $435,500.

8. No change has been made from the original tender.

IMPERIAL NAVAL DEFENCE—HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT STATIONS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What amount has been spent by the government (a) for maintenance ; (b) for improvements on the military and naval stations of Halifax and Esquimalt, respectively, since Canada assumed control of these stations ?

2. What is the estimated cost of the maintenance of each of said stations ?

3. What was the contribution to the imperial naval defence agreed upon by each of the colonies, parties to the Colonial Conference of 1902 ?

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

1. At Halifax, as follows :—

—	Maintenance of fortifications	Repairs to barracks.	To complete construction of forts.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1905-6.....	7,958 19	8,857 09	14,930 05
1906-7.....	4,349 15	12,112 03	6,557 32
	12,307 34	20,969 12	21,487 37

At Esquimalt only $500 has been advanced so far for maintenance and repairs, &c. This sum has not all been expended yet.

2. The estimated cost of the two garrisons for maintenance of and repairs to fortifications, buildings, &c., is: Halifax, $25,000 per annum; Esquimalt, $10,000 per annum.

3. I will read the answer from the papers laid on the table, relating to the Colonial Conference of 1902:

Cape Colony—

£50,000 per annum to the general maintenance of the navy. No conditions.

Commonwealth of Australia—

£200,000 per annum to an improved Australian squadron, and the establishment of a branch of the Royal Naval Reserve.

Natal—

£35,000 per annum to the general maintenance of the navy. No conditions.

Newfoundland—

£3,000 per annum (and £1,800 as a special contribution to the fitting and preparation of a drill ship) towards the maintenance of a branch of the Royal Navy Reserve of not less than 600 men.

New Zealand—

£40,000 per annum to an improved Australian squadron, and the establishment of a branch of the Royal Navy Reserve.

EXPENSE OF MILITIA AIDING CIVIL POWERS.

Mr. SAM HUGHES asked:

1. Upon what occasion since 1899 have the militia been called out to aid the civil powers?
2. What was the cost in each case?
3. By whom in each case were the costs paid?
4. Were any costs paid by the government which have not been repaid by the municipality?
5. What are the places and the amounts concerned?
6. Is it the intention of the government to collect these amounts? If not, why not?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The militia has been called out in aid of the civil power since 1899, as follows:

1 to 5. Steveston strike, Richmond, B.C. (1900-1); cost $2,021.32. All paid by the government.

Valleyfield, P.Q., mill strike (1901-2); cost $4,602.71. Municipality paid $2,040.21 in full settlement.

Toronto, Ont., strike of street railway employees (June, 1902) $3,892, paid for transport of troops from Niagara, and subsequently refunded by the city.

Montreal, P.Q., Longshoremen's strike (1903-4); cost $19.886.12. City of Montreal paid whole amount with interest and costs of judgment, amounting to $21.298.07.

Sault Ste. Marie, Clergue strike (1903-4); cost $7.343.08. Legal proceedings for recovery of the amount taken.

Niagara Falls, Ont., Power Company employees strike (1903-4). Nothing paid by government.

Sydney Mines, Sydney, N.S. (1904-5): cost, $7,809.09. Municipality has paid $2,500 of this, and legal proceedings have been taken for recovery of balance.

Quebec riots, caused by circus employees (1905). No claim against public.

Buckingham, P.Q., mill strike (1906-7). No claims rendered yet.

Hamilton, Ont., street railway strike (1906-7). No claims rendered yet.

Kingston, Ont. (1906), trouble amongst Italian navvies. No claims made against the public.

Winnipeg, Man. (1906). Trouble caused by street railway employees. No claim made against the public.

6. All claims against municipalities have been settled, or legal proceedings instituted, except in the case of Steveston. This municipality being a poor one, legal proceedings have not as yet been instituted.

MAIL SERVICE AT WELLBURN POST OFFICE.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. Has the government received a petition during the last year, signed by the residents of the village of Wellburn, and surrounding neighbourhood, in East Middlesex, asking for daily mail service at Wellburn post office?
2. If so, is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of the petitioners, and when may they expect a daily mail service?
3. If the government does not intend to grant the request of the petitioners, what are the reasons for objecting?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). On 13th March, 1905, a petition was received at this department, through Mr. J. M. McEvoy, K.C., asking for the establishment of a daily mail service to Cherry Grove, St. Ives and Wellburn post offices. Official inquiries were made, when it was ascertained that these offices were at present served semi-weekly at a cost of $68.25. It was estimated that a daily service would involve an annual expenditure of $227.25 per annum, being an increase over the amount now paid of $159. Having regard to the amount of revenue collected at the offices in question, which is barely sufficient to pay the salaries of the postmasters without in any appreciable way providing for the cost of the service, it was considered that the department would not be warranted in establishing a daily service.

Recently the application was renewed by Mr. McEvoy, and the question of increasing the frequency, though not to daily, is now under consideration.

POSTMASTER AT PISQUID EAST.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has Mr. Angus McDonald been dismissed as postmaster at Pisquid East, Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, for what reason, and who is appointed as his successor?

3. What is the distance between the post office, as at present located, and the old location ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) : A petition reached the Post Office Department to the effect that the Pisquid East post office (which should have been Pisquid) was not centrally situate, and that by removing it about half a mile south it would then be at the junction of six roads ; that it would be nearer the school, so that the children could get the mail on their way home from school. Official inquiry having been made, it was ascertained that it would be a great advantage were a change made in the site of the office.

Therefore, in accordance with the prayer of the petitioners, instructions were given to remove the post office and to place the same in charge of Mr. William R. Birt, the change in site necessitating a change of postmaster. The department is informed that the distance between the old site of the office and the present site is three-quarters of a mile.

TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Sam Hughes—asked :

1. What is the depth of water, respectively, in the eastern and western entrances to Toronto harbour ?

2. Is the depth of water sufficient for the purposes of navigation at all times ?

3. Has the government received any complaints from the city of Toronto, the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto, or other persons, because of insufficient depth of water in these entrances during the last five years ? If so, from whom, and when ?

4. Has the government received any report of vessels going aground, or becoming wrecked, because of such insufficient depth, whereby vessels were unable to obtain access to the harbour ?

5. What action does the government intend to take towards deepening such entrances, and when ?

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

1. The governing depth in the eastern channel is 16 feet 6 inches, and that in the western channel, 9 feet, 6 inches.

2. Not at all times and in all weathers.

3. Communications have been received from the following : Board of Control, Toronto, 2nd April, 1902; Harbour Commissioners of Toronto, 25th July, 1903, and on the 21st September 1903; Dominion Marine Association of Kingston, 14th November, 1905 ; Harbour Commissioners of Toronto, 20th November, 1905 ; 11th May, 1906, 15th May, 1906, 17th May, 1906, and 1st November, 1906 ; city solicitor of Toronto, 30th November, 1906.

4. The department was advised that in November, 1905, a large steamer had grounded at the entrance to the eastern channel; that on the 24th April, 1096, the ss. 'Imperial' had gone aground on shoal at eastern entrance, and on 26th November, 1906, last, that a large steam barge had foundered off same entrance during a severe gale.

5. The department has already taken action with reference to improving the eastern entrance, having, by its dredges, removed a total of 89,348 yards of material during the past three years from the eastern entrance, while during the past six years, the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto themselves have removed 70,129 yards from the western channel. Those channels are constantly filling by the action of storms and owing to the nature of the material being washed in.

VESSELS WRECKED AT PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.) moved :

For a copy of all papers, and correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and any person or persons, with reference to the sending of assistance and life boats to the relief of vessels recently wrecked on the north side of Prince Edward Island ; and also all papers and correspondence with reference to establishing life-saving stations and appliances at different points around the coast of Prince Edward Island.

He said : The recent marine disasters off the coasts of the Dominion have, I trust, brought the government to a sufficient realization of the fact that life-saving boats and appliances for the rescue of ship-wrecked mariners have been notoriously neglected by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There are hundreds of miles of the coast line of the Dominion of Canada where very little attention appears to have been paid to this phase of the work of the department. Taking the province of Prince Edward Island, for 300 miles of coast-line there is not a vestige or sign of a life-boat or a life-saving appliance. It is not because the government have not been spending money. Money is being spent lavishly upon the lighthouse and coast service. From the year 1902-3 to 1905-6 the cost of this service, roughly, has trebled. It increased from $964,000 in 1902-3 to $2,-688,000 in 1905-6. Yet no attention has been paid to the matter of supplying life-saving appliances upon the shores of the Dominion. It is not because we have not had many warnings. We had, just about a year ago, the case of the 'Valencia' on the Pacific coast which was a very disasterous and appalling wreck in which many lives were lost. I believe the government have taken this question up and are doing something towards relieving the situation there both in regard to life-saving appliances and lighthouses. But why should we be waiting for a warning to be sounded at different points throughout the Dominion ? The government

should, without any warning of that kind, take the whole matter into consideration and adopt some comprehensive plan for establishing a life-saving service throughout the Dominion. The warnings have been repeated. Just a few days ago we had a case in Toronto harbour where there was quite a loss of life. Down on the coast of New Brunswick, off Rexton, we had a very unfortunate mishap, and I believe that almost the entire crew was lost after remaining on the vessel for some days without there being any possibility of reaching them from the shore. The case to which I wish particularly to refer took place in a north-east gale last month on the north coast of Prince Edward Island. This was one of the worst storms in the history of Prince Edward Island. It came out of an apparently clear sky and lasted for some three weeks. During that time five large vessels were wrecked and ten seamen lost their lives. This storm fortunately occurred at a time when a great deal of the shipping was at an end along those coasts. Otherwise we would have had a much more deplorable loss of life. It was owing to the bravery of some of our individual fishermen along the shore that a greater loss of life was prevented. In connection with the case of a Finnish barque that was wrecked off the north coast of Prince Edward Island, I want to call attention to the bravery exhibited by two young men on that coast, Mr. Duncan Campbell and Mr. Austin Grady, who, at the risk of their own lives, in a sixteen foot dory, went out and rescued part of the crew of the wreck. I also want to call the attention of the minister to a case that occurred off Alberton where Captain Campion and four or five brave seamen went off to the wreck of the schooner 'A. J. McKeen' and rescued the crew.

The minister and the department have had ample warning. A great many shipwrecks have occurred in years previously off the coast of Prince Edward Island. In 1851 there were some 100 fishing schooners of the American fleet caught in a north-east storm off Prince Edward Island and a few days later there were 80 vessels wrecked on this coast and over 160 lives lost. In the August gale of 1873 there were some 40 vessels wrecked on the Prince Edward Island coast, some 40 vessels wrecked on the Magdalen Islands and some 30 vessels wrecked on the coast of Nova Scotia during which upwards of 100 people perished. We have had minor wrecks from that time on until the occurrence of November, 1906. This was probably the worst storm we had since the August gale of 1873. I want to call particular attention to the circumstances surrounding this case and to point out that even with appliances at hand that they might have utilized in the saving of the lives of these seamen through the red tapeism and bungling of the different department of this government, lives were lost.

For my part I was not there at the time, and will not make specific charges, but I shall bring the facts of these shipwrecks and the circumstances surrounding them home to the government and the Minister of Marine by quoting their own party organ the Charlottetown 'Patriot.' I will take the liberty of reading from the 'Patriot' of November, 1906, which contains information coming from an unbiased source as respects this government or the officials who are representing the government in Prince Edward Island. The 'Daily Patriot' of November 9, 1906, says:

Outrageous.

Here are the facts :

Yesterday afternoon M. F. W. Hyndman, Lloyds agent here, waited upon Mr. A. Lord, agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and requested that the 'Minto's' lifeboat be sent at once by rail to Souris, thence across the country, about twelve miles, by teams, to the scene of the wreck, in order to rescue the men in imminent peril of their lives on the wrecked ship 'Sovinto.' Mr. Lord communicated with Mr. Sharp, superintendent of the railway, for a special, and Mr. Sharp refused to send a special with the lifeboat and crew unless the sum of $60 was paid the railway. Mr. Lord, as agent, refused to put up the money.

Here were the two heads of departments in Prince Edward Island the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway and Mr. Lord, the head of the Marine Department. The one refused to pay the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway $60 to send this lifeboat to the rescue of these men and the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway refused to send a special out unless he received $60.

Mr. Hyndman then hastened to the railway and urged Mr. Sharp, in the interests of humanity, to take the responsibility of sending the special. Mr. Sharp positively refused to do so unless the $60 was paid. Mr. Hyndman offered to give his cheque for the $60 in the morning. Mr. Sharp refused the offer and said the money had to be paid before the special left. Mr. Hyndman then gave his personal cheque and at ten o'clock the special with the lifeboat and crew including the sailors of the shipwrecked 'Turret Bell,' who bravely volunteered to help man the boat, started.

The boat reached Souris about midnight, but as the remainder of the sailors are all saved there was no further necessity for her service.

Our readers are now in possession of the facts, and to-day the city is seething with indignation over this outrageous refusal, first of the marine agency here to pay and send the boat, and secondly on account of the superintendent's refusal to send a special with boat and crew without the $60.

Have the heads of these departments no authority ? Are they mere figure heads ? With human life at stake, here is a refusal to send assistance. What kind of a country are we living in ? Although as Lloyds agent it is Mr. Hyndman's duty to look after the underwriters' property, on the other hand it is distinctly the

duty of the government or its agents to look after the lives of the seamen.

No excuse can be offered or accepted in this case. We call upon the ministers of the two departments implicated to sift this matter to the bottom. Public opinion is aroused and there is intense feeling on the matter. Citizens on both sides of politics are strong in their denunciation of the failure of the representatives here of the departments to rise to the occasion and send forward the boat, taking it for granted that both or either department at Ottawa would justify and commend the action.

No government or its representatives can expect to receive the support or confidence of the people, while it tolerates such outrages by its officials. The 'Patriot' absolutely refuses to apologize for such conduct. In some places it might be termed criminal negligence or neglect. Here our people are milder; but nevertheless they feel deeply that the lifeboat was not sent days ago, and gladly and cheerfully sent by both marine and railway officials without any tactless quibbling about the paltry $60.

For my part I place the blame right on the minister and the department at Ottawa, and until they clear their own skirts or shift the responsibility on to the shoulders of their subordinates, on them must rest the blame for this outrageous conduct. The 'Patriot' in another editorial says:

> But we entirely agree with the 'Guardian' when speaking of 'the regrettable failure of the federal departments here to render aid to the shipwrecked sailors' when it says:
>
> 'But it is obvious that the government is responsible for the acts of its subordinates until and except the action of such subordinates is disclaimed or reversed. And the government is always responsible for the general system or want of system under which public affairs are carried on.'
>
> That's the whole matter in a nutshell. If the government upholds its subordinates in this matter, then it will be impossible for the 'Patriot,' or indeed for any other right minded journal to uphold the government in so far at least as the deaths of the ten sailors of the 'Sovinto' are concerned.

We must remember in the first place that the initiative for sending life-saving boats to the wrecked crew of the 'Sovinto' did not emanate from the Marine Department as one would naturally suppose, but from Mr. Hyndman a private citizen. The answer of the minister shows that it was Mr. Hyndman who telegraphed to the Marine Department asking that the 'Stanley' be sent to Souris so that her lifeboat might be taken across some twelve miles of country to the rescue of these men. The department did possibly do what was necessary in that case and they wired to Mr. Lords as follows:

> Hyndman & Company wire as follows:—'Men perishing on 'Sovinto' wreck near East Point, 'Stanley' in Georgetown, Souris people ask for 'Stanley's' life-boat saying they can save the men; will you order 'Stanley' to take her lifeboat to Souris promptly.' Department wishes you to do everything possible to assist.

I believe the 'Stanley' did leave with her lifeboats shortly after the message came to hand, but where did she go? Did she go to Souris as requested? No, apparently from the captain's report the 'Stanley' went past Souris and down off East Point, and then came back to Georgetown, and reported that very high seas were running and that he could not get around East Point. Why did not the captain of the 'Stanley' stop at Souris and send the boat ashore there so that it could be taken across country. It was his failure to do this which apparently made it necessary to apply for the 'Minto's' boat. The captain of the 'Stanley' reported that it was too rough round East Point, but we have information that the steamship 'Amelia' came from the Magdalen Islands to Pictou at that time and the 'Amelia' is a much less seaworthy boat than the staunch ship 'Stanely.' We have also information that several sailing ships on the same day came along this coast where the wrecked 'Sovinto' was and rounded East Point. If these vessels could weather the gale, there seems to be no reason why the captain of the 'Stanley' could not go around East Point to the scene of the wreck. Whether he did or not, he should have landed his boat at Souris without delay. That is another thing which I want the Department of Marine and Fisheries to investigate. I have no wish to make any specific charge against the captain of the 'Stanley' in this case, but it certainly would seem from the information we have at hand that he did not act with that precision which should characterize a man who is entrusted with command. In the matter of the refusal of a special train to take the lifeboat from Charlottetown, I feel sure that the government will take active steps to investigate that. If we have not got competent men with backbone enough to meet the situation when lives are imperilled then the sooner the department reorganizes and gets competent officers the better it will be for the department and for the people of the country. This, and many other circumstance as well, all go to show that the whole Department of Marine needs reorganization. The people of Prince Edward Island and the mainland are constantly humbugged with regard to the transportation of the mails and passengers, and time after time myself and my colleagues have had to protest in this House against the manner in which the different departments are being administered. In the winter time, the Department of Railways, the Department of Marine, and the Post Office Department should work in harmony one with the other as regards the service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. We have found time and again that there has been a deadlock with regard to the transportation of mails and passengers and that there has been any amount of procrastination and deception of the people with regard to the placing of the boats,

the length of time they would run on the different routes, and the giving of information as to these services which deeply concerns the people. We want to put an end to this state of things; we want simple and effective action on the part of the different departments, and we want a localized authority which will take charge of this entire service and which will be able to say at once whether this thing shall be done or that thing shall be done. I have no doubt the officers of the department here may be perfectly willing to do all they can to allay the grievances of the people down there and to give them proper service, but I must protest that the officers up here are not in a position to know the exigencies that may arise in any particular case. They are too far away from the basis of operations. By the time you get an exchange of three or four red tape telegrams and protests from the different boards of trade and organizations that want this or that done, the thing is all in a hub bub and 24 or 36 hours or several days may elapse before the tangle is straightened out. If we had a local, centralized authority to take charge of these different departments a great deal of this dissatisfaction and annoyance would be at an end and the trouble that has occurred, as I said, in November last with regard to the sending of a lifeboat to the scene of a wreck where lives were in danger, would certainly not have arisen.

I would suggest that the next thing we require is immediate action, not only with regard to this point which I have brought up, but more particularly upon the question on which I am speaking this afternoon, the establishment of life-saving stations along the coast of Prince Edward Island. We do not want to wait until another accident occurs. Fortunately these grave accidents have occurred only at intervals of years, but they only go to show that at any time we may be face to face with similar disasters, and it certainly behooves the department to take immediate and effective steps to secure the lives of mariners along our coast in case of accident. I would therefore suggest that the minister should establish three or four lifeboats and rocket appliances at different points along the Prince Edward Island coast, a coast line of some three hundred miles. I would suggest that these lifeboats be placed along the line of railway because the line of railway runs from one end of the island to another and if a lifeboat were placed on the coast it might be miles away from the scene of the accident; whereas if placed along the line of railway it can, by means of a special train, be used at any point along the coast where its services are required. I would suggest that these lifeboats be placed at Souris, at St. Peters, at Charlottetown, at Summerside, and at Tignish. At Charlottetown, you can get a special train at any time and also at Summerside and Tignish, so that these lifeboats could be transferred from these points to the scene of a wreck. These boats I presume would be manned by a captain and cockswain and he would have a certain number of men who would be on call to man the boats in case of emergency. I do not think that the experiment of installing these boats would require a great deal of expense beyond the initial expense of providing the boats and rocket appliances. A certain sum would be paid to the captains for the care of the boats and when the crews went out for practice, possibly they would be remunerated for their services, but I do not think the minister should hesitate in establishing an up-to-date service in this country, and I have no doubt that after the recent disasters on our coast and on the Pacific coast the minister will do all in his power to remedy this grievance and that he will also investigate the recent occurrence in regard to the transfer of boats to wrecks on the north shore.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This question of lifeboat service is a somewhat important one and I must assure my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) that immediately after assuming charge of this department, I gave to this question my most serious consideration. My hon. friend will find in the estimates which were brought down some time ago that a large increase has been made in the appropriation for this service, in order to provide for the establishment of new life-saving stations. I fully realized that the system of life-saving service, in this country was not as extensive as it should be and I am very glad to say that my colleagues acceded to the request which I made to them to increase by almost one-third the vote given in previous years in connection with that service. My hon. friend may be assured that I am entirely in sympathy with everything that can be done in order to reduce to a minimum the loss of life by shipwreck. Of course this question is surrounded with some difficulty. If we examine the life-saving systems of the world, we find that there is a different system in almost every country. There is a system in the United States, there is a different one in Great Britain, and in France, Germany, Sweden and Norway, the system is about the same as in England. I do not know whether it pertains entirely to the government of a country to establish life-saving stations, in fact in the mother country, Great Britain, the government has done almost nothing for the preservation of life. In England, all the life-saving service is in the hands of an association called the 'Royal National Lifeboat Institution.' That institution is maintained entirely by subscriptions and I do not think that the government of Great Britain has contributed anything to it. However, I see that the system which exists in England has been several times very severely criti-

cised, as almost any system which may be established concerning life-saving might be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought in England they had a coast-guard service under the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is under the admiralty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But that is a government institution and it is for the purpose of saving life.

Mr. BRODEUR. They contribute to the life-saving service but they are not the life-saving system which is recognized by the public in Great Britain. I was going to call the attention of the House to the fact that some years ago a member of the House of Commons, Mr. Bailey, moved for the establishment of national life-saving stations in Great Britain, and this motion of his was defeated by a very large majority. The people seemed to be generally well satisfied with the system which was then in existence. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden is perfectly right, there is under the admiralty a coast-guard service, which is not supposed to do the work of life-saving, but of course those men, being connected with the military service of the country, are apt, when occasion arises, to risk their lives for those who are exposed to danger. They are also connected with the customs service in Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are their particular duties?

Mr. BRODEUR. Their duties are supposed to be in connection with the admiralty, with the guarding of the country, it is not connected at all with the life-saving service. As I say when these men see a wreck, they voluntarily risk their lives for the purpose of saving life, but the only association which devotes itself to the life-saving service is the Royal National Life-Boat Institution to which I made allusion. Of course, this association has been criticised in several cases, and very very severely criticised. I might quote the remarks which were made some years ago by Mr. Bayley and Mr. Macara on this question, to show that, notwithstanding the services rendered by these voluntary associations in the saving of human life, they are sometimes were severely criticised. Mr. Bayley, in an article published some years ago, made the following remarks

> Before and since I have worked at the matter privately and in the newspapers, with a very considerable measure of success, although it is difficult of course to claim any specific triumph in view of the enormous difficulties attaching to any attempt to move a government department, and the sentimental, and as I think unfounded, bias which so many well-meaning people exhibit in favour of the existing system, which consists in delegating the duty to the National Lifeboat Institution, a society which, in my judgment, absolutely fails to justify even its existence, much less any claim to the support of the public, which for so many years has generously supported it in maintaining a so-called life-saving service, the very results of which condemn it as unsound in theory and useless in practice.

Of course, I would not like to pass judgment upon so severe a criticism of a charitable institution like the Life-saving Society of England; but that shows how unfair the public may sometimes be towards charitable institutions which may in some cases fail to have the success expected of them by the people.

Mr. STOCKTON. Might not those be in the nature of salvors entitled to remuneration for the saving of life and property?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. This institution, I understand, makes collections from the public, and with the money so obtained maintains along the coast a certain number of life-saving stations, and engages crews and captains for carrying on the work.

Mr. STOCKTON. I asked the question because the minister said the work was entirely gratuitous.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. I said the association itself was not subsidized by the government. The services rendered by the society are gratuitous; but of course those engaged in the work of life-saving are paid out of the money raised by the subscriptions from the public.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. Will the minister tell us the date of the extract he has read?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will find it in the 'New Review' of 1894, page 71.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. That is twelve years ago. There have been a great many changes since then.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that in France a similar system exists. There is there a voluntary association called 'La Société Centrale de Sauvetage des Naufrages,' which performs the same kind of duties as those performed by the English society. It is, however, subsidized by the government. In Germany, in Sweden and Norway, and, so far as I have been able to learn, in all European countries there are voluntary associations of the same kind. The only countries in which there are systems that are not voluntary are the United States and Canada. Of course, our system is not absolutely the same as that of the United States. About fifteen years ago we voted a sum of money for the purpose of establishing some life-saving stations. The amonut of money which was originally voted was very small, and it has only been increasing very slightly. The largest amount which has ever been in the estimates is the one which appears in

the estimates brought down this year. I may say, with regard to the American system, that it has been very severely criticised, and I do not wonder at that, because every time that a loss of life occurs, we may be very sure that there will be in the public mind a very strong feeling against the life-saving society, whether it is voluntary or subsidized by the government, for not saving all the lives lost in these accidents. In an article published some time ago in the San Francisco 'News-Advertiser' there was a very strong criticism of the system existing in the United States. I will just read an extract from that article in order to show how difficult it is sometimes to satisfy public opinion in regard to these accidents, even in a country which spends $2,000,000 a year for that service. This is an article by Mr. Macara, who says:

> A few days ago the local lifeboat service gave another exhibition of its incapacity to perform the work for which it is maintained. These exhibitions of incompetency occur periodically; in fact, it may be said that they occur almost every time that there is a demand for lifeboat assistance.

That is the kind of criticism we find, not only in the United States, where the service may be supposed to be the best in the world; where out of the three thousand lives exposed in wrecks last year, only thirty-four were lost. How is the system in the United States organized? The country is divided into districts, one on the Atlantic coast, one on the Gulf of Mexico, and one on the Pacific coast. The system seems to be organized as completely as possible. For example the Atlantic coast, from the South Atlantic to the boundary line of New Brunswick is patrolled day and night. In spite of that accidents occur and lives are lost. And, when lives are lost there is apt to be very severe criticism of the department. In spite of all the efforts that can be made in these very difficult cases, it is hard to satisfy public opinion. But I may say, with regard to the crews that we employ in the life-saving stations, nothing can fairly be said against them. No person can say that they have not shown courage and heroism when the occasion for the display of these qualities arose. Let me cite the case of Captain Ward and his crew of the life-saving station at Toronto. These officers were severely criticised some time ago, after an accident had occurred and lives had been lost. A vessel which was at the western gap, on account of a change in the wind, had to change its ground and tried to go to the eastern gap. But, so quickly did the storm come on that, within twenty minutes, and before the men had time to save the vessel or even to raise signals of distress she foundered and six men were drowned. Of course the action,—or, as it was then called, the inaction—of our officers was severely criticised by the public. But it was most unfair to criticise the men in charge of the life-saving station; for at the very time when these six men were being swept to their death Captain Ward and his men were saving a crew of fourteen who were in danger in the same harbour, and who, but for this rescue, would inevitably have been drowned. My hon. friend has referred especially to the loss of life which occurred the other day on the coast of Prince Edward Island. I have gone into this matter very fully, and I think I have all the papers which throw light on the question. I am only sorry that my hon. friend has not seen fit to wait until these papers were brought down before passing judgment upon certain officers of my department and the government.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I only quoted the judgment expressed by the government's own organ in Charlottetown.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry that my hon. friend seems willing to follow the views of this newspaper only when it makes mistakes, as in this case. Of course, there was a great deal of excitement at the time in Charlottetown and throughout Prince Edward Island, and, because of that feeling one can readily understand, things may have been published, which, perhaps, would not have been published if all the facts had been absolutely known. My hon. friend speaks especially of Captain Brown not going to Souris. Well the hon. gentleman is making a mistake there, for Captain Brown did go to Souris.

Mr. LEFURGEY. After it was altogether too late.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that was the first place he went to. I would like to state the facts of this case as they actually occurred. It is only fair that I should do so, in view of the impression which has gone abroad that some officers of the government failed in their duty. On the 7th of November last, the department received the following from the agent of Lloyds at Charlottetown, as follows:

> Charlottetown, P.E.I., Nov. 7th, 1906.
>
> Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
> Ottawa.
>
> Large ship ashore near East Point broken in two, part of crew on each section. Government has several steamers here. One should be despatched immediately to render assistance; cannot do so from shore.
>
> HYNDMAN & CO.,
> Lloyds agents.

Immediately the following telegram was sent to the agent of the department at Charlottetown:

> Ottawa, Nov. 7th, 1906.
>
> A. Lord,
> Agent Marine Department,
> Charlottetown, P.E.I.
>
> Render immediately all possible assistance with any government steamer available to ship

ashore near East Point. Advise Lloyds agent, Charlottetown, of these instructions and report your action.

C. STANTON,
For Deputy Minister.

That shows that the department did not lose any time, but that immediately on receiving the telegram the use of the government vessel was authorized to save, if possible, those on the wreck. A few hours after that, we received the following telegram from Lloyds agents :

Charlottetown, November 7th, 1906.

Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Men perishing on 'Sovinto' wreck near East Point, 'Stanley' in Georgetown, Souris people ask for 'Stanley's' lifeboat saying they can save the men. Will you order 'Stanley' to take her lifeboat to Souris promptly.

HYNDMAN & Co.

Answer here is the answer which was sent immediately :

Ottawa, Nov. 7th, 1906.

A. Lord,
Agent Marine Department,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Hyndman & Co. wire as follows: —Men perishing on 'Sovinto' wreck near East Point. 'Stanley' in Georgetown, Souris people ask for 'Stanley's lifeboat saying they can save the men. Will you order 'Stanley' to take her lifeboat to Souris promptly. Department wishes you to do everything possible to assist.

C. STANTON,
Acting Deputy Minister.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When were these telegrams sent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 7th of November—all on the same day.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I asked the minister the other day about telegrams in this case, and these were not given.

Mr. BRODEUR. I read some of these telegrams the other day. On the same day November 7th, we received the following telegram from Mr. Lord :

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Nov. 7th, 1906.

Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

As authorized 'Stanley leaves as soon as steam is up, probably midnight, for wreck near East Point.

A. LORD.

The next day, the 8th of November, in the morning we received the following telegram from Mr. Lord :

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Nov. 8th, 1906.

Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

'Stanley' left East Point wrecks last night. Storm N.E., still raging. Fear cannot do any service, sea reported breaking too far from shore.

A. LORD.

My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) has stated that Captain Brown did not go to Souris. Well, on the 8th of November, we received the following telegram from Mr. Lord, showing that Captain Brown did go to Souris :

Charlottetown, Nov. 8th, 1906.

Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Brown reached Souris, gale N.E., heavy sea thick, could not land north side, went Georgetown for shelter, left for Souris at three p.m. again. I telephoned authority, collector Customs Currie, Souris, to Brown to give Souris crew his lifeboat, impossible 'Stanley' do anything under present conditions.

A. LORD.

There is another telegram from Mr. Lord, on November 9 :

'Stanley' returned two p.m., not get north side three men remaining alive taken on shore last evening by fishermen's dory and one by plank raft. No seamen alive remaining on any of the wrecks.

That shows that those who have said outside and inside the House that the department did not do its best to save the lives of those people, did an injustice to the department. My hon. friend has thought fit, before the papers were brought down, to criticise the department severely, but he must now see by these telegrams that the department did its best in order to save the lives of those people, as it will always be ready to do everything in its power to save the life of any person in peril. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has cast some aspersions upon Captain Brown. I have not the pleasure of knowing Captain Brown very well, I have met him once or twice since I have been in the department. But from what I know of Captain Brown, there is not a man in this country more courageous, more hardy, more devoted to his duties than Captain Brown, the man who has been in charge of the 'Stanley' for many years. I am sorry my hon. friend has thought fit to cast aspersions upon a man who enjoys the confidence, not only of the people of his island, but of everybody in the maritime provinces who knows him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand there was an application to some agent of the department for the use of a lifeboat.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was coming to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wanted to find out what delay there was between the date when this application was made and the time the lifeboat was actually granted.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was going to take up that question. I suppose my hon. friend refers to the application made to Mr. Lord to send the lifeboat of the 'Minto' to Souris, by special train. With regard to that, I may say that the department was not informed of the circumstance at the

time. The only correspondence which was exchanged between our agent Mr. Lord and the department was the telegrams I have just read. He did not communicate to us the fact that he was applied to for the lifeboat of the 'Minto' and asked to send it by special train to Souris. I may tell my hon. friend that if Mr. Lord thought the price was too high, or if he thought that any service could be rendered by this lifeboat, and had applied to the department for permission, he would certainly have received the necessary authority to do so. Certainly the instructions were broad enough. The first telegram was sent him on November 7, when we told him :

Render immediately all possible assistance.

On the same date we sent a second telegram when we were asked to send the lifeboat of the 'Stanley.'

Department wishes you to do everything possible to assist.

So far as the department is concerned, we gave him instructions and the necessary authority to render all possible assistance. I do not know exactly for what reason he did not refer to us the request he received for the lifeboat of the 'Minto'; but I understand from the report which he has sent to us that there is some reason for that. This application was made to him in the afternoon of November 8, and it was a few minutes before he got orders from the department to send the lifeboat of the 'Stanley.' The 'Stanley' was then lying at Georgetown and the 'Minto' was lying at Charlottetown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where was the wreck?

Mr. BRODEUR. The wreck was at East Point, off the coast near Souris. Georgetown was the nearest point to the wreck, and therefore we had given instructions to send the 'Stanley,' which was at Georgetown, to the assistance of the people who were wrecked at East Point. He received this telegram ordering him to send the lifeboat of the 'Stanley.' I understand by a report I have in my hand, and which I have just received to-day, that a few minutes before he received our telegram ordering him to send the lifeboat of the 'Stanley,' he received an application from the Lloyds agent to send the lifeboat of the 'Minto' by special train. He communicated with the Intercolonial agent at Charlottetown to get a special train, and was told that the price was $60. I do not want to discuss the question whether the agent of the Intercolonial was justified in doing that, I suppose he acted according to his instructions. At all events, our agent, Mr. Lord, did not refer the matter to us, and if he had done so I would probably have given instructions to charter the special train and to render all the assistance possible. But here is what happened. At the same time that this application was made for the lifeboat of the 'Minto' he gave instructions to the lifeboat of the 'Stanley,' which was at Georgetown some forty or fifty miles nearer to proceed to the wreck. When he was asked to send the lifeboat of the 'Minto' and was told that it would cost $60, he thought he was not justified in sending it. On this ground my hon. friend charges the department with responsibility for the loss of life. I may tell him that at the time this application was made for the lifeboat of the 'Minto' to proceed to the wreck, the lives of all the persons on that boat were already saved. On the day before a certain number of people had lost their lives because, I understand, they had left the wreck unprepared to reach the shore. On the next day when Mr. Lord could have sent this lifeboat by special train, all the persons on that wreck had been saved. I suppose therefore my hon. friend will at least do us the justice to say that we were not the cause of any person losing his life by failure to send that special train.

I think that disposes of the serious charge which has been made outside this House that Mr. Lord acted improperly in regard to sending lifeboats. When he knew that the lifeboat of the 'Stanley' had left for the scene of the wreck, he was asked a high price for sending the lifeboat of the 'Minto,' and I suppose he thought the lifeboat of the 'Stanley' could accomplish the work, and in fact it had already left for the scene of the wreck.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Sixty dollars a head was too much.

Mr. BRODEUR. It may be that Mr. Lord could have paid the $60 but my hon. friend knows very well the character of Mr. Lord. He is a very cautious man. Last year Mr. Lord was severely criticised in this House because he had bought some potatoes a little too high and he was perhaps afraid this year of spending $60 for that purpose. Now, I am glad that this discussion has come up because the impression has gone abroad that the department has not done its duty in connection with this matter. I think we have shown that the department has done all in its power to assist the saving of the lives which were exposed in that wreck.

Now, a word in regard to those two young men who went to save the lives of those three who were on the wreck. Those two young men certainly deserve the praises which my hon. friend has given them. They have shown once more the hardihood, devotion and energy of our fishermen generally. We must recognize that our fishermen on the coasts are among the bravest men to be found in the world. Some of them are not highly educated men, they have not obtained a very high education, but at the same time you must recognize their energy, their devotion, their hardihood and, in

cases like this, their heroism. I am glad to bear this testmony to these two young men, who, in spite of the waves that were breaking upon the coast, in spite of the almost sure death that they were exposing themselves to, seeing these people whose lives were in jeopardy, took a fishing dory which was lying on the shore and risked their lives in saving these seamen. They deserve the praises which have been bestowed upon them by my hon. friend and I hope that it will be the privilege of the department very soon to offer rewards to these men befitting the heroism which they displayed on that occasion. I have not consulted those who have had anything to do with the patronage of the island concerning that. I intend very soon to establish some stations on the Prince Edward Island coast and I will be glad to offer to these two young men the position of keeper to show that the country wants to reward those to whom reward is due. My hon. friend has referred to the question of establishing life-saving stations on the island. I am giving this matter my most serious consideration. I have already reports made by the officers of the department on that question. I have no less than three reports before me at the present time. I am giving this matter my most serious consideration and I hope before long to be able to establish some life-saving stations on the island.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion. I have heard all that has been said by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) of the disastrous loss of life down in the province of Prince Edward Island. I agree with many of the statements which he has made. Earlier in the session, I think, on the 28th November, I called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this subject in this manner:

1. Has the government taken any steps to provide life saving stations along the coast of Prince Edward Island, in order to prevent a recurrence of the losses of life and property such as happened during the recent severe storms on the eastern coast of Canada ?

I got an answer to that question in the affirmative. I lost no time in bringing the matter to the notice of the Marine Department. I was astonished when I heard the hon. minister trying to shelter himself by quoting before the House what was done in Great Britain and in European countries and especially when he quoted what was done so far back as 1894. I am not very sure that the state of affairs which he referred to as existing in the old country is altogether correct. He referred to the state of affairs that occurred in Great Britain tweve years ago, as his model for Canada to-day. Then, he referred to the United States and read a report showing that the life-saving system in the United States was defective. Mr. Speaker, what has that to do with Canada or Prince Edward Island? Is that any justification? Was there any system at all in Prince Edward Island? It is not that the system was inefficient or defective; it is that there was no system at all. I was very much taken aback that his speech was mainly devoted to defending his department. He never told this House what he intended to do. He said he had reports, but the House is just as wise now in regard to what he is going to do as before he got up to speak. I am going to tell the hon. minister where he is wrong and where the Department of Railways is wrong. The agents down in Prince Edward Island are tied down by strict rules and they are afraid to make a move without consulting the departments here. That is a state of affairs which should not exist. In the present case what happened. They had to telegraph to Ottawa before they could make a move. Why should that be the case? Are there not men in Prince Edward Island who know what is required there ? The matter is due to the strict manner in which the agents are held down by the departments. I remember three years ago—I do not know whether it was under the present minister or some other minister—that the winter steamer 'Stanley' was three months icebound. They had to have instructions from Ottawa before any relief could be sent to that steamer. The 'Minto' finally went to the rescue of the 'Stanley.' Her propellor was broken. The lives of the men on the 'Stanley' were in jeopardy just as much as the lives of men were at stake in the recent storm off east point. What had the people of Prince Edward Island to do? They had to organize a rescue party and go to the relief of the 'Stanley.' It was only by the efforts of the people of Prince Edward Island that the 'Stanley' was released. I do not lay the blame on the agents in Prince Edward Island, on Mr. Lord, or Captain Brown, or Mr. Sharpe. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) will pay any attention to me I will bring to his recollection the fact that Mr. Sharpe, who represents the railway company in Charlottetown, is not at liberty to do what he would like to do. There is no person in this House but will say that these men are men with warm hearts and that they would like to go to the rescue of those whose lives are in danger. The fact is they were bound down by strict rules from the department at Ottawa and they were afraid to incur the expense. I remember a few years ago when there was a snow blockade on the Prince Edward Island Railway, I asked the Minister of Railways if his department was doing anything to raise the blockade, and he said that the people down there should get out and shovel the snow themselves.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Will my hon. friend pardon me for interrupting him to say that I made no such remark as that which he has attributed to me. When my hon. friend was speaking on that occasion I interjected: 'Do you expect me to go down there and shovel the snow,' and that was made the basis of the allegation that I had said that the people of Prince Edward Island should get out and shovel the snow. I made no such statement. This is the first opportunity I have had since I have learned of the allegation to make a correction. I now say that I made no such statement as that attributed to me.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. Of course I accept the word of the minister, but I suppose the 'Hansard'——

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think you will find it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. Of course I shall not contradict the minister, but that is what I understood him to say and I think that is what is in 'Hansard.' At all events in the present instance Mr. Sharpe knew under what a hard and strict master he was and he was afraid to incur the paltry expenditure of $60. I remember that some few years ago when the passengers landed from the winter boat after being two or three days out in the Gulf they wanted a special train to bring them from Georgetown to Charlottetown, but they had to put their hands in their pockets and pay for that train because the Railway Department held the superintendent under such strict rules that he was afraid to act. I remember another instance of the same kind in Georgetown a few winters ago. The people there wanted a telephone down on the wharf to make inquiries as to the steamer, but the telephone was refused by the Railway Department and a few private citizens had to put their hands in their pockets to get a telephone and then when the telephone was there the government were ashamed and paid for it. I trust that in this case they will refund the $60 to Mr. Hyndman and not leave him at the loss of it. He deserves the gratitude of every lover of humanity. I do not wish to take up the time of the House or to make any political capital out of this matter, but I do say to the head of the Railway Department and to the head of the Marine Department that they do not give their officers in Prince Edward Island that proper control which men of ability—and they are men of ability—ought to have. If time had not been wasted in telegraphing back and forward to Ottawa there is no doubt in my mind but that a number of lives would have been saved. I am glad that the Marine Department is about to recognize the services of Mr. Grady and Mr. Campbell who in a small dory and in the face of tumultuous seas risked their lives for the lives of others. I may tell the Minister of Marine, however, that the people of Prince Edward Island have, out of the generosity of their hearts subscribed a purse of $500 for these brave men, and I suppose the Marine Department will likely now give them a medal. There is one thing I wish to say in regard to the captain of the 'Stanley.' I cannot understand why the Minister of Marine should get up in the House to lecture my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) for placing blame on Captain Brown. My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) said nothing which in the least reflected on Captain Brown. He simply quoted from the government organ in the province its reference not only to Captain Brown, but to all the circumstances of the case, and it is unfair for the Minister of Marine—who I thought was a fair-minded man—to cast any imputation on the conduct of my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey). I think the minister should withdraw that part of his speech; it had no bearing on the discussion at any rate. I believe that Captain Brown is a very able man and that he has performed good service for the province. I believe also that Mr. Lord and Mr. Sharpe are painstaking officials. I do not blame these gentlemen. I blame the department here in Ottawa. Let me suggest this to the Minister of Marine: These severe storms come periodically along our coast; we had one in 1851, another in 1872 and another very severe storm last year, but this great maritime country of Canada, perhaps the fifth maritime nation of the whole world, has done practically nothing in the way of establishing life-saving stations. I would advise the minister not to go to France for his example, or not even to Great Britain where he says there is nothing to learn, let him save a little of the money that has been wasted every year in his department and let him go to the United States, the most progressive nation in the world, to see what he ought to do in this respect, and if he does I believe he will do a great service to the country. I regret that the minister spent so much time in discussing what his department has done and in trying to free it from blame instead of enlightening the House as to what he intends to do in the future.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). If we are to take literally the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) we would assume that his object was to obtain better facilities for the saving of life around the coast of Prince Edward Island. But apparently, the real object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) and his coadjutor in the representation of that province is not what a reasonable mind would assume from the motion itself, but rather to endeavour to impute blame to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries more particularly, because some unfortunate sailors on the steamer 'Turret Bell' had lost their lives.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is certainly part of what I rose to tell the House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I understood my hon. friend to say that although his resolution apparently was intended to obtain better facilities, really underneath he had that idea in view. I would like to say that, coming from one of the maritime provinces, I would unhesitatingly support my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) did he really desire and honestly wish by introducing this resolution and by his remarks to impress on the House and the minister the necessity of providing more complete means for saving life around the various maritime provinces. As a maritime people, those of us representing the provinces down by the sea who have so many citizens among our constituents, who make their living out of the sea, we realize perhaps more completely than hon. gentlemen from other portions of Canada, the importance and necessity of providing up-to-date means of life saving, particularly in the autumn season of the year and I hope that notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island have not been candid and have sacrificed the reasonable proposition they should have made in the interests of the country and of their constituents more particularly, in discussing these questions in order that they may impute wrongfully some blame to the department, I hope, notwithstanding that, the minister will realize the importance and necessity of completing day by day and year by year, these life-saving stations around the various provinces by the sea.

I did not have the opportunity of hearing my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), but I heard my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) and his speech is a sample of the peculiar utterance which comes from gentlemen of his peculiar type coming from that province of Prince Edward Island. There is no blame to be attached to Captain Brown, no blame to be attached to Mr. Lord, no blame to be attached to anybody except my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) he says and the only reason why any blame should be attached to the minister is that my hon. friend does not agree with him in politics. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) has provided evidence so clear and so complete, as to where the blame should rest in regard to this matter, that I am sure my hon. friend will admit before this discussion closes that Mr. Lord, who happens to be the agent of the department at Charlottetown, is the one man who ought to be condemned by the House, and by the minister, and in my judgment ought to be dismissed. Of course it would not please the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) if he was dismissed. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) does not want him removed. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) knows the absolute and complete instructions of this department were given as contained in the telegrams brought down as may be seen by the telegram of November 7, in which he was instructed to render immediately all possible assistance, and by a further telegram that 'the department wishes you to do everything possible to assist.' Notwithstanding these instructions, repeated twice in the same day, this gentleman, Mr. Lord, refused to exercise the ordinary reasonable discretion that any man of ordinary common sense having to do with a public office in this country would have exercised under the circumstances, and to provide the funds necessary to convey that boat there at the time and under the condition that life might be saved. What were the facts in regard to this matter as exemplified by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) reading from the government organ which my hon. friend has given to the House as a statement of the facts which this House can regard as absolutely trustworthy. That statement was to the effect that application was made to the agent of the department asking him to provide means by which the lifeboat of the 'Minto' could be sent to the scene of the disaster. On going to the Railway Department to ascertain how the boat could be taken there he discovered it would cost a certain amount of money. He then refused to pay the money. He might as well have refused to pay men to take the boat down to the 'Stanley' if she was going to convey the boat from Charlottetown to the scene of the wreck. The most ordinary common sense would have warned him in the face of the repeated instructions from this department to use every possible means to provide assistance to these people whose lives were in danger, and should have compelled him or any other man worthy to occupy a position of that kind to pay for that boat being taken to the scene of the wreck. But this gentleman did not do that. He absolutely declined to do that and in addition did not ask the government in Ottawa what he should do, never communicated to them the fact that the boat might be taken there before the 'Stanley' could reach the scene, took no means of any kind in order that the minister or his officials in Ottawa might know that a boat might be sent there in time to save life. When Mr. Lord did not do that, what is the use of my hon. friends from Prince and Queen's (Mr. Lefurgey and Mr. A. Martin) coming here and talking about the department? If this gentleman did not perform the ordinary common-sense duties which a man would perform, no matter whether he were a government official or not, and advise his superior as to conditions of that kind, I submit that the proper course would be to deal with him as a man

who has no common sense, and that the people of this country and of Prince Edward Island, in view of what the 'Daily Patriot' says, do not require his services longer.

In dealing with this case, I am endeavouring to place the blame where it actually belongs. Do my hon. friends mean to say to the people of this country that the minister is to be blamed for a condition of facts as to which he was absolutely and totally ignorant, when he had given these instructions, positive and clear as they were to his agent there, and the agent not only declined to carry them out, but failed to acquaint his superiors with the conditions as they really were, I am sure my friends will agree with me that it is the bounden duty of the minister to deal with his case, as it is a serious one, a case of absolute neglect of duty on the part of this agent in Prince Edward Island. The evidence on that point is so clear that it is not arguable. I regret that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) should find fault with Captain Brown of the 'Stanley.' Let me say then that coming from the province adjacent, where these boats touch, we all realize that in the two men in charge of the winter boats we have experienced navigators, men whose judgment as to what is proper and fair to be done, and what is right for the safety and interests of the people who have to cross between the mainland and the island in the winter, is of so high a character that it would be with the greatest possible difficulty that any one could be found to replace them and there is no evidence here, and I understand that my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) has reproved my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) because he ventured to indicate that Captain Brown was to be blamed for any neglect of duty in regard to this matter.

But we were told here by my hon. friend that the Minister of Railways is to be blamed because he said something about shovelling snow a couple of winters ago. We are told that the department did not do this and did not do that in previous years in regard to winter communication. I wish to submit to the House and to the country that if there have been any difficulties in regard to winter communication they are very largely traceable to the gentleman who is in default on this particular occasion, the agent in charge of the Marine and Fisheries Department in Prince Edward Island, and yet, notwithstanding that the evidence is so clear that the agent there declined to interpret these full and plain instructions in the way any ordinary man would interpret them, in view of the fact that he failed to advise the department that there lay within reach easy means of saving life, in spite of that the member for Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) ventures to say that he does not want to blame Mr. Lord, but he wants to blame the minister who did not know there was even a lifeboat in Charlottetown, did not know there was any means by which a boat could be taken to the scene of the wreck simply and solely because Mr. Lord did not advise him of the fact. It seems to me that my hon. friends have forgotten the real facts of the case. They would like to impute some blame to the minister on account of the fault of a gentleman who is much more close to them and has to do with this situation in the province of Prince Edward Island, and I am sure that the member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) if he was candid, if he honestly wanted to assist in the establishment of life-saving stations in Prince Edward Island, and to have better conditions there, would agree with me in saying to the minister that the agent who is now in charge of the department in Prince Edward Island is not a gentleman who should be in that position, that he is a man who, in the interests of the country, should be removed. It is rather refreshing to hear my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Alex. Martin), associated as he is with a party which in days gone by always told us that we should look to the mother country for precedents, telling us now that we ought not to look to Great Britain or to any other country across the Atlantic, but we ought to look to the United States as the guiding star by which the Department of Marine and Fisheries hereafter should shape its course.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Your own minister stated that they were the best equipped.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is not fortunate in his suggestion as to where we should look for guidance. I agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) that we have not conditions in this country under which private subscriptions would be available for the purpose of establishing coast-guard and life-saving stations. As I have said, I think that work should begin with the government. I hope there will be two results from this discussion—first, that the hon. member for Prince will see that this agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Prince Edward Island, who will not attend to the instructions of the department is removed and a better man put in his place, and, secondly, that we may have a further extension of life-saving stations all around the coasts of the maritime provinces.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I). Having read some articles in the newspapers and some speeches delivered a few days ago in the Senate on this subject, and having listened to the remarks in this House this afternoon, I have come to the conclusion that on this question, as on many others,

the man who is most dogmatic and emphatic, who knows all about it, is the one who in reality knows very little about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that a reflection on the hon. gentleman who has just sat down ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I consider that it would be unfortunate if people in other countries, particularly in the countries where the wrecked vessels were owned, read these articles and these speeches; because if they did, they would come to the conclusion that the officials of the government of Canada were inhuman monsters who did not care for the suffering or even the lives of their fellow creatures, and that the regrettable loss of life that resulted from the wreck of the barque 'Sovinto' might have been avoided if reasonable life-saving appliances had been available—a very erroneous impression, because the regrettable loss of life on that occasion was due to the mistakes made by the captain of the wrecked ship, as I think I shall be able to prove. Let me state here that three other ships were wrecked on the same coast during the same storm within a short distance of the place where the barque 'Sovinto' was wrecked, and every soul on board of each of these ships was saved. The first ship to go ashore was the 'Turret Bell,' about twenty miles distant from where the wreck of the 'Sovinto' occurred, and every soul on board was saved, including the captain's wife, because the crew appear to have done everything that was requisite to save themselves. The next ship to go ashore during the same storm was an iron ship called the 'Olga,' about four miles from this wreck, and on this occasion, again every soul on board was saved, including a lady passenger, and very great assistance was rendered to the crew by the people on shore. The next that went ashore was a vessel laden with fish. This was a mile distant from this wreck, and here again everybody on board was saved.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. By what means were they saved ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The crew of the ship 'Olga' were saved by their own efforts, aided by people on shore, who tied ropes around their bodies and went out into the water. With regard to the barque 'Sovinto,' she went ashore between midnight and morning. As soon as the captain found himself in the breakers, he cast both anchors into the sea, which proved to be the first mistake he made. The ship dragged her anchors for some distance, and struck at the worst possible place—a ledge of rock a little distance from the shore. The anchors held and the ship was grounded on the boulders. The anchor chains held the forepart of the ship, and about two-thirds of the latter part broke away. If the anchors had not held, the ship would in all probability have gone ashore in a little cove a short distance to the west of where she broke, noth east as the wind was. She had on board a large deckload of deals, which went overboard as soon as the ship struck, and the water between the ship and the shore was covered with deals driven in every direction by the force of the wind and waves. When the ship parted there were three men forward putting on their life-belts, and they were kept there and could not return to the rear part of the ship, and two of them were afterwards drowned. The rest of the crew were in the cabin in the afterpart of the ship. They had some nourishment, chiefly molasses and port wine, sufficient to sustain them for some days. As the day wore on the captain and crew decided to launch their own lifeboat, which was one of the best that could be built. The ship was classed A 100 at Lloyds. The people on shore—fishermen and farmers —rendered what assistance they could. They saw that the crew were doomed, because it was almost impossible for any boat to live in that sea with the quantity of deals drifting about in the water, and they instantly prepared to render what assistance they could. They tied ropes around their waists and the hardier ones went into the sea at the risk of their lives, while the others held the ropes up on the rocks. The ship's lifeboat had not been more than two or three minutes in the water when it was dashed against the ship's side and the air-tight compartments were broken, she became lopsided and instantly precipitated the men into the sea. Three of the men climbed back to the ship, the others clung to the boat. Several of them lifted themselves to the planks; the captain was one of these. He found himself, first, on two or three planks with one of his men. The next wave swept him off the planks, but he found himself near the lifeboat and he grasped the life line. They were fifteen or twenty minutes in the water. Every man might have been lost but for the assistance rendered from the shore. As the men floated in they were seized by the people who had waded to their armpits in the water. Every man so rescued was unconscious and was carried to shore in that condition. But for the launching of the lifeboat at that time in all human probability the crew would have been saved. The second following day, the after part of the ship, with the three men who had clambered back on the wreck, drifted further into shore and lay broadside to the shore thus making herself a breakwater. The deals were strewn along the shore for miles, but the sea had gone down somewhat and there were fewer planks between the ship and the shore. It was then that these two young men, Grady and Campbell put out in their dory. They thought they had some chance to reach the ship—there had been no chance up to this time. They volunteered and with the dory, reached the

ship and took off two of these men who were still on the after part of the vessel, where all might have remained in comparative safety up to that time. They found it impossible to reach the forward end where the three men were. And the second day after the wreck had occurred, two men were washed off and the third saved himself by swimming to shore with his life belt on. As he came near the shore he was seized and rescued by those who had waded out for that purpose.

These are the facts of the case. These men could not have been saved by any lifeboat launched from the shore, as proven by the fact that the lifeboat launched from the ship and manned—it is to be presumed—by an experienced crew of seamen—did not live more than two or three minutes. And before she reached shore she was broken into matchwood. Every man who was saved had been wounded by the deals. And most of those who were lost were not drowned but were killed by the deals that were hurled against them with the combined force of wind and wave.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was speaking, asked as to the date when this unfortunate haggling occurred between the two government officials in regard to sending a special train with the lifeboat. As a matter of fact, some hours before that—as the minister explained—the last man had left the doomed ship. But these officials did not know that and are not thereby excused. This haggling over the special train was the only indefensible part of the whole transaction, in my opinion. For, as I have stated, no matter what assistance had been available in the way of lifeboats, no assistance could have been rendered until the sea had gone down somewhat, so that a lifeboat could go out from shore with some reasonable degree of safety. And let me say here to the minister that if he desires, as he has already stated he does, to reward the men who risked their lives in the dory on that occasion—no doubt they did risk their lives—he should also remember the men, who, for two days went down into the sea and risked their lives in the midst of the flying deals to save the men who came from the ship. For two days these men remained on the shore, only going home for food. Throughout the night they kept fires burning, and when the men were rescued, everything that humanity could suggest, everything that people could do, was done for these poor sailors. And, as proof of the care that was taken of them, we have the fact that in a few days, nearly every man was able to go around, while only one man took pneumonia and he recovered.

I agree with what has been stated—that life-saving stations should be provided on the maritime coast of this country. But we must face the fact that wrecks will take place and loss of life will occur no matter what life-saving stations are provided. These fatal disasters are by no means unknown in these countries or in those places where life-saving stations are found. Considering the number of vessels cast away on that coast during that heavy storm, it is a wonder that no more lives were lost. Four ships were cast away in that gale within a few miles of each other, and only ten of the crew of one ship were lost, and these were lost through the mistake made by the captain of the ship himself.

I trust that the statements which have been made in the excitement of the moment and without full knowledge of the facts, whether those statements were made in newspapers or in the other chamber of this parliament, will not be taken seriously by people living in other countries. After the remarks made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) with regard to Mr. Lord, the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Charlottetown, it would appear that my hon. friend is not friendly to Mr. Lord. Mr. Lord is not a perfect man, but I believe he is endeavouring to do his duty as he sees it. He is a timid man—too timid perhaps. It seems to me he was not justified in the course he took in refusing to pay for a special train that was ordered out with the lifeboat. But he has this explanation to offer: That, this was late in the afternoon, and in the early part of that same day he had a message from Captain Brown informing him that he was on his way to Souris with the lifeboat. Mr. Lord may have thought he might reasonably conclude that the lifeboat of the 'Stanley' would be at Souris before he could send the 'Minto's' boat by train. In addition to that, when Lloyds' agent called asking him for the lifeboat, he saw the telegram from Lloyds authorizing the agent to spare no expense to rescue the crew, and he asked Lloyds' agent to pay for the special train. This is the explanation he gives. It may or may not be a justification of his action. There can be no doubt that some delay was caused by the haggling over the sending of the special train. But no real harm resulted from this. I would ask—and I am sure Mr. Lord will be glad if the request is granted—that the minister should hold an investigation into this matter. If it be found that blame attaches to Mr. Lord or to anybody else, let punishment be administered. But it is unfair for men who know but little of the acts to cast blame upon agents of the departments in the strong manner in which my hon. friend from Pictou has done.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). I desire to call attention to the fact that a similar accident to that which has formed the subject of debate this afternoon occurred off the coast of the county

of Kent, N.B., and all those on board the wrecked vessel, eleven men perished. For five days this wreck lay on the coast, and it was impossible to reach the men owing to there being no life-saving appliances in that part of the country. When, after the lapse of five days, parties reached the vessel with the boats that were available for the purpose, they found not a single soul on board. Owing to the lack of life-saving appliances, every man had been lost.

Now these wrecks occurred within from half a mile to a mile of each other. If there had been a life-saving station anywhere near, all these lives could have been saved. I do not know, the newspapers do not state, whether any communication was made with the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the time, I do not know anything that the department could have done to save those lives. I am not attempting for a moment to cast any reflection upon the department with regard to this matter. I am only calling the attention of the House to it for the purpose of showing how essential and necessary it is that we should have, with our large maritime trade, life-saving stations at different points. Now so far as this particular matter is concerned, I fail to see that the department was very much to blame. I am not in the habit of giving any bouquets to any department of this government, but it does seem to me that they acted with considerable promptitude in the matter. I think, however, that the agent was very blameworthy in that regard. It does seem to me that he had no right to haggle over the price under the circumstances. It seems to me that the instructions contained in that telegram were quite ample for any man to act upon who had a proper understanding of his duty. Whether or not those lives could have been saved, is another matter. I think the government should probe this matter to the bottom, and ascertain who was really to blame, if any one was to blame, for the loss of those lives, because it is a reflection upon the maritime management of the department that lives should be lost in this way if it was possible to save them. It should not have been necessary for the agent to telegraph to the department at all. His general instructions were quite ample for any man who desired to do his duty. I do not care who the man is, if through his negligence and misconception of his duty, these lives have been lost, he should be severely punished.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Hughes) made some remarks with regard to nautical knowledge which I almost thought were directed a little toward the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). I would like to point out to the hon. member for King's that when he undertakes to say, without any nautical experience himself of much importance, so far as I am aware, that this captain made a mistake, and that the loss of these lives is due to that mistake, he is going pretty far.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I beg to say that the captain himself told me so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he has, that is another thing.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. And so have other seafaring men of thirty years' experience. He did the best he could.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as that is concerned, I do not know whether the captain made the statement having regard to the conditions which were apparent to him at the time, or with regard to the conditions which were apparent afterwards. It is with regard to conditions which are apparent at the time that any man must be judged, and notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's statement, I should be very much surprised indeed to learn that the captain acknowledged that he had made a mistake having regard to the conditions as they appeared to him at the time. It is a very simple matter, after we are on shore, for any of us to criticise events which took place during a storm at sea and say that a man made a mistake. Any sea captain, looking back at what he had done, and understanding the conditions of the case which he did not perceive at the time, may acknowledge that if he had taken another course the result might have been different. But that is not what I understood to be the imputation of my hon. friend from King's. I understood his imputation to be that the captain made a mistake which he should not have made, having regard to his knowledge of the conditions at the time. These matters come before the courts over and over again, cases with regard to the abandonment of vessels as a total loss, with regard to the exit or non-exit from a harbour in threatening weather, and the rule which the courts have invariably laid down is that it is not right to judge any man by conditions which he afterwards discovers, but according to the conditions as they presented themselves to him at the time.

Now, what I wish to say with regard to this matter is that there is too much necessity for negotiating between the different departments of the government. That is the whole secret of one difficulty which occurred in this case. The hon. member for King's has explained—and I am glad he has done so, because I did not so understand it before—that even if there had not been this shuffling which took place at Charlottetown, the result would not have been different, because the last man, I understood him to say, had left the vessel before the lifeboat could possibly have reached this spot.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Some hours before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So it does not appear that the result would have been different. But in a visit to Prince Edward Island that I made a couple of years ago I found this difficulty with regard to the railway service, the postal service and the conveyance of passengers. I found there were three departments involved, the Post Office Department, the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the necessity for negotiation between these departments, the necessity for one department to obtain consent of another for a special train for the conveyance of mails, for example, the delay which took place through these negotiations, was responsible for a great deal of the dissatisfaction and poor service of which the people of Prince Edward Island have so often complained. That is the point that impressed me most in listening to this debate. I do not think it is so much the fault of any man. I am not prepared to pronounce judgment upon any man until the papers are brought down and a proper investigation has been held, and until the men have a right to make their own defence. But I am prepared to say that there is too much necessity for these negotiations. Why should not the Department of Railways and Canals, owning a government railway, convey a government life boat to the scene of the wreck without the payment of $60 in hand? What does it amount to? If the Department of Marine and Fisheries was to pay it to the Department of Railways and Canals, it would be simply handing it over from one department of the government to another, it would not mean five cents one way or the other to the people of this country. That through negotiations of this kind, a mere matter of bookkeeping between the departments of the government, lives of men on board ships wrecked on the coast of Prince Edward Island shall be put in jeopardy I do not think that is a condition of affairs which should obtain. I trust that these three departments of the government will see to it that their officers in the province of Prince Edward Island shall have a much freer hand in taking measures for the safety of life and the conveyance of the people of the province in their business affairs, than they have had in the past. I am not saying this by way of reproach to the present administration, it may have been so under the previous administration. But, however, that may be, even if it continued under a Conservative administration for fifteen years and under a Liberal administration for ten years, it is time it should be stopped, and I venture to think that in making that suggestion to the government I will have the approval of every member on both sides of the House.

Now with regard to the main feature of this debate which, after all, is not with regard to what has been wrong in the past, but as to what we may expect in the future. What action ought the government to take for the purpose of preventing the loss of life on our maritime coasts, whether on the Atlantic or on the Pacific? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it seemed to me, belittled too much the system which obtains in Great Britain. I want to tell him that that matter has been thoroughly investigated by an English parliamentary committee no further back than in 1897. I want to tell him further that there is a provision in the English statutes for the appropriation of public money out of a particular fund so soon as it shall be demonstrated that the Royal National Life Institution is not doing its work properly. I will read a little summary from a compendium of the English law on the subject which will explain to hon. members of this House exactly what the system is in Great Britain. It is headed 'Life-saving Appliances.' The merchant shipping Act, section 742, provides:

> That the expenses of establishing and maintaining on the coasts of the United Kingdom proper lifeboats, with the necessary crews and equipments, and of affording assistance towards preserving life and property in cases of shipwrecked and distress at sea, and of rewarding the preservation of life in such cases, as the Board of Trade direct, are to be charged on and payable out of the Mercantile Marine Fund, so far as they are not paid by any private person.

The government has not found it necessary in Great Britain to draw upon this fund to any great extent at least for the reasons which are indicated in a further selection which I will read:

> The function, however, of establishing and maintaining lifeboats with the necessary crews and equipments on the coasts is actually performed by the Royal National Lifeboat Institution, a society incorporated in 1860, but which had existed from 1824 to 1854 under the name of the 'Royal National Institution for the preservation of Life from Shipwreck,' the funds of which have been and are provided by voluntary subscriptions and donations, and the administration of which is in the hands of a committee. In 1897 a committee of the House of Commons, on complaints made against the general and financial management of the institution ivestigated the whole of its affairs and administration, and reported as follows:—'The various local associations have 377 branches and own over 3,000 lifeboats. In 1896 it had an income of £117,000, of which £40,000 was derived from subscriptions, £16,000 from Lifeboat Saturday Fund, £43,000 from legacies, £17,000 odd from dividends. The lifeboats are manned by fishermen and beachmen, and their crews are not allowed to claim life salvage from ships, but are allowed to claim property salvage on any terms they can arrange with the shipowner.'

It was suggested by the Parliamentary Committee, and I have no doubt that the suggestion has been carried out, that the privilege of obtaining salvage on property

subject to arrangement with the shipowners should be abolished.

In forty-two years nearly 22,000 lives have been saved by the institution, and nearly 40,000 awards for saving life have been granted by it since its foundation in 1824.

I would like to ask the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to what follows :

The committee found that the administration of the institution had been economical, its material and appliances efficient and suitable, and the remuneration of the crews adequate ; and concluded that there was no ground for recommending that the lifeboat service should be taken over by the state, in view of its efficient and successful maintenance by public benevolence, and that the thanks of the whole community were due to the committee of the institution for the energy and good management with which for so many years, often in very difficult circumstances, it had carried out the national work of life-saving without reward or remuneration of any sort.

I would like to point out also to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that by the Harbours, Docks and Piers Clauses Act, 1847, it is enacted :

That every harbour authority, unless the special Act otherwise provides, may not take any rates in respect of their harbour, dock, or pier before they provide, and always thereafter maintain in good repair, an efficient and well appointed lifeboat, mortars, rockets, &c., with the necessary tackle and competent crew to work it, for the assistance of ships in distress ; and such appliances must be stationed at the most advanced works in the harbour, &c., or such place as the Board of Trade may approve, and be used when necessary.

Why, in Great Britain, they have been most thorough in their instructions to the master and crew of every vessel as to how they are to avail themselves of this rocket and mortar system. When my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) says that no life-saving appliances could have been of any possible use under the circumstances under which this vessel was wrecked, I venture to think that he has overlooked what might have been accomplished by the very inexpensive method of the rocket service at that place by means of which a line could have been thrown over the vessel attached to the mast or some other stable portion of the vessel, and by means of which the men could have reached shore probably without danger to their lives. I would like also to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there is in addition to this in Great Britain, a coast-guard service. That coast-guard service has for one of its principal objects not only the retention of these men as a naval reserve but also the work of preventing smuggling. But, that is not the only work in which they are employed or in which they are supposed to be engaged, because, quoting from the report of the admiralty authorities as far back as 1882 with respect to the naval reserve, I find this statement :

It should be remembered that the coast-guard takes a prominent position in the country, they are foremost at all wrecks, they are conspicuous at all our great watering places, and are looked upon as examples of the officers and seamen serving in the Royal Navy.

The men of the coast-guard in 1882, when this report was made numbered 3,921. At the present time they number nearly 4,400 men scattered all around the coast of the United Kingdom whose duty is to patrol the coast and whose duty when a wreck takes place is to do anything they can by means of the mortar and rocket service to save life and to report the wreck as soon as possible to the nearest life-saving station at which a lifeboat is available. The Royal National Institution has 303 lifeboats in service upon the coast of the United Kingdom. I mention these facts because it seems to me that they may be of some service to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in devising a scheme for a better service in Canada. Some comment was made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in regard to certain observations of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) as to our following the ideas which prevail in the United States rather than those which prevail in Great Britain. My hon. friend from Queen's was following the Minister of Marine himself in that regard and for the very good reason that we cannot expect in Canada to have the enormous private subscriptions necessary to maintain an efficient service of this kind on our coasts. Therefore, it seems to me that we must follow the example of the United States in that regard and depend almost altogether upon governmental aid for the purpose of doing any good work in this regard. I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine will bring about some better service and I should think it well for him to bear in mind that the mortar and rocket service which have saved so many lives in Great Britain might with advantage be instituted at some places at least on our coasts.

Mr. BRODEUR. In regard to that question of the mortar and rocket service I have looked a little into it and I am advised by the officer of the department who has given special consideration to this question that the rocket system seems to be a little obsolete and that another system called the line gun, would be preferable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, of course, is only a development of the rocket system. If I refer to the mortar and rocket system I refer to any system by means of which people on shore can throw a line out to the vessel and establish communication between the shore and the vessel. I am not

referring to that particular system but to the general system of saving lives in that way. It is well the subject has been brought to the attention of the House. It is very desirable that no report should be spread broadcast that our coasts do not afford reasonable means for saving life. No doubt the circumstances in the present case have been somewhat exaggerated and I am glad to know that they are not as serious as we at first deemed. I sincerely trust that with the efforts of the Minister of Marine directed along the lines which have been discussed this afternoon we may in future have an efficient life-saving service not only on the Atlantic but on the Pacific coast. I notice that the board of trade of Victoria or Vancouver has passed a strong resolution urging on the government the absolute necessity of better means for saving life on the shores of the Pacific.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). It is important that some move should be made by the department towards establishing a signal service by which information could be conveyed to vessels in difficulty, as to what the crew should do under particular circumstances. I have in mind now the loss of life which occurred at Richibuctou, New Brunswick, only a short time ago. It is well known that the bottom of the branch of the sea there is shifting sand, and had the crew remained on the vessel no lives would have been lost. As a matter of fact the cat which did stay on board was saved. Had there been some system of signalling by which the information could be conveyed to those on board that there was no danger of the ship going to pieces, no lives would have been lost. I understood the Minister of Marine to say that the coast-guard service in England was entirely gratuitous.

Mr. BRODEUR. I referred to the Royal Humane Institution.

Mr. STOCKTON. Had the minister referred to the coast-guard service I would have pointed out that by section 568 of the Merchant's Shipping Act a scale of fees is prepared by the Board of Trade for the remuneration of the coast-guard service in saving property.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). May I divert the attention of the House from the sea coast to the upper lakes, for the purpose of referring to recent occurrences which have reflected very great credit on the life-saving crew at Point Pelee. I quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken as to the importance of keeping our life-saving stations in a state of thorough efficiency, and I think we are to be congratulated on the knowledge that the government is fully alive to the situation. So far in this discussion reference has been made only to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but I would point out that it is also very important that the life-saving stations on the great lakes should be thoroughly equipped. On the 22nd of November last, Lake Erie experienced one of her periodical storms. Early in the morning of that day the Steamship 'Connemaugh' went aground on Point Pelee. There is a life-saving station there consisting of the captain, Lewis Wilkinson (cockswain) and six others all of them fishermen and all living within a few miles of each other. The crew were got together very hurriedly; they tried to get out to the wrecked steamer; they were driven back time after time by the rough sea; their boat filled time and again, but they persevered and their heroic efforts were rewarded by the rescue of the whole crew of twenty-two men. Then they learned that when trying to enter the harbour of Leamington the vessel 'Chauncey Hurlburt' had been wrecked and that the lives of her crew were in danger. They loaded their boat on their wagon, drove fourteen miles or more and arrived in time to rescue the crew of thirteen men. As their representative I feel very proud of the heroic work that without any red tape has been done by this life-saving crew at Point Pelee. They are not as well equipped as they would like to be; they have asked for a mortar for throwing lines to a wreck and hitherto the department has thought this would be an extravagant expenditure. But in the light of the experience of what has happened there—it is a place where wrecks frequently occur, it is a place where wrecks may be expected to occur—I call the attention of the minister to the necessity for equipping that life-saving station in the most perfect manner possible. We have an efficient crew there; they are volunteers; they practise several times every season, getting only a small remuneration for it, and I hope they will be encouraged in the splendid work they are doing.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). My apology for participating in this discussion is that like my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) I represent a maritime constituency on the coast of which such sad scenes as have been pictured here this afternoon occur from time to time. Many times I thought that something more remained to be done in order to reduce to the minimum the dangers to which those who go down to the sea in ships are exposed. I am well aware that it is impossible for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to provide means which will render absolutely secure the lives of those who engage in the hazzards of a seafaring life. Accidents will happen, and on a long coast line it is impossible to have stations erected at every point. But I do join my hon. friends in impressing upon the minister and in impressing upon the government

that everything that it is humanly possible to do should be done to save life along the Atlantic coast line, the Pacific coast line, and the shores of the great lakes as well. Some years ago I had an opportunity of witnessing on the sea coast of England near the city of Newcastle, the perfection to which life-saving apparatus have been brought. I saw an exhibition given there by a life-saving crew of the work that can be done in the way of throwing lines to ships and other details of life-saving, and I was greatly impressed by all that can be accomplished in this direction at a comparatively small expenditure. Just one word as to some of the matters that have been discussed here this afternoon in connection with the recent disasters on the shores of Prince Edward Island.

I share the view of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) with regard to the officials of this government at Charlottetown. I share the view of the hon. member for King's and Albert, N.B., (Mr. Fowler) who has also spoken on this matter, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the officials of the Marine Department, I go further and if necessary I will include the officials of the Intercolonial Railway at Charlottetown, are not worthy of the positions they occupy if, when life was in danger, they hesitated about the expenditure of $60; if they hesitated about the expenditures of any sum of money required to render assistance when lives, as it was known to them, were in danger. It is all very well for us to call up the transportation of mail matter, the transportation of passengers and the various other services on the Intercolonial Railway in Prince Edward Island. These are matters separate and apart entirely. I agree that there should be some responsibilities that officials of the government should observe in the matter of transporting mail and passengers, but in cases where life is in danger there should be absolutely no responsibility placed upon any official of this government to observe any order and the official of any government who is not prepared to take upon himself the risk of doing anything that it is possible to do in order to save life is not worthy of a position at the hands of this government. This applies more particularly in the case of the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Charlottetown who had positive instructions from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to do all that is in his power to render assistance. It is not creditable to the agent of that department and I would join with those who have gone before me in impressing on the minister the desirability of at the earliest possible moment seeing to it that it will not be possible that such a thing shall be done again. I am not prepared to exempt from responsibility the agent of the Marine Department at Charlottetown, and I would go further and not exempt the agent of the Intercolonial Railway at that place.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it is very regettable to have to recall the very many serious accidents that have happened on the Atlantic and on the Pacific and also upon the great lakes. It seems on looking into this matter that there must be a screw loose somewhere or other. Within sight of the city of Toronto within the last few weeks six people went down to death on the steamer 'Resolute,' or at least went down to death in trying to find their way to land from that steamer. The 'Resolute' hovered about the harbour of Toronto for twenty-four hours and she could not make the harbour by the eastern enterance owing to a severe storm; she tried to enter by the western entrance, but the crew decided they could not enter by the western entrance as the water was not of sufficient depth. The lives of these six people could have been saved if there had been proper life-saving apparatus upon the island. There is a life-saving station there, I understand, but it is not properly equipped. I am told that the boats are entirely out of date and I simply rose to draw the attention of the House to the position of affairs existing at that point, a point where there is a tremendous amount of shipping and where, if anywhere, we must be convinced that these appliances should be improved in order to avoid disasters such as occurred in the last two weeks in Toronto harbour.

Mr. BRODEUR. In justice to Captain Ward, who is in charge of the station at Toronto, I may say that when the accident to which my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) refers occurred, Captain Ward was engaged in saving fourteen other lives. That is the report he sent to the department a few days ago. I regret that I have not the report with me because I would have been glad to quote from his report as to that.

Mr. KEMP. I would say in reply to the minister that Captain Ward is a very brave man and his family are very brave. One of the members of his family saved one of the members of my family who was about to drown in the lake.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). The debate this afternoon points I think more especially to two particular matters. One is the necessity which is shown to exist and which apparently has not existed on the island of officers of the department having power of initiating expenses in matters such as this where life is at stake and where absolutely quick action is necessary. I think it has been shown that apparently the officials not only of the Marine Department, but also of the Railway Department in Prince Edward Island did not feel that they really had sufficient power or authority in themselves to act in such an

emergency as arose, and the consequence is we find the local head of the Railway Department refusing to transport a lifeboat unless he is paid in advance for a special train. That, I think, is a matter that should engage the attention of the heads of these departments especially, and some authority should be placed on the island which would make them free to act in emergencies. It has been stated that as soon as the agent of the Marine Department telegraphed to Ottawa he got instructions giving him full authority. Why, Mr. Speaker, should he require to telegraph to Ottawa at all under such circumstances, when these men were clinging at almost their last grasp to a wreck in an angry sea expecting to be washed off at any moment? Why, under such circumstances as these, should it be necessary for any officer of the government in a responsible position to consider that he was obliged to telegraph to Ottawa for instructions as to what he should do? That, I take, it is the point that is being brought out and it is one to which we should give our most serious attention. It is not so much that after the official telegraphed to Ottawa he did not get full authority, but that he should have felt himself under the necessity of telegraphing to Ottawa at all. He should have been in a position to feel that he was able to take the initiative without going through any such procedure as that. The hon. member (Mr. Alexander Johnston) rather condemned the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Charlottetown. I suppose it was for not acting more promptly. However, we had the opinion of the hon. member for King's, who comes from the island, who says that he knows that official and has a high opinion of him and he thinks that he should not be condemned, at all events without some investigation. That certainly is my opinion, that is the least I think we should do to any one who is placed in the position that that official was evidently placed in, of having something of importance to do in a hurry and feeling that he had no authority or initiative sufficient to allow him to do it without consulting headquarters at Ottawa.

The other point that has been brought out is the necessity of having life-saving stations on our coast, not only on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, but also on the coasts of the great lakes. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) when he was replying to the member for Prince (P.E.I.), referred to the different methods that were taken by different nations for providing life-saving stations. He said in fact that it was a question in his mind whether it was really the duty of the government to establish these or not, or whether it was to be left to the initiative of the people themselves. He instanced Great Britain as a place where the voluntary system was in vogue. To a large extent of course he is correct in that, although as was shown by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the Royal National Lifeboat Institution is aided largely by the expenditure which is incurred I think through the board of trade on the coast guard service which takes full charge of the mortar appliances and that method of aiding distressed vessels. They, however, have so little difficulty in raising funds for that purpose in the old country that while at one time they did receive some assistance from the marine fund of the government through the board of trade, they afterwards found that they did not want it and declined it. In this country, unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, the people are educated in a different way—educated somewhat perhaps by the government themselves, who are constantly taking into their own hands the power to do things which parliament is generally supposed to do, and the effect, I am afraid, has been to educate the people largely in the view that they must look to the government for everything. Certainly, I think the people of this country should look to the government for the establishment of life-saving stations. There are to-day perhaps hundreds, or if not hundreds certainly very many Canadian sailors who owe their lives to the life-saving stations of the United States, which extend from the borders of my own province all down the United States coast. These stations are very efficient. I have been at one or two of them, and I have found the men very attentive and the boats and appliances sufficient. It is some such thing as this that the government of this country will have to provide as an addition to the ordinary aids to navigation which they already feel it to be their duty to supply. I do not wish to take up any time with regard to this matter, but coming from a maritime port, I feel that I should certainly express my feeling on the subject, which is that it is the bounden duty of this government to take this matter into their early consideration and provide these establishments at those parts of the coasts which they think the most suitable, and to provide them as fully and as speedily as possible.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). Since the attention of the minister has been brought to this matter so fully this afternoon, I presume that he will take it into his serious consideration. I wish only to refer to one matter in regard to the Bay of Fundy. During the last year I believe the government has been improving conditions there; but the portion which I wish to speak of particularly happens to be in my own county. Some years ago the government established a life-saving station on the Island of Grand Manan, the crew and boat being located at Seal Cove. The Bay of Fundy is likely to be in the future—in fact, it is now—the outlet

of a great portion of this western country of ours. We believe the Bay of Fundy will eventually carry perhaps two-thirds of the traffic in the winter time, and it is necessary that that highway be made as secure as possible, not only for vessels, but for the lives of the sailors as well. In connection with the Seal Cove life saving station, I wish to point out to the minister the necessity for some changes, which is recognized by every one living along that coast as well as by the captains and crews of the vessels sailing from the port of St. John and other ports of the Bay of Fundy. Seal Cove in itself is not a dangerous point. The wrecks which have been referred to to-day have been within easy reach of the shore, where perhaps a mortar could throw a line. The most dangerous points near the island of Grand Manan are Murr Ledges, Old Proprietor and Gannet Rock. It would be extremely difficult for a lifeboat from Seal Cove, particularly in the winter, to reach either of these points seven or nine miles distant. It might go to pieces before it reached there. I would suggest that the minister look into the matter very carefully and see if some power boat cannot be furnished for that station or section. It is certainly one of the most important points in the Bay of Fundy. If I might be permitted to make another suggestion, it would be this, that the fishery service and the life-saving service of the Island of Grand Manan might be combined in the same power boat.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I would not have said a word on this subject were it not that the Department of Railways and Canals is by implication brought into the controversy with respect to the wrecks that occurred off the coast of Prince Edward Island. It appears that the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway refused to grant a special train on a certain occasion for the purpose of transporting the lifeboat from Charlottetown to Souris. I wish to say this in reply to the hon. senior member for St. John (Mr. Daniels), that the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island railway is fully authorized and has full power and authority to exercise his discretion in the matter of a railway train, special or otherwise, without referring the matter either to Moncton or to headquarters at Ottawa; and in the exercise of that discretion, Mr. Sharpe declined to furnish that train. Certainly the matter was not referred either to Moncton or to Ottawa. The explanation which I understand he gives is this, that the movement of lifeboats was under the direction of the agent general of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the province of Prince Edward Island, and that therefore the Intercolonial Railway could not be called upon to move the lifeboat from Charlottetown to Souris any more than the Intercolonial could be called upon to move lifeboats in any other direction. His judgment may have been correct or incorrect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not the hon. minister think an exception might be made at least where life is at stake?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot say that it is entirely in accord with my own ideas of the humanities ; but he was a free agent in the matter, and he exercised his judgment. It is true, the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway are parts of a department of this government. But it must not be lost sight of that these railways are, independent of that, a business or industrial organization. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says it is a mere matter of bookkeeping—that after all, a government railway is subject to the direction of the government and that the moneys handled are government moneys. Quite true. But the same is true of the expenditures of any of the departments. And my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) calls the Department of Railways to strict account, if, perchance, there should be a deficit in the operation of the railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. minister will permit me a word—I was merely suggesting that the bookkeeping might be done afterwards, and the lives saved first.

Mr. EMMERSON. I appreciate that argument very well. But I can quite understand also that, if there was a dispute over the question arising in this case, the superintendent of the railway might feel that the Department of Marine should assume its proper responsibility and that the matter should be adjusted beforehand. I have had some experience in matters which may involve something of the same principle. Hon. members on both sides will remember a discussion we had concerning the transportation of hay over the Intercolonial Railway a few years ago. By reason of the entire loss of the hay crop in that section of the country, we were told, the people would be obliged to destroy their cattle if hay were not supplied, and that this destruction would do irreparable injury to the agricultural industries of that section of the Dominion, destroying the growing cheese and butter trade and rendering useless the considerable expenditures that had been made by the Department of Agriculture in order to develop that trade. I felt at that time, as I feel now, that the cost of transportation of that hay should have been a charge against the Department of Agriculture. I sought to make it so, instead of allowing it to be made a charge on the Intercolonial. But, in fact, the management of the Intercolonial were held responsible for a deficit that year a part of which was due to that expenditure and its

consequent loss of freight and loss of the use of cars. This was a matter of book-keeping, perhaps, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would have charged it to the Minister of Agriculture himself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I felt that he should pay it, but he was not so generous as I had hoped he would be. It is barely possible that the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway may have had this before his mind, and consequently may have feared that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be equally hard-hearted and would refuse to loosen his purse strings. Undoubtedly the Prince Edward Island Railway could very well have furnished a special train—undoubtedly it could have furnished it without charge. And, if there had been loss of life occasioned by reason of the non-furnishing of that train, I certainly, as head of the department, would have felt very keenly the action of the superintendent in that refusal. However, happily, his action did not so result. My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) I think is more interested in the political side of this matter than in the humanitarian side. The question of humanity is the only one that interests me. The truth seems to be that the lives had been sacrificed even before the request for the special train was made.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the minister excuse the action of the head of the department, because there were no lives lost?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not speaking of the action of the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; that is a matter with which I have nothing to do. I am speaking of the judgment exercised by the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway. I read the article in the 'Patriot' that has been referred to. I do not know how many people sent me copies of the paper containing that article. My office was flooded with them. They were marked copies, and when I opened them, I realized that fact. They were marked as if for fear that I would escape reading some particular line or word. It would not become me to reflect upon the action of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That matter has been fully discussed. But, as to the action of the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, I leave it to the judgment of the House and the country to say whether that action was wise or unwise. I intend to inquire into the facts, in fact I have already arranged to do so.

There was a very unfortunate wreck on the northern coast of New Brunswick, in the Straits of Northumberland, at the mouth of Richibucto harbour. As has been stated by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Stockton) there are no rocks there, but there are sand bars that extend out into the straits. These sand bars shift year by year. One heavy northeast gale will change the channel of entrance to any of the harbours along that coast—Escuminac, Richibucto, Cocagne, Shediac, Tracadie or any other harbour there. It appears with reference to this particular wreck, that the vessel came to anchor off the shore, and, without stopping for a moment, apparently, to consider the situation, the crew of eleven men hustled into their one small boat and pushed off. But the sea was raging so fiercely that the boat was dashed to pieces immediately.

Mr. STOCKTON. They would have been perfectly safe.

Mr. EMMERSON. As my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) says they would have been perfectly safe if they had remained aboard their vessel. If there had been a dozen life stations there, assistance could not have been rendered these men, they so promptly left their vessel after anchoring, unless as my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John says they could have given them signals.

It is a matter of very little moment, perhaps, what I said, on a former occasion with respect to a certain snow blockade in the province of Prince Edward Island. I remember the discussion and I remember my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) reading some telegrams and calling forth regrets from myself as to the great snow drifts which prevented trains from moving in that district. I thought my hon. friend went further in his criticism than he should have done, and I, in a very mild way, asked if he expected me to go down and shovel snow. It seemed to me he felt that I had neglected to do something that I ought to have done, but he did not say what it was, and so I asked that question, which I think will be found in the 'Hansard,' if remarks so utterly irrelevant ever find their way into the 'Hansard.'

Mr. LEFURGEY. You cannot shovel snow.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can shovel snow, let me tell my hon. friend, and I sometimes snow people under. But I want to tell my hon. friend that I made no suggestion at the time, nor would I make it now, that the good people of Prince Edward Island should ever go down and shovel snow for the benefit of the Prince Edward Island Railway. I would not expose them to that. They are isolated from the mainland, and they suffer a great many grievances, at least we hear of a great many, and I certainly would not pile upon them the indignity of requiring them to shovel snow for the government railway. I was much sur-

prised a day or two after that little discussion in the House to see, in some of the eastern papers, the remark credited to me which my hon. friend has mentioned, and I hope he will accept this disclaimer. I did not think it was necessary for me to make any apology for the superintendent in connection with the lifeboat. He has full authority and he exercised his judgment. I am not in a position at this moment to sit in judgment upon him as to what he should have done under the circumstances, but when I am put in full possession of the facts I will reach a conclusion. In the meantime I see no objection to my hon. friend having all the facts from the Railway Department in connection with the matter.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I suppose, after this lengthy discussion, the minister will spend some time in looking into the conditions of life-saving apparatus in this country, and I hope that when he does so he will not forget the great lakes of Ontario where there are many volunteer life-saving crews not very well equipped. I remember some years ago bringing to the attention of the government, one crew in my own county, and making application for a better apparatus, so that this and other volunteer crews would be able to do better service. I remember at that time the government were rather economical in their views, but I hope that, with this object lesson before them the minister will take this matter into serious consideration, and that he will send out an inspector, if necessary, to ascertain what the volunteer life-saving crews have been doing, and will see his way to make an appropriation to equip them with a better apparatus.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as the county of Témiscouata, which I have the honour to represent here, faces one of the most dangerous parts of the St. Lawrence, I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that during the last heavy storm, towards the end of November, a boat went off from Rivière du Loup and perished crew and cargo near Red Island. Fifteen people, including the pilot, lost their lives. For over eight days the public and the parties interested have laboured under the greatest uneasiness, knowing not even what vessel had perished, and that for want of communication.

I avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to those facts and at the same time to ask him if he does not contemplate to connect those islands, that is, Red Island and Green Island, with the mainland, one way or other, by means of a telephone line. Thus, for instance, if we had communications by telephone between Green Island, Red Island and the mainland the keeper of Red Island would have informed the department and the parties interested sooner than he did. If we had a telephone system it would not take eight days—as the case just happened—to know what is going on or if vessels are in peril.

I would suggest, further, that the department should place alarm whistles on Red Island and connect Green Island with the mainland by means of a telephone system. In that way the department could communicate at once with the shipwrecked, and we would not have to lament over accidents which so frequently occur because we would be in a better position to provide the most efficient relief.

I think the question is worth studying and I am sure the minister will not fail to study it considering the care with which he administers his department. Therefore, I hope he will find a proper means of truly attaining the object which I have pointed out.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I must say, in answer to my hon. friend, that, as a matter of fact, the department has now under consideration a demand of like nature. If I remember aright, that question had been brought before the House last year by my hon. friend himself, and I may tell him that it calls for the serious consideration of the department.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this question. Not long since an accident took place at Lion's Head, when the steamer 'Jones' went down with all on board. This is a very dangerous place for navigation as several accidents have taken place there in the past. Those living in that part of the country think it would be very desirable if there were a life-saving station there. When this question is under consideration, and I presume the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) will direct his attention to it in the way of making inquiry as to what should be done in regard to the equipment of those stations that are already in existence and the establishment of others that are needed, I trust he will not overlook this point. It is with that object in view that I bring the matter to his attention now. If my knowledge or the information which I have obtained is correct, I think it is very desirable that a life-saving station should be established there. Not only is one needed there, but there are several other localities on the great lakes where it would be very desirable to have life-saving stations established. When human life is at stake no effort should be spared and no reward or consideration should be regarded as too great to provide anything that can be provided for the purpose of saving those whose lives are in danger.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like just to say a few words in reply to some remarks that were made on the other side of the House. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was very wroth with me because I had not waited until the papers were brought down or until it had been proved that his department and the officials of his department at Charlottetown were entirely blameless in the matter. I failed to see anything in the report that he has given us that is going to clear the department from a great deal of blame. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had to get up in his place and come to the rescue of the poor minister. Oh, he said, it was a shame to accuse this department; it had never done anything wrong. He said that the members for Prince and Queen's, instead of getting up and going after the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries should go after the officials of the railway and marine departments at Charlottetown who were to blame. The hon. member for Pictou also said that if he had any idea that I was treating the subject in a fair sense apart from its political aspect he would certainly give my position his entire approval. I want to assure the hon. member for Pictou and the members of this House that my object in bringing this question to the notice of the members of the government and of the House is entirely of the best, yet because it happens that the Marine Department, or the Railway Department or the officials of these departments are to blame, the hon. member is only too ready to get up and say that I have a political object in view. But, we find that he was only too ready to throw the blame upon Mr. Lord because he knew Mr. Lord was an appointee of the Conservative administration. I will leave it to the House to judge who was dealing with this subject from a political point of view. The hon. minister hinted that I was making specific charges against Mr. Brown, Mr. Lord and other officials. If the minister had followed my remarks he would have known that I put the blame straight upon himself and his own department and that is where I intend to leave it until the minister clears it up. We, on this side of the House, are not supposed, when we have information of wrong-doing, of maladministration by any department, to put the blame on the underlings or the officials who are miles away from the capital. Our first duty is to hold responsible the department to which these officials belong and then let the department investigate and see where that blame properly lies. In this instance I particularly stated that not being on the scene when the accident occurred I did not care to make any specific statements myself but I would give the minister the most unbiased information I could by quoting from their own government organ, the Charlottetown 'Patriot.' That is what I did. The minister seems to think that the Charlottetown 'Patriot' was not a very reliable organ and possibly in some cases he may be right, but I think I was justified in quoting from the Charlottetown 'Patriot' as to the facts in regard to the sending of assistance to those who were wrecked at East Point. I made no specific charge against the department. I read the telegram that the minister sent to Mr. Lord that 'the department wishes you to send the 'Stanley' and to do everything possible to assist.' That was all very good but I do blame the department that it should be necessary for the official representing the department at Charlottetown to waste hours in telegraphing to the minister here whether he should send the 'Stanley' to the relief of those wrecked mariners. Not only that, but why should it be necessary to telegraph to the department in the numerous other cases referred to by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and myself in regard to the steamers conducting the winter service? What was the necessity of having to carry on this red tape business when the exigencies of the situation required immediate and prompt action?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is absolutely nothing in the regulations of the department which prevented Mr. Lord from acting under the circumstances. As I have said the fact is that he never reported to us as to an accident having occurred or as to what he should do. We were simply informed by Mr. Hyndman, Lloyds' agent, that a wreck had occurred and then we told Mr. Lord to go on and render all assistance possible.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I was just going to speak on that point. I know that we have complained in the past of the necessity of telegraphing to the department regarding the disposal of the boats when the exigencies of the case required immediate and prompt action on the part of the officials down there. Then the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) got up and after discussing subjects that had nothing to do with the case, after talking in a circle about this thing and that thing, said that if all the irrelevant remarks were put down in 'Hansard' it would be a very serious thing. I think if the hon. minister had stopped short in his own remarks, instead of talking about shovelling snow and other matters that have nothing to do with this question, he would possibly have spoken with greater relevancy to the matter before the House. There are reasons that stand out clearly as to why I wished to bring this matter before the House this afternoon. Foremost is the necessity for the Marine Department taking active and immediate steps to provide life-saving stations and appliances

throughout the whole Dominion. If the hon. member for Pictou had carefully listened to my speech he would see there was nothing political in that aspect of it. The fact that I made reference to the circumstances surrounding the wreck of the 'Sovinto' and that some official of the department was to blame, afforded no ground for the member for Pictou to pick a quarrel with me and accuse me of introducing politics. The mere fact that there was no loss of life after the refusal of the heads of the department to send a boat forward, does not exonerate them from blame. The 'Sovinto' went ashore on a Tuesday and it was sixty hours afterwards before the last survivor left the wreck. What were the heads of the department doing during these sixty hours? Is there no blame upon them for not acting. I wish it distinctly understood that I have made no charge against any of the officers; all I asked is that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Railways and Canals shall institute an inquiry as to their conduct in this matter.

Motion agreed to.

CO-OPERATIVE AND INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES.

Mr. MONK moved:

That the special committee to which has been referred Bill (No. 2) respecting Co-operative and Industrial Societies, be composed of Messrs. Aylesworth, Lennox, Lemieux, Smith (Nanaimo), Bourassa, Verville, Gervais, Sinclair, White and Monk.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 13, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 19) respecting The Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof.—Mr. Aylesworth.

QUESTIONS.

TUNNEL TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY asked:

1. Has the government had any further investigation into the question of a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland? If so, what was the nature of such?

2. What is the attitude of the government in regard to the construction of a tunnel, to fulfil the terms of confederation, and give continuous communication, winter and summer, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?

3. Is it the intention of the government, as promised by the Minister of Public Works, to get a complete report and survey covering the cost, construction, &c.?

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

1. In regard to the first part of the question the department has collected records and reports of surveys already made. The cost of modern tunnelling has been estimated from information derived from former investigations but no new survey has lately been made.

2. In regard to the second part of the question I submit that it is out of order as it is argumentative.

3. It is the intention of the government to consider the information at their disposal in regard to this matter.

SWAN LAKE RESERVE.

Mr. STAPLES asked:

Has the government made any move to have the Swan Lake Indian reserve, township 5, range 11, west of the 1st meridian, released in order that it may be settled and brought under cultivation? If so, what advancement has been made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Owing to pressure of other business it has not yet been possible for the government to take the matter up; but it is purposed to do so at the earliest possible date.

DEPUTY COLLECTORS, INLAND REVENUE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. How many deputy collectors, Class B, Inland Revenue office, are employed at Toronto, what are their names, and what is the amount of salary paid to each one?

2. How many deputy collectors, Class B, Inland Revenue office, are employed at Montreal, what are their names, and what is the amount of salary paid to each?

3. How many deputy collectors, Class B, Inland Revenue Office, are employed at Winnipeg, Vancouver, St. John, N.B., Windsor, Ontario, Stratford and Owen Sound, respectively, what are their names, and the salary paid to each?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The following is a statement showing the names of the deputy collectors, Class 'B,' employed by the Inland Revenue Department at the following places, also their respective salaries.

	Place.	Name.	Salary.
1	Toronto	Coleman, C.	$1,000 00
	"	Dager, H. J.	900 00
	"	Ritchie, H.	1,000 00
	"	Boyd, S. I.	1,200 00
2	Montreal*	.....	.....
	"	Chagnon, C. P.	1,000 00
	"	Patterson, C. E. A.	750 00
3	Winnipeg	None	.....
	Vancouver	None	.....
	St. John, N. B.	None	.....
	Windsor	Keogh, P. M.	1,000 00
	Stratford	Jeffrey, A. J.	800 00
	Owen Sound	None	.....

*Resigned.

CHEESE CURING BUILDINGS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. How many cheese curing buildings in all have been erected or provided by the government ?

2. Where are they located ?

3. What was the cost of each one, including care, and any other expense or expenses connected therewith ?

4. What charge, if any, was made to the users of them ?

5. Did the government pay for transporting cheese from the factory to the curing rooms ? If so, what was the cost in connection with each factory, and the aggregate of all such costs up to date ?

6. Who paid the charge for transportation from curing rooms when shipping ? If paid by the government, what has been the aggregate of such costs to date ?

7. How many cheese manufacturers have taken advantage of these curing rooms, and how many cheese have been stored by each, year by year, and the length of time each consignment has remained in the curing room ?

8. Is it the intention to continue the use of these curing rooms for the future, or to extend them ?

9. If not intended to continue the business, what disposition will be made of those now owned by the government ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would have to ask the hon. member to move for a return as it would be quite impossible to furnish all the information asked for in the form of an answer to a question.

Mr. SPROULE. If I had assurance that, if I moved, I should have the return in a reasonable time——

Mr. FISHER. I assure the hon. gentleman I will get it as soon as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the new rule it can stand as motion for return.

MAILS TO AND FROM WINTER BOATS, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Who had the contract for the carrying of the mails to and from the winter boats at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, during the winter season of 1905-6, and from Cape Traverse to Summerside ?

2. What was the service to be performed ?

3. Was the contract let by tender, who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender ?

4. Has the contract terminated, and is it the intention of the department to call for new tenders ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. As ice-boats were not used for the conveyance of mails between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse during the winter season of 1905-6, this department was not called upon to make any arrangement for carrying the mails to and from the ice-boats at Cape Traverse and Summerside.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. The department entered into a contract for four years dating from 1st of December, 1906, with Mr. J. P. Irving, payment to be at the rate of $3 per round trip between Cape Traverse and Summerside. As the frequency of such service is very uncertain, it was not considered advantageous that tenders should be invited.

CUSTOMS REVENUE ON FARM IMPLEMENTS, TOOLS, ETC.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of duty received by the government in the fiscal year 1906 upon the respective articles named in the following items, as numbered, of the new customs tariff, viz.:

Item 445—Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers.

Item 446 — Cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders, weeders and wind-mills.

Item 447—Threshing machine outfit, when consisting of traction or portable engines and separators.

Item 448—Hay loaders, potato diggers, horse-powers, separators, n.o.p., wind-stackers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post-hole diggers, snaths, and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.

Item 449—Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or strwa knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, n.o.p., and pronged forks.

Item 450—Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.o.p., shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for the same, and lawn mowers.

Item 451—Stoves of all kinds, for coal, wood, oil, spirits or gas.

2. What would have been the total amount of duty received in the same period—the fiscal year of 1906—had the tariff now proposed by the government been then in force, giving such duty for each of the items 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450 and 451, separately ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is not possible to answer the question in the form in which it is, but it can stand as notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I prefer answering it myself.

LAND WITHDRAWN FROM RESERVATION FOR THE WATERING OF STOCK.

Mr. AMES asked :

What disposition has been made of the land withdrawn from reservation for the watering of stock, by order in council dated 21st December, 1903, and published in the 'Canada Gazette' of December 8, 1906 ? (Ref. 455630.)

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Township 12, range 12, west 4th meridian, south and east of river.—South half section 7, leased to Grand Forks Cattle Company; northwest quarter section 9, sold to Grand Forks Cattle Company, as part of the purchasable one-tenth of their leasehold; section 21, leased to Grand Forks Cattle Company.

Township 11, range 13, west 4th meridian.—Section 35, south and east of river, leased to Grand Forks Cattle Company.

Township 12, range 13, west 4th meridian.—Section 1, east of river, and section 2, east of river, leased to Grand Forks Cattle Company.

WHARF AT MURRAY RIVER.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government constructed a wharf at Murray river, in connection with the Murray harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

2. If so, whose land and shore front was expropriated in connection therewith, and (a) the date of such expropriation ; (b) have said lands been paid for ; (c) if not paid for, why has not the case been referred to the Exchequer Court for settlement, with other cases mentioned in the reply of the Minister of Railways on December 3rd ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, a wharf was constructed at Murray Harbour.

2. 708 square feet was expropriated from Cartney McClure, 2,644 square feet from Augustus McGinnis, and 3,340 square feet from Deborath McKenzie ;—all land above high tide.

(a) Land mentioned was expropriated on June 22, 1906.

(b) Payment for the land and inconvenience of reaching the water was offered to the several parties, and was refused by them.

(c) All the above cases have been referred to the Exchequer Court.

RECESSION OF NIAGARA FALLS—REPORT OF DR. SPENCER.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Why has the manuscript of the report of Dr. J .W. Spencer, referred to by the Minister of Inland Revenue in answering question on the 3rd December last, on page 445 of 'Hansard,' not yet been received, and what steps have been taken to obtain it ?

2. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government, other than as shown by Dr. Spencer, on his recession map, to determine the exact location of the international boundary line at Niagara Falls ?

3. Is the boundary line as shown by Dr. Spencer on his said recession map his final determination of the question ?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Dr. Spencer has repeatedly been requested to furnish the manuscript of his report under the terms of his agreement with the Geological Survey, but he has failed to do so.

2. The international boundary line at Niagara Falls was located by commissioners under Article 6 of the Treaty of Ghent. They reported in 1822 and their report was illustrated by maps on one of which the international boundary line at the place in question was shown, and this continues to be the boundary line.

3. This is unknown.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, MADOC TO ELDORADO.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked :

1. What subsidies, either Dominion, provincial, or municipal, were paid to the Belleville and North Hastings, the Grand Junction, and the Grand Trunk Railways, respectively, for the construction or extension of the railways from Madoc village to Eldorado, in the county of Hastings?

2. Was there any contract between the Dominion government and any of such companies under which the subsidies were paid ?

3. If there was such a contract, did it contain any clause providing for the operation of the road, or the return of the subsidies ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). In answering these questions, I deal only with Dominion subsidies :

1. Subsidy paid by Dominion government to Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, Madoc to Eldorado, 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, and 49 Victoria, chapter 10, $21,888, paid to January 5, 1899.

2. Yes, a contract was entered into with the Belleville and North Hastings Company.

3. Contract contains clause for operation of road, but no specific clause for return of subsidies, if not operated.

MAIL STEAMER 'EMPRESS OF BRITAIN.'

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax) asked :

1. When did the mail steamer 'Empress of Britain' arrive at Halifax on the last voyage from England ?

2. At what hour did the mail train for Montreal leave Halifax ?

3. When did this train arrive in Montreal ?

4. How long afterwards did said steamer arrive at St. John, New Brunswick ?

5. How many hours was said steamer detained at the entrance to St. John harbour for want of sufficient water to enter ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Anchored in stream, Halifax, December 7, at 12.35 a.m.
2. 5.33 a.m.
3. 1.45 a.m. on December 8.
4 and 5. Steamer arrived at entrance St. John harbour on Friday evening, December 7, at about five minutes after ten. On account of the thick fog and waiting for tide, there being insufficient water to float her, she did not reach dock until about 4.30 p.m. on December 8.

RAILWAY ACT 1903, AMENDMENT—LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 4) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903. He said : I dare say that the House will be almost unanimously glad to hear me say that this is probably the last time when I shall be required to inflict my remarks upon hon. members on the very important subject to which this Bill relates. Last session we passed a Bill exactly the same as that which I am now asking the House to pass, with the single exception of a change in the date fixing the time when the railways shall comply with the provisions of the law. Last year, after we had finally and unanimously agreed in this House on what the Act should be, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson)—suggested, I dare say, very wisely; I am not criticising—that at least a year should be given to the railways after the passing of the Act, to get their level crossings in shape and comply with the proposed new law. But the Senate did not pass the Bill last session. Since then, four or five months have passed. And, as the Senate did not pass the Bill, the railways were not obliged to assume that it probably would pass on this occasion. Therefore, I have thought it better, so that there should be no contention on that point, to extend the time six months further. And so, instead of requiring the railways to comply with the Act on July 1st, 1907, it is proposed in this Bill that the law shall come into force on January 1st, 1908. But, as this is the only change, I think I am right in saying that my Bill is exactly the same as was passed by the House last session and sent to the Senate. I will not weary the House with a long history of the matter, but I think the House should understand the important stages of this legislation. For three years we have debated this matter in this House. During three different sessions we have had this Bill very earnestly, and I am bound to say with all due deference to the Senate, very intelligently and very properly discussed in this House and its committees. For the first two sessions the Bill was referred to the Railway Committee of this House. The railway corporations asked to be heard and were heard, at almost unlimited length, in explanation of any ground of opposition they could show in the matter. They were allowed, day after day, to put before the members of the committee, every possible objection they could have to this proposed amendment of the law. Then last session it was found that the Bill was more likely to succeed in remedying what was recognized on both sides of the House as an evil, if it were sent to a special committee, and it was sent to a special committee composed of four gentlemen from the government side and three from this side of the House. The railways asked to be heard before that committee, and were heard at considerable length. They gave a mass of evidence, principally directed to showing that the change in the law would entail a heavy expense upon them. That was the most serious feature of the Bill. They thought it was a hardship upon them. The Minister of Railways and other gentlemen on that committee, along with myself, looked into the matter with an earnest desire to remedy what was recognized by everybody concerned as an evil. The result of the work of the committee was found in a Bill which was brought down to the House and reported, very late in the session. After the Bill was reported it was amended and rewritten, and was finally passed unanimously by the House. The Bill was not identically the Bill as I had introduced it, but it was an amendment to the Act amending the Railway Act which the Minister of Railways was putting through the House dealing with other branches of railway legislation.

I do not know that the House wishes me to go into an elaborate history of this matter. I may say that we had a law since 1857 which protected people on these level crossings. That was interfered with more or less by the railway companies from year to year, until we came down to the session of 1903, when it was enacted that the companies could either protect or fence their track at these crossings, and if they did so they were not liable. That was the construction put upon the Act by the Supreme Court and admitted by all lawyers to be a right construction, and that is the Act as it stands at present. You will see therefore that there was no protection to people travelling upon the highways or the railway crossings at rail level, because if the railway only had their track fenced against the adjoining property owners, that did not in any way afford additional protection to people on the highway crossing the railway; it had nothing whatever to do with safety to the public at the point

of intersection. Now we dealt yesterday with the question of saving the lives of people voyaging upon the sea, which was considered an important question. But this is an equally important question. The lives of Canadian citizens are jeopardized every day, as any one will see who reads the newspapers, at these level crossings, in fact the lives of everybody are concerned in this question. The farmer who hauls his goods to market in a wagon or who drives across in a buggy proceeding to any city, town or village, and the residents of cities, towns and villages are in jeopardy whenever they pass these crossings unless some law is passed such as this House recognized in the Act of last session.

Now it was erroneously supposed in the Senate that this Bill was nothing more or less than a measure to limit the speed of railways to ten miles an hour at all these level crossings. That is not the object of the Bill, that is the penalty if a railway does not comply with the object of the Bill. The penalty is that if they do not afford protection at these crossings they must not run faster than ten miles an hour. But the Act does not require them not to exceed that speed by any means. That is the result if they break this enactment. Under the Bill as passed by this House last session they have only to go to the Railway Commission if they do not wish to afford the protection and get special permission not to give the protection. This Bill we have now is not the Bill as I introduced it, it is not as drastic and far-reaching, but it is in the right direction. I am here to promote the interests of the people, but recognizing that my ideas cannot always prevail I accepted a compromise last session and agreed that we could make a step in the right direction by passing the law as we did even if it did not entirely prevent the loss of life upon these level crossings. I agree to the compromise because it was a step in the right direction and I could not get any more. Now the Bill as brought in last session and drafted by the Minister of Railways provides that they must either protect the crossing or reduce their speed to ten miles an hour; and if they do not wish to comply with that regulation, if they do not want a court or jury to say whether their protection has been sufficient at a crossing they can always go to the Railway Commission and get a special order in regard to such crossing. That was the only way we could make any advance on the question. That Bill as passed by this House was sent to the Senate. As I say it reached the Senate at a very late period in the session two days before the Governor General was coming to prorogue the House. If there had been time that Bill could have been the subject of a conference between the Senate and the House of Commons and I think we would have been able to convince the Senate that it was a proper Bill to pass. I think the Senate made a mistake, that the Senate did not realize what they were doing when they rejected this Bill. The Bill as it passed last session reads this way:

227. No train shall pass over any highway crossing at rail level in any thickly populated portion of any city, town or village at a greater speed than ten miles an hour, unless such crossing is properly protected, or unless such crossing is constructed and thereafter duly maintained in accordance with such orders, regulations and directions of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and the board, as may be enforced with respect thereto. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate that it deems expedient.

2. The company shall have until the 1st of July, 1907, to comply with the provisions of this section.

In the present Bill I say until the 1st of July, 1908. To show the interest that is being taken in this matter I may mention that since then I have had a great many letters from boards of trade, municipalities and other public bodies, besides private individuals all over this country, approving that legislation, and wondering that the Senate did not pass it. Out of a large number I will only read a few. Here is one I got from the city of Toronto. On June 11th the secretary of the Toronto Board of Trade wrote as follows:

This board has been very much interested in the matter of the level crossings, and I am anxious to procure a copy of your proposed Bill as passed by the Railway Committee.

Meaning the special committee to which it had been referred.

Will you kindly forward same so that I will get it by return mail ?

It was sent to them and as soon as the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto saw it they passed this resolution:

Resolved that the Council of the Board of Trade heartily endorses the Bill introduced by Mr. E. A. Lancaster in the Dominion House.

That is dated June 14th, they having got the Bill as rewritten in the special committee on June 13. The letter was answered on June 12th and on June 14th, they said:

Resolved that the Council of the Board of Trade heartily endorses the Bill introduced by Mr. E. A. Lancaster in the Dominion House to provide for the proper protection of level railway crossings in cities, towns and villages, and trusts that it may become law.

That is a sample of the way the country view the matter. The Senate had this Bill before them. As I have said the hon. gentlemen of the Senate had it before them only two or three days before parliament prorogued. They had hardly any opportunity, at all events, to condemn it justly;

they had an opportunity of approving of it if they had faith in the Commons and after the House of Commons composed of two hundred and fourteen members had for three years dealt with this question, had referred it to special committees, and had given it its complete and exhaustive attention, I do think the Senate might better have said: We will assume that the House of Commons is right upon this question because we have not had an opportunity of considering the matter as it has. I notice upon looking at the Senate debates of July 9th of last session that it did not take fifteen minutes to dispose of this question. Hon. Mr. Davis moved that the clause be struck out. He said:

> There is no necessity for it, since it is all covered by section 227 of the old Act. The Act as it stands gives all the protection needed.

The Act as it stands does not give any protection. As long as the railway fences it does not give any protection at all. The hon. gentleman in the Senate who moved to strike that out did not know that. Had he been in this House, had he attended the committees which considered this Bill, had he had the opportunity that we had to understand this question he could not have made any such statement as a justification for striking that provision out. The Hon. Mr. Scott said:

> It leaves it subject to the orders, regulations and directions of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It must have been adopted very hastily in the House of Commons, because in the Railway Act, 1903, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is abolished.

With all due deference to the hon. gentlemen in the Senate, I must say that they did not understand it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) very properly said that this must not only be subject to the regulations of the Board of Railway Commissioners but that the old railway board, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, had made a lot of permanent orders applicable to a great many cases and we should not put railways to the expense of duplicating these orders where such orders were already in force and that there was no necessity of compelling them now to come again before the Railway Commission to get them to adjudicate upon a matter that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, their predecessors, had already adjudicated upon. So, with all due deference to that hon. gentleman in the Senate I would say that he, himself, was dealing with it hastily and not the House of Commons. He did not know that there were orders in existence issued by the old railway board, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which affected this question and he thought that because that board was abolished in 1903, when we enacted the Railway Act and appointed the Board of Railway Commissioners their orders were all abolished—an entirely erroneous idea. The Senate, after hearing what is said to-day by the hon. Minister of Railway and Canals, who will no doubt follow me upon this question, must see how erroneous their idea was last year and I have no doubt that under those circumstances they will promptly pass this Bill. At all events I will ask this House to send it to them as quickly as possible, to go into committee and read it a third time as soon as they can so that before they get busy with too much legislation the Senate will have time to consider this matter fairly and reasonably and to inform themselves on the subject if necessary so that we can see who is wright and who is wrong, although I have no doubt myself upon that question. I stay by the House. After the House had discussed this matter for three years, appointed special committees to consider it, after they had withstood—I will not use the word 'lobby'; I do not like it—the arguments and the blandishments of the railway representatives who did not want the Bill passed, after they ascertained what their constituents called for, after they unanimously concluded that this Bill should be passed, I still think they are right upon this question and I think the House will agree with me when I say to the upper House: We have every respect for you, but as you have not learned of this matter as we have, as you have not acquainted yourselves with the ins and outs of the question as we have, as it is clear that you have not understood the facts requiring legislation or the legislation itself, we shall ask you to confer with us, if necessary and pass the Bill this session. I might also point out how the press of the country viewed this question after the Senate had rejected this amendment. I do not know who sent this paper to me, as I am not a subscriber to it, but somebody sent me the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of July 11th, in which I find this article:

> Mischievous Interference.
>
> The Canadian Senate in the dying hours of the present session is supplying in its own acts sufficient reason for its reformation. Yesterday it distinguished itself by vetoing Mr. Lancaster's amendment which prohibits railway trains from running faster than ten miles an hour over level crossings in cities, towns and incorporated villages.
>
> This is a railway reform which Mr. Lancaster has advocated for some years and which he finally succeeded in inducing the House of Commons to endorse. Why the Senate should stand in the way of a piece of popular legislation of this kind is not apparent. It is assuredly flying in the face of public opinion when it refuses to co-operate with the lower House in such an essential measure of public safety. The level crossing is a menace to public life under any circumstances. In congested communities it is a veritable death trap which every year claims hundreds of victims in Canada and the United States. If the level crossing cannot be abolished in cities, towns and

incorporated villages, or if it cannot be protected with gates or watchmen, then it is surely desirable that railway companies should limit the speed of their trains as proposed in Mr. Lancaster's amendment. Nothing could be fairer than giving the railways the option of protecting their crossings, or of reducing their speed at crossings where protection is not afforded.

This newspaper quite understood it. They have the option of protecting as the Railway Commission may require, or else of reducing their speed.

The paper says further:

> The House of Commons interpreted the overwhelming force of public opinion when it endorsed the Lancaster amendment, and the Senate made out an exceedingly good case for its reform, or its abolition when it declared that railways should continue in the right to convert public crossings into shambles.

That is a sample of the way the press of the country views the matter. There are no politics in it. It is a matter of protecting the lives of the people who must cross these tracks in cities, towns and incorporated villages where buildings obscure the sight of the approaching train and where noises deaden the sound which might otherwise warn people of the approach of the train. If the Railway Commission say that a crossing is sufficiently protected as it is by the mere notice up above of 'railway crossing' on a cross board that is all that is necessary on the part of the railways. If they can convince the board in cases where many crossings are similarly constructed that all that is needed is a board to show the railway crossing and a white fence so as to attract attention the board may, under my amendment, say that that is sufficient if they chose to do so. But, if the Railway Commission do not do so, if the railway company will not apply to the Railway Commission to say what protection is required, it is their own fault if they are put to undue expense as they might have made application. I reiterate what has been said by that paper. I have had conversations with hundreds—I might almost say thousands—of people in the last two years and none of them can understand why the fairness of the legislation should not have appealed to the Senate as it did to the House of Commons. I do not wish to inflict myself any longer on the House, I do not believe it is necessary and I simply now move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps hardly necessary that I should add anything to the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster), who has just taken his seat, in respect to this Bill. It is perhaps due to the House, in view of what occurred last session, that I should make an explanation supplementing his remarks. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has for two or three sessions past introduced a Bill similar in its tenor to this. I did not feel, however—I had not reached the point where I could support the several Bills which the hon. gentleman introduced because I felt that they went a little too far. I was quite in sympathy with the object he had in view, but I saw that we were placing very onerous responsibilities and burdens upon the railways of the country; that we were in fact tying them down. I believe it is well we should move carefully in that direction, and while I am no particular friend of railway corporations. I do think they should be dealt with fairly and justly. The Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) last session was referred to a special committee of which the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) was chairman. That Bill as introduced sought to amend section 227 of the Railway Act, 1903, which reads

> No trains shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village at a speed greater than ten miles an hour unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act or unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

The Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) last session sought to amend that section 227 as follows:

> By striking out the word 'or' in the third line and substituting therefor the word 'and,' and further amending section 227 by adding after the word 'expedient' at the end of the section the words 'but wherever in any such portion of a city, town or village the railway crosses a highway at rail level the said speed of ten miles an hour shall in no event be exceeded unless the company provides protection at such crossing for persons using the highway, against approaching trains.

The whole matter was looked into very thoroughly by the committee; we had expert witnesses on the technical features and we had evidence from the representatives of the railways as to the expense involved by the changes which would be absolutely necessary to conform to the provisions of the Bill of my hon. friend. The committee after hearing the evidence and after full deliberation submitted to the House the following amendment—they proposed to repeal section 227 and subsitute therefor the following:

> No train shall pass over any highway crossing at rail level in any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village at a greater speed than ten miles an hour unless such crossing is properly protected or unless such crossing is constructed and thereafter duly maintained in accordance with such orders, regulations and directions of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and the board as may be in force with respect thereto. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate that it deems expedient.

2. The company shall have until the first day of July, 1907, to comply with the provisions of this section.

This latter, I think, was a very fair qualification. Now, to conform to the provisions of this amendment would mean a very onerous burden upon the railways of the country, and the members of the committee unanimously concluded that it would be unfair to impose suddenly upon the railways this burden. We thought it in the public interest that there should be some further protection with respect to level crossings, and it seems to us under present conditions that no better provision could be had than that contained in this proposed legislation. No one can fail to recognize that there are very many accidents all over Canada, yearly, monthly, weekly almost, in connection with these rail level crossings and it was considered that some provision should be made to obviate that danger. The committee, therefore, made this proposal which was accepted by the House of Commons unanimously, in fact while the Bill was promoted by a private member it was adopted by the government and made part of the government Bill in amendment of the Railway Act. But when it went to the Senate in the very last hours of the session the Senate declined to accept it. It is not for me to question the judgment of the Senate, but it seems to me that in the public interest there should be legislation of this character. I am heartily in sympathy with the object which my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has in view, and while I would not wish to place undue burdens upon the railways of the country, yet, having regard to the time they have to provide for the requirements of this legislation, I think they should be asked to conform to it and do justice to the public at large.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). The principle embodied in this Bill has been before the House on a number of occasions; in fact it has been submitted to the House so frequently that it at last became known as a 'hardy annual.' It met rather an unfavourable reception at first, and it was modified from time to time. When I first entered the House I met it in its secondary stage and I was able to give it my approval and support. It was a matter of great pleasure to me that last year the government were willing to accept it in a modified form and to incorporate it in a government measure, in which form it passed through the House of Commons. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), who introduced the Bill, had the satisfaction of seeing it pass through the Commons, and I presume he had the reward of feeling that his was a duty well done ; the reward that comes from persistence in almost every line; the reward that comes from strength of character. However, the hon. gentleman did not finally achive success as the Senate did not acquiesce in the Bill.

The Bill, however, does contain matters of importance which I think should appeal to the Senate, and which on further consideration probably will appeal to it. The Bill contains a principle which I think was intended to be contained in the very earliest Railway Act, and it was only after it was shown by a certain number of decisions of the courts that the highest courts gave a different interpretation to the Act from that of the lower courts and from that of the ordinary layman, that the necessity of making the matter clear became evident. It is not necessary now to enter into a consideration of that, as the House has acquiesced in this principle. It brings into view something that is involved in the advance of modern civilization—the relative value of human life and the convenience of a great number of people. As between these two, the value of human life is so great that one would scarcely hesitate; and yet we are willing that under certain circumstances the convenience of the many should involve danger to a few; but it is our duty to see that that danger is minimized. The hon. gentlemen who have just spoken have pointed out how unfortunate it is that the Senate has not seen its way clear to agree with the House of Commons on this matter, and they have handled the matter very delicately indeed. They have attributed that largely to the lack of care or watchfulness on the part of the Senate; no motive has been assigned. It has been rather suggested that the members of the Senate did not thoroughly understand the full intent and meaning of this Act, and that on further consideration they will see it more clearly. It may be remembered that last session I introduced a resolution into this House with the object of improving the Senate. I cannot say that it met with a very rapturous reception here, although it did provoke some discussion in the other chamber. Well, as a supporter of this Bill I felt a little disappointed that the Senate did not see their way clear to pass it, and I am not going as far as the hon. gentlemen who have already criticised the Senate's action in the matter. For various reasons I am rather pleased that they took some action, for the presence of action indicates some presence of life. But activity does not always go in the right direction. I attended church the other evening——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. A not unusual thing with me, and a gentleman sitting beside me was continually ejactulating 'praise the Lord,' which came in usually at the right moment. He fell asleep, however, and when he awakened the sermon was not yet over, and he continued to ejaculate, 'praise the Lord,' but unfortunately at the

wrong occasions. It may be that the action of the Senate did not come at the proper moment. So I hope that when they see this Bill, they will find that its merits warrant its unanimous acceptance by both Houses.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

THE SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Act which this Bill proposes to repeal was passed in 1886. For the information of hon. gentlemen I will read the substantial clauses of that Act. The first clause applies the Act to railways incorporated by Dominion law and under the jurisdiction of this parliament. It does not apply to local railways or street railways, but only to such railways as come under the Railway Act of Canada. It then enacts that a railway company may appoint an agent for the sale of its tickets. Clause 4 says:

> Every ticket sold by any agent shall have the name of such agent and the date of the sale written or stamped plainly upon it, and any person who fraudulently alters, changes or imitates such signature or date, is guilty of an offence against this Act.

Section 7 is to this effect:

> No person except those authorized as above mentioned, shall sell or offer for sale any railway passenger ticket, or pass, ticket, certificate or other instrument, enabling any person or purporting to entitle any person to travel on any one railway, or more than one railway, or on any part of one railway, or parts of several railways to which this Act applies.

That is, no railway ticket shall be sold without authority. Subsection 4 of section 9 says:

> The sale by any person of the unused portion of any ticket otherwise than by the presentation of the same for redemption, as provided for in this section, is an offence against this Act, and shall be punishable as herein provided.

In other words, in 1886 this parliament in its wisdom enacted a law making it a crime for anybody who had purchased a railway ticket to offer it for sale, and, if convicted, he was subject to the penalties imposed by the Act. Now, I believe that is unnecessary legislation for this country. A great many abuses have occurred under it, and I intend for a short time to try and point them out to the House. If a person buys a bread ticket or a milk ticket or a concert ticket, he can dispose of it if he wishes to do so; but strange to say if he buys a railway ticket and does not use it, he can dispose of it only in one way. It has been made a crime in this country to sell this article of every day use. The reason given in the old days for this Act was that it was to stop scalping. If there was scalping it was the railways themselves that caused it; and if they pursued a policy of treatment of the public which ended in what appeared to them to be a loss, they should have changed their policy instead of coming to this parliament for protection. No other class in this community has this special protection. To illustrate how this law works out I wish to read a letter which I received just two or three days ago from a citizen of this country giving his experience. Here it is:

> Dear Sir,—I am much pleased to learn from the 'World' that you are introducing an amendment to the Railway Act forbidding the sale of an unused portion of a railway ticket, Such a law in the first case was an imposition on the people of this country, and I understand it was placed in the statute-books through the efforts of the railroad companies, and by the assistance of Hon. Edward Blake. As the law now is, a passenger cannot sell his ticket or portion of it, to any one except the company he buys it of, and then, must take what the company sees fit to give for it, and send their value of it when they get ready. It would be just as sensible to have a law that a man cannot sell a horse to any one except the man he bought him from, and the same with any other commodity bought and sold. I know the railroad companies say they will take back the ticket and refund the money. But note the delay in so doing. My own case for example. I was coming down the lakes with a ticket which brought me from Collingwood to Toronto on the Grand Trunk. Arriving at Owen Sound I found by coming in by the Canadian Pacific Railway I would save twenty hours and hotel bills. I did so. On arriving at Toronto I applied at ticket office for rebate and was told the ticket would have to go to Montreal, which it did, and it took over four weeks to get back the small amount allowed me, which was about one-half what it cost me to come from Owen Sound via the Canadian Pacific Railway.

That is in order to get home he had to buy a ticket over the Canadian Pacific Railway at a cost greater than that of his original ticket. He goes on:

> Again I bought a ticket at Reed Deer, Alberta, for Strathcona, and changed my mind and did not use the ticket. Next day when I returned the ticket to the Canadian Pacfic Railway agent I bought it from, he refused to take it back and said I would have to send it to Montreal. This time it took nearly six weeks to get back the value of the ticket. So you see you will earn the good will of the travelling public if you succeed in annulling this iniquitous law.
>
> It is a serious matter for foreigners coming to Canada and not knowing that we have such a law, to be punished with a heavy fine or imprisonment because they dare to sell their own property to any buyer they choose.

That is the actual condition of affairs and that is happening all over this country.

A man buys a railway ticket and goes on a journey; sometimes he buys a return ticket and on that condition gets a reduced fare. That man may change his mind, he may wish to travel in another way or he does not wish to go quite so far or he desires to go partly by another road, either for pleasure or the advancement of his business. If he desires to do this he is taxed for the full fare, he has to go through a circumlocution office that occupies from four to six weeks, he has to pay additional money and suffer great inconvenience. This thing has occurred all over the country, people in every portion feel it time after time. I have heard complaints of this law and people say they know of no other country in the world, perhaps excepting Pennsylvania which is railroad ridden and where there is something of that character, where there is a similar law on the statute-book. I take it that a railway ticket is practically a token, that it is given for something and for the person who purchases it, and if it is not used, if the purchaser changes his mind, he should get his money back and be able to forthwith sell that ticket to some one else who will use it. That is what takes place all the world over. It is not a crime in any other country, if having purchased a ticket you change your mind; it is not a crime in any other country than Canada to sell such a railway ticket. I take it that a railway ticket is a token and will pass from one to another, that it is good until used and is good for use by the holder. It is like a bank note or a postage stamp, it can go from one to another and ought to be of that character. And if we had the right railway legislation in this country we would have that kind of railway ticket, one that is good wherever it goes. In some other places, they have adopted the system of mileage books. We have those mileage books here and the railroad in that instance admits that this is a ticket good until used and good over any portion of its system. They concede something to the public there, but they have these tickets of which I speak and which it is a crime to sell, tickets which compel the purchaser to go by a certain way and within a certain time. If the ticket is not used in that way it has to go back to the railway and the purchaser has to wait for weeks for the money and then get a small percentage of the value of the ticket returned. If you are in New York and wish to go to Boston you cannot buy a return ticket but you can buy two tickets of one kind. These tickets read 'good from New York to Boston,' or 'vice versa.' In the United States they do not give return tickets but they have given this wider character to a railway ticket that it is good either way and then, as I say, all over the United States they are going largely into this system of book tickets, good in any direction, and unlimited. There are no conditions, these tickets pass from one to another and if a man has no use for his ticket he can sell it. Why he should not sell it, I do not know. He has paid for it, he has paid for the transportation of one person between two points and if he cannot use it himself why should he not be able to sell it to a neighbour? It does not seem to me that Canadians should be stigmatized as criminals because they dare to sell a railway ticket one to another.

Another thing, we Canadians are getting the worst of these laws which we are making in this country in connection with our railroads. An American citizen can buy a ticket over a Canadian railroad at two cents a mile and if he does not want to use it can sell it to his neighbour in the United States who may use it, and he does sell it; but the Canadian, if he buys a ticket at three cents a mile in his own country cannot sell it, cannot dispose of it, must take it back to the railway company and it must be redeemed in the manner of which I spoke. The defence of the railway companies is: Oh, we are giving the public a cheap kind of ticket on which if they go and come by our road they get the advantage of cheapness, and if we give them this cheap ticket a part of the contract is that the purchaser must use it, not some one else. That is not what the people of Canada want. They want cheap transportation but they want cheap transportation without limitation of any kind and if they buy a ticket they want one that is good for so many miles, and good in any direction. Take the case of a business man who is a traveller, not a commercial traveller but travelling on his own business, and he wishes to go from Ottawa to Toronto to do some business. If he buys a return ticket say by the Canadian Pacific Railway he will get a reduced rate, but that does not suit his business. He wants to go from Ottawa to Toronto and do business there and at points on the way and to come back to Ottawa by Prescott or Brockville and do business at these points. He cannot do this and get a cheap ticket; the railroad says to him: You can only have a cheap ticket if you consent to this limitation, that you must go direct to Toronto and come back the same way. We will not allow you to go around by Prescott and Brockville and do business there and come back. So, the man, in order to have his freedom and to do business as he wishes, pays the high rate of three cents or three and a third cents a mile. What the people want is the cheapest possible ticket, available at all times, without limitation and in any direction on the system.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) say that the rate between Toronto and Ottawa, is 3 cents to 3⅓ cents a mile?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. But by the Canadian Pacific Railway? Suppose a man buys a ticket from Ottawa to Toronto, is the rate as stated by my hon. friend, 3 cents to 3⅓ cents a mile? I was under the impression that, for that distance, the rate was below 3 cents a mile.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is and is not the case. Let me show——

Mr. EMMERSON. I was just wondering whether the hon. gentleman was making the positive statement, or whether——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not say that that is the rate in that particular case. What I say is that the prevalent rate, the rate posted up in the Grand Trunk office for all passenger traffic over this line, is 3⅓ cents a mile. The minister shakes his head. But I have the tariff here and——

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the limitation as to the mileage?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If you wish to go from Toronto to Kingston, you must pay 3⅓ cents a mile. If you wish to go from Toronto to Hamilton, you travel at 3 cents a mile. And I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways of this House, and especially of members who represent counties between Toronto and Montreal, to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway is charging all the local traffic on that road, 3⅓ cents a mile. And the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) apparently, does not know it, though we pay him $8,000 a year to protect the public interest.

Mr. EMMERSON. You have raised it a thousand. Of course, I do not object to it being $8,000; I would prefer it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And I do not think anybody would object, if the minister were the right man.

Mr. EMMERSON. But it is only $7,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, perhaps, Santa Claus will do something for you. What I am going to argue is that we should not retain this law upon the statute-book for the protection of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Railway when these companies themselves are the greatest delinquents in regard to obeying the law that I know of. I intend to argue that we should, as an act of retaliation, if nothing else, immediately repeal this law. Why should we take so much trouble to afford them legal protection, when they themselves are guilty of violating the law of the land every day? In that connection, let me say a word or two about the Grand Trunk Railway. In the 'Canada Gazette,' of last Saturday, there was this little notice:

> Notice is hereby given that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada will apply to the parliament of Canada, at the present session thereof, for an Act repealing or amending the provisions of section 3, 16 Victoria, chapter 37.
>
> W. H. BIGGAR,
> Solicitor for the applicants.

And what is it that the Grand Trunk Railway Company wish to repeal—this Grand Trunk Railway Company which has special protection in regard to tickets by the law of this country so that it can drag a man into court, brand him as a criminal, and send him to jail because he dares to sell a ticket which he purchased from them with his good money? Here is what they propose to repeal as covered by this modest statement in the 'Canada Gazette.' I have here the statutes of Canada, 16th Victoria, 1852. I turn to chapter 37. The declaratory clause is as follows:

> Whereas, the construction of a railway from the city of Toronto to the city of Kingston, and thence to the city of Montreal, will greatly tend to promote the welfare of this province——

And having so declared, clause 3 enacts as follows:

> And be it enacted, that the gauge of the said railway shall be five feet six inches; and the fare or charge for each first-class passenger by any train on the said railway shall not exceed two pence currency for each mile travelled, the fare or charge for each second-class passenger by any train on the said railway shall not exceed one penny and one-half penny currency for each mile travelled, and the fare or charge for each third-class passenger by any train on the said railway shall not exceed one penny currency for each mile travelled; and that at least one train having in it third-class carriages shall run every day throughout the length of the line.

And, a little further on in the same Act, clause 28, we read:

> Provided always, that the guarantee of the province shall not be given to the company incorporated by this Act or in respect of the railway hereby authorized to be constructed, to an amount exceeding the sum of three thousand pounds sterling, for every mile in length of the said railway.

Here is a railway that was to be for the benefit of the province of Canada, and was to receive a guarantee of £3,000 a mile on its bond issue, and the construction and operation of which were supposed to bind the parts of Canada closely together. And parliament, in its wisdom, enacted at that time this clause which declared that there was to be a third-class service over the entire system of the Grand Trunk Railway at a maximum rate of a penny-a-mile. Yet, in the proceedings in the police court in Toronto, under which Mr. Hays is proceeded against as a criminal because he has not obeyed the statute, it was shown that no one could buy a penny-a-mile ticket, and that there was no third-class service given to the public, though it is expressly provided for in the law of the land,—and not

only made part of the law, but made a condition of the voting of an immense-guarantee to that railroad. And Mr. Hays, or those representing him said in the police court in Toronto, that, so far as they knew, there never had been a third-class service on the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railroad in this country. A gentleman came into my office a few days ago and said to me: 'Mr. Maclean, I have been watching what took place in the police court and what has been taking place at Ottawa, about the two-cent rate; and, when the Grand Trunk Railway says that there never was a third-class service at a penny-a-mile, or that the Grand Trunk Railway never conceded that point, he is ignorant of the facts of history, for here is one of the third-class tickets issued by the old Montreal and Lachine Railway, the predecessor of the Grand Trunk Railway.' The ticket that he showed me was a copper token, and I have it here. On one side appear the words, 'Montreal and Lachine Railway Company,' with a representation of an old style locomotive; and, on the reverse the words, 'third-class.' And there is a hole through the centre of the token for the convenience of stringing it on wire or cord. I went into the library and tried to get a little history of this third-class ticket. I found that in the collection in the library there is one of these copper medals. Perhaps the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would like to look at this token. I will send it to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen it before.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman has travelled on it, if he has, he can be a witness. But here is what the book says in regard to this medal or token:

> It was found that ordinary railway tickets were not convenient for use among the Indians and workmen on the Lachine canal, who formed the bulk of third-class travel by this road. These tickets were therefore imported from Birmingham, they were strung on a wire as they were collected by the conductor. The balance remaining in the hands of the Montreal and Champlain Railway Company were melted at St. Lambert in 1862.

Now here is this Grand Trunk Railway that has special protection against the people of Canada, which refuses to comply with that law, and will not carry the public on third-class tickets at a penny a mile fare. I say a railroad that does that has no right to any special protection from this House. Therefore we have to seek a vindication of the law, and proceedings are going on in Toronto to-day to compel the Grand Trunk Railway to give people this third-class penny a mile passenger service, but it remains for a private citizen to retain his own lawyer, to back up his own case in order to get the law vindicated. Parliament is willing to give these railways additional legislation to make it criminal for people to deal in railway tickets, but nobody seems to make it his business in this country to compel the Grand Trunk Railway to carry out the law, while at the same time the company coolly come to this House and ask that a fundamental clause in their charter be repealed requiring them to afford a lower rate of travel over their railway system. That very same clause that is in the Grand Trunk charter is the only foundation, the only legal sanction, of that magnificent third-class passenger system they have in England. This is the clause under which railways in England run a penny a mile train a day, and it came about because an able railroad manager in the service of the Midland Railway said a good many years ago, I will cut out the second-class cars, I will improve the third class, I will put a third-class coach on every train and close it in. In England, as at Lachine in the early days, these third-class cars were open; but this enterprising railroad man in England, on the Midland said, we will have a penny-a-mile car on every train, and we will make the car much better than it might be. So the whole railroad travel in England was revolutionized on that one clause, and it would have been revolutionized here, and we would have been at the same stage of progress to-day, if that clause had been enforced in this country.

Now I want to give one or two other reasons why we should not give this special legislation to railways who treat the public as they are doing to-day. I gave the other day an instance of discrimination which occurred in my own county, I showed the treatment accorded to a farmer in that township. I stated then that the railways can charge farmers two local tolls when the traffic happens to pass over two local railways. I am here to supplement that, and to say what those two railways did to this farmer in regard to his carload of tiles. The carload was twenty-five tons; from Beamsville to Hamilton, over the Grand Trunk, twenty-one miles, $17.50; from Hamilton to Toronto on the Canadian Pacific Railway, forty miles, $21.25. And because they had merely to switch it up to the farmer's siding, seven miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway, they added $15 for the switching. In other words, these two railways jointly, and in a conspiracy against the public, compelled that farmer to pay three local rates on one carload of tiles passing over 68 miles. If there had been any way by which they could have done it and taken that car over another line, they would have charged him four local rates. The leader of the opposition asked if there was not any provision in the law against such things. I say no, because I have here a correspondence with the Department of Railways and Canals which says that these men can impose these three local charges. Yet we allow them to break the law, and we give them

this special legislation which they got some years ago from the then government, which makes Canadians criminals if they deal in railroad tickets which they have bought and paid for.

Now I want to give one or two other instances. I spoke about the demurrage charges that this farmer had to pay on a load of posts. They charged him $5 demurrage charge and they said: We have been looking for you five days, and we could not find you; now you have to pay for the freight, and take your car, and we will charge you $5 demurrage. So he paid it. It took them ten days to put that car on the siding, and they taxed him $1 a day for demurrage charges, pretending that they could not find his address. They knew where his siding was, but they did not use it for ten days. How long will people stand this kind of treatment? I met a man on the train the other day who said he intended to build a factory and employ a lot of men, but whether he would carry out his intention depended altogether on the railroad rates. He said to me, I picked out a likely place where I could get labour and material, but before I start to build a factory I go to the railway to get their terms. The bricks to build my factory are made a hundred and twenty miles from the site of the factory, they will pass over two railways, and there will be two local rates to pay. They tell this man that if he takes a carload of bricks a hundred and twenty miles over a line where two local freights are exacted, he must pay $60 a car, containing 10,000 bricks, $6 a thousand for the freight alone after he buys his bricks in the yard for $8 a thousand. The farmer I spoke of had to submit to three local charges, the freights were over one-half the price of the tiles. Yet the farmers are told to put in tiles and drain their land and improve it. How can a man build a factory if he has to draw bricks a hundred and twenty miles and pay $6 a thousand for traffic charges?

Then let me point out how these railways discriminate in regard to coal. It is a strange thing in this country that when you want to get a law enforced, and when you want to know anything about a railway, you have to go and hire an expert to work it up for you. As a newspaper man working in the public interest, I engaged an expert to look up some of these discriminations, and he has enlightened the public considerably by his discoveries. What does he find to be the actual condition of affairs in this country, notwithstanding the Railway Act? Canadians in this country will stand anything, they stand being made criminals of for selling a railway ticket, and they stand all kinds of exactions. Let me read you one or two cases. There is a Canadian Freight Agent's Association in connection with the railways of this country, they have been organized since the Railway Commission came into force. This is what this expert finds, as some of the things they claim to have done for Canada.

They have abolished competition between railways.
Secured the legalization of demurrage charges.
Abolished free cartage.
Imposed additional charges for storage.
Increased the charges for switching at central points.

All these things have taken place of late. As to discrimination here are some facts: From Port Stanley to Toronto the Père Marquette Railway publish a rate of 60 cents per ton for coal, and to meet this competition the Canadian Pacific Railway makes a similar rate from Port Burwell, but to intermediate points, such as St. Mary's, Stratford, Berlin, Waterloo, Guelph, Galt, &c., the rate is 90 cents per ton. In the face of these facts will the Canadian railways undertake to say that competition does not have the effect of reducing the cost of transportation. It has certainly reduced the cost of producing steam power at London and Toronto, but the policy of making low rates to competitive points has been the building up of a few favoured places at the expense of other portions of the country, and is prejudicial to the best interests of the people of Canada.

These two great railways which have this special law and special protection are actually discriminating against points in Ontario and giving coal to Toronto at one half the rate they charge to intermediate places because they are forced to do that by competition. These railways should not be allowed to discriminate as they do discriminate in this country every day. They should not be allowed to impose these double tolls as they are imposing them and especially they should not be allowed to have legislation like that on the statute-books for their protection while they run riot all over the country and treat the people as they like. I have spoken of discrimination only in the very shortest possible way, but I have spoken of it on other occasions. Railway discrimination is to-day the crying evil of this country. The so-called customs duties that are collected from the people are a very small matter, a very small tax, as compared with this most unfair tax collected by the railways in regard to passenger rates and freight rates. I do not intend to go any further into that on this present occasion, but I now come to something of the highest importance and in regard to it I want the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister, as I see I am getting it. We have in this country a Railway Act which we passed some years ago. It is a very fair Act and it is in the right direction. But, there is another Railway Act on this continent and it was passed in Washington a short time ago. I have the new Railway Act of the United States and I want to show the right hon. gentleman the

difference between the Railway Act of the United States and our Railway Act and the difference in the way in which they administer it in the United States as compared with the way we administer our Act in this country. I referred the other day to having been taunted with regard to the drafting of my Bills. Now, I want to tell the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals whose predecessor had able lawyers to draft the Canadian Railway Act—and probably it is very excellent draftsmanship—that there is a great difference between the draftsmanship of our Act and that of the United States Act. The draftsmanship of the United States Act is such that it makes it effective.

Mr. TISDALE. Which Act are you quoting?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am quoting the Act to regulate commerce as amended and Acts supplemental thereto.

Mr. TISDALE. That is the interstate law?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is the interstate law, but it is the Act that does the trick, that regulates the railways in the United States.

Mr. TISDALE. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will show the hon. gentleman where it does. When we speak about draftsmanship and about enforcing the law, I will show how it works out. We make a Railway Act and leave it to the tender mercies of the public to enforce notwithstanding our expensive departments of justice and railways the courts and laws for taking evidence.

Mr. EMMERSON. You mean inexpensive.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The people do not think so. The minister may. This Act deals with the Railway Commission of the United States and I am just going to read a few words here and there from it:

> The commission is hereby authorized and required to execute and enforce the provisions of this Act ;——

Have we anything like that in the law of this country? No enforcement of that kind.

> —and the costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the United States.

Is the public purse used here as in the United States for the enforcement of our Railway Act and for the protection of the public? I have not heard of it; yet, it is provided for in this clause. Let me read another clause. I wish the Attorney General of Canada were here. He is never in this House when any of these important questions are up, but I hope the Prime Minister will direct his attention to this.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are not here enough to know how often he is here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, I am always here when my things are on.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are here Mondays and Wednesdays.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Where has the hon. gentleman been since this House opened? Will the hon. gentleman tell me where he was? I will tell the House where I was and what business I was on. Will he tell the House what business he was on and where he was?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will be very happy to.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All right; we will have a conference after dinner.

> And the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed, whenever he has reasonable grounds to believe that any such person, corporation, or company, has knowingly received or accepted from any such common carrier any sum of money or other valuable consideration as a rebate or offset as aforesaid, to institute in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction a civil action to collect the said sum or sums so forfeited as aforeaid.

The Attorney General of the United States and every attorney in the United States under him is directed to do these things, to enforce the law and to use the money out of the purse of the United States for that purpose so as to protect the people of the United States as against railway corporations. In a few minutes I will show you how that kind of legislation has resulted in the interest of the people, but I want to go on with one or two other quotations:

> It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, whenever the Attorney General shall direct, either of his own motion or upon the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to institute and prosecute such proceedings, and the proceedings provided for by this Act shall not preclude the bringing of suit for the recovery of damages by any party injured, or any other action provided by said Act approved February 4th.

It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys under the authority of the Attorney General of the United States to institute proceedings. Do you see the magnificent provision for the enforcement of the law in that? They not only make the law, but they make provision for its absolute enforcement. That is a characteristic of the interstate commerce law which they have in the United States and it is doing marvellous things there for the people.

Then, they had to deal with the telegraph companies. I dealt with that question the other day and showed why the telegraph companies should be put under the control of the Railway Commission. Let me read

two or three short extracts in regard to that matter:

Whenever any telegraph company which shall have accepted the provisions of title sixty-five of the revised statutes shall extend its line to any station or office of a telegraph line belonging to any one of said railroad or telegraph companies, referred to in the first section of this Act, said telegraph company so extending its line to connect with the telegraph line of said road or telegraph company to which it is extended at the place where their lines may meet, for the prompt and convenient interchange of telegraph business between said companies.

Here is the way they deal with telegraph connections in the United States. The law reads:

For the prompt and convenient interchange of telegraph business between said companies, the said railroad and telegraph companies referred to in the first section of this Act shall operate their respective telegraph lines so as to afford equal facilities to all without discrimination in favour of or against any company or corporation whatever and shall receive, deliver and send business with connecting telegraph lines on equal terms and affording equal facilities and without discrimination for or against any one of such connecting lines, and such exchange of business shall be on terms just and equitable.

But to-day in Canada we allow the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific who own telegraph lines of their own to deliberately refuse to connect with the Ontario government railway telegraph line at North Bay, compelling the message to be taken out of one office and into another and repeated at double local tolls, thus delaying and impeding the great interests we have at Cobalt. If telegraph companies dared to do such a thing in the United States, but they would not dare to do it, they would be hauled before the court by the law officers in the name of the Attorney General of the United States and justly punished. Let me read a little more from this railway law of the United States:

It is hereby made the duty of the Attorney General of the United States.

Was there ever such mandatory draftsmanship in any Canadian law?

It is hereby made the duty of the Attorney General of the United States by proper proceedings to prevent any unlawful interference with the rights and equities of the United States under this Act and under all Acts of congress relating to all such railroad and telegraph lines and to have legally ascertained and finally adjudicated, &c.

The Attorney General of the United States is thus commanded to see that the law is carried out in the public interest. It is his duty to do it and the whole resources of the United States are at his service to enforce the law.

And it shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inform the Attorney General of all such cases of neglect or refusal, whose duty it shall be to proceed at once to judicially enforce the forfeiture hereinbefore provided.

These are a few clauses of the Interstate Commerce law of the United States. See how it differs from the law of Canada in this respect that the enforcement of the United States law is made the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is also made the duty of the Attorney General of the United States, and it is made the duty of every United States attorney from one end of the country to the other, and the resources of the United States are at their disposal to enforce that law. I want to mention another fact, and it is very instructive to the Prime Minister and to those in Canada who have the administration of this law. The Attorney General of the United States who has these duties imposed on him is the Hon. Elihu Root. He had occasion to make a speech the other day at Albany in connection with the state election. He has been good enough to send me a copy of the speech and I shall read an extract or two from it. Mr. Root is certainly the ablest international lawyer in the United States; he is a man of the highest legal attainments, a man who can earn anything from $100,000 to $400,000 a year in his profession, I am told, and he has entered the United States cabinet at a salary of $10,000 a year. Mr. Root said:

There is a great reform going on in the United States, a great upheaval of public opinion against the corporations. Now, this process of intelligent and effective redress of wrongs is going on, great and substantial progress has been made in it. Laws are being reformed so as to meet the present evil; laws are being enforced with vigour and success. The most conspicuous and fit representative of this great and beneficent work in this state is Charles E. Hughes; the most conspicuous and fit representative of this same great and beneficent work in the federal government is Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States. Let me state some of the corporate evils which he has undertaken to deal with; not all, but the principal ones.

I will just cite from Mr. Root's speech the corporate evils which he says Roosevelt has undertaken to deal with and which are pertinent to the question before the House:

Many railroad companies have exercised their arbitrary power to fix their rates by arranging them in such a way that even without giving rebates they have favoured the large shippers in special localities and have been unreasonable towards small shippers in other localities. By these unfair means the big, rich corporations have been continually driving the small weak men to the wall, taking away their business and increasing their own wealth.

I wish the Attorney General of Canada was present in the House to-day to hear what I am aout to read now. I wish he were present to hear what the Attorney General of the United States has said.

The managers of many great corporations, not satisfied with the natural increase of successful business have enormously increased their capitalization beyond either their investment or the value of their property fairly used in business. Much of the watered stock has been sold to innocent investors, much of it has been secured by the managers themselves through various devices for insufficient consideration. These greatly excessive capitals and the necessity of the paying of interest upon them have stood as barriers against the reduction of transportation on rates or the prices of products to a point which would secure a fair business return. Against these battlements of wrong the President has charged with all the energy and sincere conviction of his nature ; he has waged and is waging open warfare, not against wealth but against ill-gotten wealth ; not against corporations, but against the abuse of corporate power ; not against enterprise and prosperity, but against the unfair and fraudulent devices of selfish greed.

And then :

For the accomplishment of this due measure of control which from time immemorial our laws have recognized as necessary, the government of the United States has taken up the task where the several states have failed and is performing and purposes to perform its duty, not beyond, but to the full limits of its constitutional power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did Mr. Root become Attorney General of the United States ? I think he is Secretary of State.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, he is Secretary of State. I think he was Attorney General for a while.

Mr. EMMERSON. He never was attorney general.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. At all events he is certainly one of the ablest lawyers in the United States. His colleague, Mr. Moody, is attorney general.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, yes, he is a very able man.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What he is claiming credit for is what the Attorney General of the United States, backed y the President, is doing to enforce this Act. Now, I will show what the attorney general is doing :

After the Elkins anti-rebate law was passed by congress in 1903 it was supposed, and the Interstate Commerce Commission reported, that the railroads had substantially abandoned giving rebates. Their good resolutions do not seem, however, to have lasted. The struggle for business enabled the shippers soon to secure a renewal of rebates, or, by ingenious devices, advantages equivalent to rebates.

Thereupon the Department of Justice began active prosecutions for the enforcement of the law. Fifty-three indictments have been found against hundreds of defendants and covering many hundreds of transactions. There have been fourteen criminal convictions. Fourteen individuals have been fined to the gross amount of $66,125. Nine corporations have been fined to the amount of $253,000. Thirty-five indictments are ready for trial in their regular order upon the court calendar.

That is what the Attorney General of the United States is doing to-day for the enforcement of the Railway Act of that country, and he is doing it under the direction and with all the energy behind him of the President of the United States. In other words, if Congress enacts a law, those who have charge of the administration of the law conceive it to be their duty to enforce that law against the railways. Let me give you another instance :

The Railroad Rates Act, which was the subject of such excited discussion during the last session of congress, has already justified itself. Since the passage of the Act less than five months ago there have been more voluntary reductions of rates by our railroads than during the entire nineteen years of the previous life of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is the enforcement of the law that will produce results. The mere passage of a law is only a cover for inroads on the people. He goes on :

On the single day of the 29th of August, 1906, two days before the Act went into force, over five thousand notices of voluntary reduction of rates were filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission by the railroads of the United States.

All this has not been easy ; it has required not merely skill and ability and patient industry and the tremendous personality of the President, against all powerful influences urging on congress and lawyers and courts, but it has required and still requires persistency, long-continued and constant effort, a deliberate, settled, and unvarying policy.

That policy is now before the American people for their approval or disapproval, and it is confronted by two dangers.

In the United States they have a law which not only protects the people, but imposes the duty on the attorney general and all the attorneys representing the United States all over the country of enforcing that law. As a consequence railroad after railroad there is obeying the law. Thousands of railroad tariffs have been revised and reduced in the interest of the people—not because they have an Act on the statute-book, but because they have men charged with the administration of the law who enforce it and see that justice is done. We have no such thing in this country to-day. I have yet to hear where the Attorney General of Canada has instituted any action to compel a railway company to obey the law. We had no law imposing that duty upon him. If we devoted our time to enacting such a law instead of passing such a law as we passed in former years for the special protection of the railroads, we would be doing something for the people. Now, this good work of enforcing the law that is going on in the United States is not finished. In every paper you take up you can read of

convictions against railroads being secured by the Attorney General of the United States. Let me read two or three sentences of what happened on Tuesday last in New York :

Fines aggregating $150,000 were imposed yesterday afternoon by Judge Holt, in the United States Circuit Court, upon the American Sugar Refining Company and the Brooklyn Cooperage Company, upon pleas of guilty to indictments alleging an acceptance of rebates on sugar shipments in violation of the Elkins Anti-rebating Act. This, with the $18,000 imposed upon the same defendant a few days ago on conviction, makes a total of $168,000 it will have to pay this morning for 'rebating.'

For the granting of these rebates the New York Central has already been convicted twice and fined $108,000 and $18,000. Its late traffic manager, Frederick L. Pomeroy, likewise convicted for giving rebates, was fined $6,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has nothing to do with the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But it has to do with the officers representing the people of the United States enforcing the law against rebates.

Mr. EMMERSON. Those are the district attorneys?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The point is this. They have laws, and we have, compelling fair dealing and fair treatment of the people; but the vindication and enforcement of the law there is in the hands of the public authorities, while here you have to go to the Toronto police court if you want to have the law enforced. I ask the Minister of Railways whether it is his intention or the intention of the government to enforce the law in regard to the passenger rate of a penny-a-mile on the Grand Trunk, as the Attorney General of the United States is to-day enforcing the law over there? When the hon. gentleman comes to deal with that question, I hope he will take the people into his confidence; and if he is not in a position to do so, I hope the Prime Minister will do so, and say whether he intends to compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company to give that service to the public which it is entitled to give, not only between Toronto and Montreal, but all over its lines. The Montreal 'Gazette,' which I will compliment by saying that it is open and straight in its advocacy of the interests of the railways of this country, and does not pretend to fight the railways behind the mask of interest for the farmers, says this morning that the Grand Trunk is asking for the repeal of that Act so that it may be put on a par with the other railways of this country. That is to be the plea. The way to put the Grand Trunk Railway on a par with the other railways is to enforce that Act, and to-morrow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will follow and will give a service of two cents a-mile, and so will all the other railroads of this country. That is all the responsibility the hon. gentleman and his government need to incur in order to effect a revolution to-morrow in passenger transportation, that is, to notify the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in the same way as Attorney General Moody has notified the railroads of the United States, that they must obey the law. That was in the original charter of the Grand Trunk, a charter that declared that it was for the general welfare of the whole of Canada at that time, from Quebec to the Detroit river, that the concession of a penny-a-mile to the public was a part of the consideration for a substantial money grant, on which the people of Canada have from that day to this been paying the interest, although the railway company undertook to pay the interest.

Now there is the situation and if there is this agitation all over the country—and I have letters here from all kinds of people saying that they do want these cheaper rates in this country and they do want this infamous law abolished which makes them criminals if they deal with railway tickets, as they would with other property —I say in the face of that demand from the people and in the face of that violated law the government should declare to-day, in the face of the facts, in the face of what has happened in the police court in Toronto and what is happening before Chief Justice Meredith to-day and in the face of what appears in the 'Canada Gazette' of last week that they intend to ask for the repeal of this law, that, instead of repealing that two cent law, the whole resources of the government, the Attorney General, the Minister of Railways, the Prime Minister himself, and the money of the country, should be devoted, and that these men would consecrate their efforts to the enforcement of that law and the compelling of that Grand Trunk Railway Company to give the people of Canada a two-cent a mile passenger rate all over its system. It will not hurt the Grand Trunk, it will increase its business as I contend but that is neither here nor there. There is such a thing as law, and the sacredness of law, and the righteousness of its being enforced, and there is also another sacred duty ; it is that when a man takes an oath and goes into the service of the people and becomes a responsible minister of the state, and especially an attorney general, it is his duty to insist on the enforcement of that law right up to the handle. If it is wrong he ought to repeal it, if it is right he ought to enforce it, and on behalf of the people of Canada to-day, on behalf especially of the people of Canada who live along the line of the Grand Trunk, these people who to-day are paying three and a third cents a mile for railway passenger rates, on behalf of these people I ask the Prime Minister of this country to do two things,

to repeal this law which is on the statute-book, which makes it a crime to sell a railway ticket, and to use all the resources of this government to compel the Grand Trunk to obey the law which was passed some years ago and which does concede to the people of this country a penny a mile railway travel. It concedes to them simply what was conceded to the people of England by the English Railway Act. But under this same Act the people of England have all their railway passenger privileges. Whatever their privileges are, they have them all in that little clause, a penny a mile train, one train a day each way, on each portion of the line. For it we have got nothing in this country. As one of my correspondents says the old days have passed in this country, the pioneer days are over, the country is thickly populated and these railroads can now afford to give a better rate. They will make more money. It has been proved time after time, it is being proved in every case where it was attempted in the United States and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has an opportunity to-day, if he cares to seize it, that will let him get out of all this trouble of having to handle the two cents a mile question by simply asking his attorney general if that is the law and telling him if it is to go out and enforce it against the Grand Trunk. By that he will get a two cents a mile rate from one end of the system to the other, because if the Grand Trunk gives a penny rate, mark my word for it, you will see Sir Thomas Shaughnessy come down with the next train. That will apply all over the system because that covers every connection of the Grand Trunk, if it does not even cover the Grand Trunk Pacific. I cannot say as to that, but it covers everything that the Grand Trunk to-day controls and if that is the case the people of Canada expect that from this government.

This great revolution that has taken place in the United States and this enforcement of the law is a reaction after a condition of things that was almost unbearable. The same condition exists in this country, but our public men and public opinion have not yet reached the point of affecting the reform. Public opinion has got to that length and the only thing wanting now is the action of the responsible ministers of state. On them the responsibility lies, they must enforce this law and again I appeal to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on behalf of the people of Canada, to take that blot off our statute-book. He had nothing to do with the putting of it on the statute-book, he may have been in the House at the time—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, no.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN—but his name was not connected with it in any way, and I appeal to him to rise to the occasion and to solve the difficult situation by simply telling the Grand Trunk that they must obey the law and that he is the man to enforce it, and that he is here to do it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, after listening to the remarks of my hon. friend the mover of this motion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) which have been very interesting indeed, but which have not borne on the subject matter before you—

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would perhaps be interesting to come back to the Bill the second reading of which my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has moved. It is very difficult to follow my hon. friend.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. He has touched very lightly upon this particular Bill, he has had some other Bills in his mind likely, and I have no doubt that this one will be followed by others that will claim the attention of the House. Perhaps it will be well for us to consider the Bills as they come before us. The matter of the two cent rate and the question as to what the Attorney General should do, and what the Attorney General of the United States said are very interesting themes but they do not have to do with this particular Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Oh yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question of the two-cent rate is one thing, the question of the sale of railway tickets is another. I apprehend that there was good reason in the minds of the legislators of that day when the Act, chapter 110, of the revised statutes, was enacted. They do not have generally in the United States anything similar to our return tickets in this country and therefore the railways in that country have not the same difficulties to meet that the railways in Canada have to meet in that regard. A railway company in Canada will agree to convey a passenger for a certain rate a certain number of miles. The rate is graded according to the distance and is proportionate to the distance. If that particular passenger wishes to return the railway says to him : we will give you a return ticket, one that will take you to your point of destination and return you to your home. We will discriminate as to the price, if you will engage to come back by the same line in the same way. The railway says to the passenger : We will take you 200 miles, at a certain rate, but if you are going over our whole line, a distance of 800, 500, 600 or 700 miles, we will give you a proportionate rate lessened according to the distance. That is a matter of contract, a matter of arrangement and I apprehend that the object of the legislation of a former day was to prevent fraud and abuse with respect to this matter. Now this has

nothing whatever to do with the question of a two-cent rate. If a two-cent rate is correct and if it should be enforced, well and good. But, if the railways make a special engagement and say to the other parties to the contract: We will do thus and so, if you will do thus and so, and if such a bargain is open to abuse by one party or the other, it seems to me that either parties should be protected against that abuse.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister say that in the United States you cannot buy a return ticket on the railway here ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say they do not have them.

Mr. SPROULE. Why, actual experience is the very reverse.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have had actual experience and I say that on the Boston and Maine, on the Pennsylvania, and on the New York, New Haven and Hartford—

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon minister that I bought a ticket by way of Chicago to the west and on that ticket was printed permission to return by one of three routes.

Mr. EMMERSON. That might be—it is very much like one of these Cook tourist tickets. The railways have special arrangements among themselves by which a passenger can go one way and return by a circuitous route. The same thing is allowed in Canada. You can make an arrangement to go over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, then strike the Dominion Atlantic, and come back by way of Boston.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. minister is wrong when he says that there are no return tickets in the United States. All excursion tickets are return tickets, and more excursion tickets are sold there than here. You can get all kinds of return tickets in the United States. If we are going to argue this matter, let us argue it on the basis of the facts, as they are.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They certainly sell return tickets in the United States, for, six or seven weeks ago I bought a return ticket from New York to Lakewood. It may be that it was at the regular single fare rates. I cannot speak as to that.

Mr. BRISTOL. A short time ago I bought a return ticket to Arizona. What the American railways expect in the case of a transcontinental return ticket is that the passenger shall go to the company's office at the end of the outward journey, sign his name and identify himself as the person entitled to use the return part of the ticket.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is practically what I have stated. I made the statement and I am prepared to substantiate it by evidence, that, as a uniform rule in connection with the railway systems of the United States, they do not have return tickets such as we have on the Canadian systems.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I take issue with the hon. gentleman—

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has made his statement. I have made my statement and I can substantiate it. Take the Boston and Maine system, the New York, New Haven and Hartford, New York Central, and the Pennsylvania, and what I say is true of all these. However, it is entirely immaterial ; the matter was only mentioned incidentally as showing that the difficulties in the United States in this regard were not as great as they are in Canada. It is universal among the railways of Canada to issue return tickets, on which special rates are given in consideration of the fact that the purchaser enters into an engagement to return by the same route. That is, in order to secure the patronage of the traveller on the return, the railway gives him a special rate for the whole journey. Now, that is subject to abuse. Suppose I wish to go to Toronto to-morrow, but have no intention of returning. If I purchase a return ticket and use it only one way, and then sell the return half of the ticket to a friend who wishes to come to Ottawa, I save money. But I do so by defrauding the railway and in violation of my agreement and contract with them. It seems to me that the railway company has the right to some protection in this regard and that this scalping of tickets should not be permitted. But, be that as it may, I have only mentioned the matter to show what must have been in the minds of the legislators who enacted this particular clause which my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) seeks to repeal. But there is enough in the Bill—though the hon. gentleman seems to have paid no attention to the matter, for he has not discussed the Bill—to entitle it to the consideration of this House. It seems to me that this Bill should be read the second time and referred to a committee for consideration—probably, the railway committee would be the best. Therefore, while I support the second reading of the Bill, if my hon. friend does not move it, I will move, that it be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am in your hands.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words with regard to this Bill because it has engaged the attention of this House once before. I never was able to see the justice of the present law. If a man buys a railway ticket for a journey of a hundred miles, and if, for any cause he is compelled to cut his journey short fifty

miles, I do not see why he should not be allowed—

Mr. EMMERSON. I neglected to state that under the law in Canada, any portion of an unused ticket is redeemable at a rate in proportion to the original cost of the ticket. This, as I understand, is not the law, in any part of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. But it does not work out to the benefit of the individual who purchased the ticket. Let me give an example—and that example will show that the railway companies themselves were the ones who created all the trouble. The railways used to sell tickets between Boston and Chicago for $13. That is, $13 bought the right to a passage for one person from Boston through to Chicago. The rate from Boston to Toronto was $13 and the rate from Toronto to Chicago was $11. But, if the passenger, instead of going through from Boston to Chicago, ended his journey at Toronto, he could not transfer his right to be carried to Chicago to another person. If he sold his ticket to another person, and the railway companies knew of it, they would refuse to carry that other person on that ticket. The minister says that under the law, the purchaser of a ticket can get a rebate of a proportionate amount for the unused portion. But the proportionate amount he is allowed as rebate is counted on the basis of first-class passenger rates. That is, he paid $13 for his ticket from Boston to Chicago. He travelled a little more than a half the distance, and was allowed a rebate of all over the first-class passenger fare to Toronto. But the first-class fare from Boston to Toronto was $13—thirteen from thirteen and nothing remains, and so the man got nothing for the unused portion of the ticket. That is where the injustice is—

Mr. EMMERSON. But if the contract were not entered into the amount would be much more than $13. If there had been no return—

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about a return ticket at all. I am talking about straight travel over the line. That has been going on from time to time.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is specially as to distance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Wasn't that an excursion?

Mr. SPROULE. No, they sold these tickets by the thousands and every man who had one of them had the right to travel over the road. The present law makes it a crime for that individual to sell that ticket to any one else to be used. Let me refer to some of the arguments that were advanced in this House when this question was discussed before. For myself I opposed the law which took away from the public a right which I think they ought to enjoy.

We were told that a ticket is a contract between the railway company and the individual who purchases it. We, opposing that law, contended that it was no such thing. I go to a railway wicket and instead of buying one ticket, suppose I buy half a dozen tickets and hand them around to members of my family to use. Still they did not purchase the ticket. I passed it over to them. Why don't you apply the same principle when you buy a ticket for yourself as when you buy as an agent? Would it not be just as right and just as equitable in the one case as in the other, supposing that in both cases a portion of the ticket could not be used? I say that when you purchased a ticket you purchased the right for some person to travel over that road, and if the purchaser is unable for any reason to use the whole ticket, and get consideration for all his money, he should have the right to pass the balance over to another person and get consideration for the unused portion of that ticket. I never could see any justice or reason in depriving a traveller of that right.

We were met with the contention that a great injury was done. We were told: Here are a lot of tickets that have been sold at a low rate. But who sold them? The railway companies themselves sold them. Many railway companies resorted to this traffic when they were financially hard up and were obliged to borrow money in advance on their tickets, and they sold them by thousands. Every one of these tickets contemplated that the holder could travel over that road at some time, but if the traveller came over a Canadian railway as part of the route he had to lose part of his ticket, say, for instance, the Grand Trunk Railway. If a man travelling over that road endeavoured to use that ticket by transferring it to another, he became a criminal and was liable to punishment simply because he tried to get back a portion of his money. Is that fair? Is that justice? I say the law bears heavier upon the poor man than it does upon the rich man, because the rich man can afford to lose a few dollars while the poor man cannot.

Then we are told that there is a notice on the ticket that it is not transferable. But that part of the ticket which says it is not transferable has been declared to be not a binding contract, because I can hand it over to anybody and he has a right to use it. If I give it away for nothing that makes no difference; but if I sell it for a consideration then I become a criminal. If I use that ticket for a portion of the road and through some accident I fall sick and am carried to a hospital, must I lose the remaining portion of that ticket when I have paid for the whole of it? I have paid a first-class fare for so many miles of road, for 100 miles, we will say, and if I am un-

able to travel more than half of that distance must I lose the balance of my ticket? I say that is not fair to me, and it is not fair to the public. The principle which obtains in the United States ought to obtain in Canada. When you buy the right to travel over a road you or some one else should have the right to do so. As has been well said, it does not cost the railway any more to allow another man to use the balance of that ticket; he may be exactly of the same weight as the purchaser and take up the same room, therefore, I say there is no injustice done to the company. I am not talking about cheap excursion tickets to be used on the same day, I would not make this law apply to them. But when you buy a ticket and are unable to go the whole distance there should be no law making it punishable for you to sell the remaining portion of that ticket. But it is said : There is a notice on it that it is not transferable. That does not hold good in law. I have heard it said by able lawyers in this House that this condition does not bind the purchaser because he has no option, he is a contracting party, but he has no option. I go to the wicket and say I want to buy a ticket for Toronto. How much is it? The clerk tells me so much and I lay down the money. He hands me the ticket with that condition on it, and I say I do not want it with that condition ; I want it without a condition. He tells me that is the only condition on which I can buy a ticket at this wicket; therefore, the contract is forced on me and I have no option but to accept the ticket. When a man buys a ticket from Montreal to Toronto, either he or some one else has a right to be carried over that road. If the purchaser cannot go the whole way he should have the right to sell the unused portion of his ticket to some one else. It is not the same with a sleeping car. If I have in my pocket a sleeping car berth for Toronto, it says the number of the car is so and so, and the number of the berth is so and so ; I have practically bought the right to occupy that berth for a continuous trip upon the car No. 5, say, and berth No. 4, and it is good for no other car and no other berth. Still I can sell that ticket to anybody else, and he can use it, and there is no law against it. That is often done by members of this House who transfer their sleeping car tickets to some one else, and would it not be just as reasonable and just as equitable to allow the same right to a man who buys a ticket on an ordinary car? When a man tranfers his sleeping car ticket there is no complaint from the railway company about it. Of course it may be said that they don't know it. But even if they did know it, would they dare to stop any member from sleeping in that berth ? I think they would not. I say, therefore, that a man who purchases a ticket on an ordinary day coach and is unable to use it, or part of it, he should have the same right of transferring it.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). I wish to say only a few words, lest there should be any misunderstanding in the minds of the members who are not on the Railway Committee. The only class of ticket on which there is no limitation, either in Canada or in the United States, is what is known as a first-class ticket full pay. There is no question but that such a ticket is good under all circumstances and at any time. I do not think there is a limit regarding it for even ten years. There might be some reasonable regulations regarding its use, but I understand there is none. A man is entitled to a rebate for all that part of it that he does not use. It is a difficult question how to regulate the payment of the rebate, and I think the railroads might make some improvement, but I fear it would be difficult to do it by law. All the other classes of tickets stand on separate ground and they stand on contract because they are conditional. Therefore, it is quite proper to put upon them that there is no transfer. It does not matter what they put upon an unconditional first-class ticket because the law has settled all that. All the others have their conditions and they are sometimes very complicated.

Mr. SPROULE. Take a regular first-class ticket and if a man is unable to use it and he sells it to some one else, what then?

Mr. TISDALE. I am not talking about the selling. I think it would be regrettable that hon. members of this House should get an improper impression of what the law is without it being corrected. The law is precisely similar in regard to all of these and I have had a somewhat extensive experience in regard to this question, having been interested in some lawsuits arising out of it. The requirements are almost similar in all these conditional classes of tickets. They have different plans of mileage tickets. They are not uniform mileage tickets. There are associations of roads. There are cases where six or seven roads issue mileage tickets which are good on any of them. Then, they have their conditions. Some roads will not allow any one but the purchaser to travel on the mileage tickets. Some very wisely ask no questions as long as the tickets are used. Some companies confine them to their own roads. Very complicated qestions of law arise in regard to conditional tickets. As far as I am concerned I would be very glad to hear the principle of this Bill discussed in the Railway Committee. When this law was passed it was passed by a Conservative administration and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. TISDALE. After discussion; I think it was although I do not know.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no division upon it. It was passed in 1882.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand that, but I waive the point. Whether there was or was not is no reason why we should not deal with it now.

Mr. SPROULE. Several parties talked strongly against the law.

Mr. TISDALE. That may be. I have done that myself, but I am not above changing my mind on such matters if good reasons are given. I apprehend that there was a very good reason for the legislature at that time passing this law. I am very much interested and I am glad that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has asked for a reference of this Bill to the Railway Committee because I have a perfectly open mind upon it. No two institutions in this country ever did more good service for the country or advanced it more than those two great corporations, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. But they are liable to misbehave themselves and I am in favour or regulating them if it is reasonable. If it is unreasonable I am not. It rather prejudices me if anything when the argument is devoted, not to giving reasons why this would be a good change in the law, but to casting animadversions upon two excellent and great institutions which have done very many good things for this country. We have regulated them and I am prepared to regulate them now, but I am not prepared to regulate them if there is not some cause. If there were not some reason, outside of the fact that it helps the railway companies I never would have been in favour of this legislation and I would vote against it. I am not now going into the reasons for the position which I take because I want to confine myself at the present time to the principle. Let us go into the committee with open minds, hear the discussion on the other side and if they cannot give as good reasons why this law is in the interest of the community as well as of the railway companies we will easily deal with it.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Just a word directed to the question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) who has just resumed his seat has referred to, namely, the principle involved in this Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who introduces this amendment gave one instance and one only that of a letter seeking for the remedy of what he undertook to say was a most terrific abuse in this country. He said that the grievance existed from one end of the country to the other, that it existed on every branch both of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in Canada. I have the honour to represent a constituency which has five branches of the Grand Trunk Railway running through it, and I have never had one letter, nor have I heard of anybody else having any letter, complaining of the abuse which the hon. gentleman speaks of. He did not address himself to this point. I am ready to admit that and I wondered for a time whether the new rules which came into force this year and which regulate the bringing of motions in this House were directed against the introduction of a Bill and the delivery of a speech devoted to everything else except what the Bill contains. In some of the other points he made I was somewhat interested and by what he said in regard to them I was very much instructed, but I received no instruction from the hon. gentleman on this particular question. As I understand the legislation it deals entirely with the question of whether we should permit scalpers to operate in regard to transportation tickets in Canada or not. I submit you beg the question if you take an isolated instance such as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has taken when he says: If I buy tickets for the members of my family or some friend of mine, I am not at liberty to hand them to one or the other and get the money for them. I do not think that any one would contend that that would be a breach of this Act. It might be under a most technical construction of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a question of agency.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) suggests that it is a question of agency, but nevertheless it also involves the question of selling tickets. That is not what was sought, as I understand, from my reading of the 'Hansard' of 1882. The reason I speak as I do now is that I desire to call attention to this question in order that we may understand what we are referring to the Railway Committee for discussion. It is not, as the hon. gentleman sought to make us believe, that the present law was a grievance and an abuse which required a remedy and that the public was clamouring for it. At all events, I have escaped hearing of the clamour either by letter or by reading in the newspapers for a remedy for this particular grievance that he speaks of. I have heard of many others. I have heard of his penny-a-mile, and I have heard of the question of discrimination in rates on which there has been a live discussion. A grievance is alleged to exist and if it does exist it ought to be remedied, but I must confess that in so far as this particular question is concerned, I have not heard it urged as a grievance or an abuse. Let us go back to the discussion which took place twenty-four years ago in this House. It was alleged that the scalping system was an abuse. I see that there was evidence produced by the late Sir George Kirkpatrick, who was the father of the Bill in

the House, that this legislation was not for the benefit of the railway companies entirely, but that the public, immigrants, ignorant people who were buying tickets from scalpers, were at that time being absolutely defrauded, that tickets were being sold to them by people who are not recognized by the law, by people who were not legalized and that there were many instances cited of people who were put off trains because they had not proper tickets.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Was there a legalized ticket seller at that time?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why do you use that term?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Legalized agent?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is a merchant a legalized merchant?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Yes, in so far as he is recognized by the law. There were no such persons as legalized agents as against scalpers or ticket agents. The hon. gentleman does not seem to set aside the legalizing of agency. All he seeks to do is to take away the penalty but there still remains the legalized agent of the railway company to sell tickets, but under this provision you will not have agents who cannot scalp. What my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) aims at will not affect the rural districts, or the community which he appeals to on his plea for cheaper rates, because you do not find these scalpers operating throughout the country; you find them in the larger cities like Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Vancouver. If any benefit would come from such legislation it would be a benefit to what you might describe as the loose fish in the cities who would obtain through a scalping office these cheaper rates, thereby depriving the railways of the profit they are entitled to, and it would not benefit in any way the agricultural classes. If that is the result of scalping, is it a thing which we should legalize in this parliament? My hon. friend read a letter in which it was suggested that the Hon. Edward Blake was the father of this legislation, but the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has shown that is not the case. The Bill was introduced by Hon. Mr. Kirkpatrick (afterwards Sir George Kirkpatrick) and it received a good deal of consideration in the House. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) at that time opposed it, and a Mr. Guthrie spoke on it, and he said something which it appears to me had a good deal of common sense in it. Mr. Guthrie said:

> This House should not leave the matter as it now stands. We must either pass some such Bill as this or we must legalize the business of ticket scalping.

That contention of Mr. Guthrie seemed to be approved by the consensus of opinion in the House of Commons at that time. Now, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) before we discuss this Bill in the Railway Committee; I would ask him to set his ingenuity (great as we know it is) at work to do something in the constructive line and not to apply it always to the destructive. If we come to the conclusion that we should not prevent the scalping of tickets, then we should get control of the scalper. The scalpers do not operate in the country districts, they are always to be found in the lower streets of the various cities, they are not high class brokers at all, and if we are to destroy the present system we should get control of them. In the words of Mr. Guthrie:

> We should either sustain this legislation or we should in some measure endeavour to legalize the business of ticket scalping.

I therefore would suggest to my hon. friend that instead of being destructive, he should set his ingenuity to work to construct some system by which the business of ticket scalping may be legalized and controlled. This volume of 'Hansard' shows that when the matter was brought before the House it was fully discussed and submitted to the Railway Committee for consideration. The present legislation came back from that Railway Committee with the special recommendation that the Bill should be placed on government orders and Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, took it up as a government order and it was passed in the year 1882. It has remained on the statute-book ever since that time. Has it done any harm; is there any outcry against it? That is something I would like to be enlightened upon before I consider the Bill in committee. I know of no outcry in the locality which I represent against it, and I have heard of no outcry elsewhere. I am not inclined to agree with some hon. gentlemen who have said that this is a great boon to the railways. I would point out on the other hand that it is a protection for the travelling public; that it is a protection for the innocent immigrants —who are coming in greater numbers now than when this law was passed—and who are liable to be defrauded by ticket scalpers, as we know people are defrauded day after day by ticket scalpers in the United States. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman who asks us to pass this Bill will have to sustain his contention by some better evidence that abuses and grievances have existed under the present legislation which has been in force for twenty-four years. We are taught in law that stability or finality is a desirable thing to be attained.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am glad my hon. friend endorses what I say. He says that the railroads should have no advantage, as he calls it, of this kind. If I were representing the railroads, and if, when my hon. friend addresses his argument to the House,

I were to apply the tu quoque argument to him, I think the hon. gentleman's argument would probably fall to the ground. But I do not think the argument of my hon. friend is a sound argument; I do not think he has given any conclusive proof that abuses and grievances such as he has referred to exist; I do not think he has given us any proof in support of his argument this afternoon in regard to two-penny rates, in regard to carloads of tiles, bricks, oats, discrimination in rates, telegraphs at North Bay, &c., &c.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has put my case exactly, and my case is the case of the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) has missed the point. I am trying to put at the service of the people of Canada the cheapest possible railroad ticket, unlimited, in any direction whatever. I want the railroad ticket in this country to be at the lowest possible price, unlimited, that like a bank note it can pass from one to another, good for one mile or ten miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are a free trader in railway tickets.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am, and it is coming to that.

Mr. EMMERSON. And a high protectionist in other respects.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, all these class privileges are fought for by the Liberals, the Liberals are the restrictionists; they don't want to free the people. The object of this legislation is to do away with these limitations and these crimes in connection with railway tickets and to compel railways to give unlimited tickets at the lowest possible price. That is coming, and coming rapidly, and that is the object of the Bill. As the member for Grey points out, you cannot get the railway ticket you want now, but you must take whatever ticket the company chooses to sell.

Mr. EMMERSON. You will go to Newfoundland by the way of Behring strait.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and, on motion of Mr. Emmerson, referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at six p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 14, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved:

That when this House adjourns on Thursday, the 20th of December, it stand adjourned to Tuesday, the 8th of January next.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Before that motion passes, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he should make the date of the re-assembling the 9th instead of the 8th of January. To those of us who come from the maritime provinces, particularly from Nova Scotia, it would be much more convenient to have it on the 9th as that would enable us to leave on Monday morning whereas if the House reassembles on the 8th we would have to leave on Saturday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a matter as to which the government are perfectly indifferent, we are in the hands of the House and if it would better suit the members to reassemble the 9th instead of the 8th, I am quite agreeable as far as the government is concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move that the motion be amended accordingly.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as amended agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR REPORTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would ask the Prime Minister whether we are likely to have a portion of the Auditor General's Report this afternoon as promised by the Minister of Finance?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand from the Minister of Finance that the last proof sheet of one volume has been corrected and therefore we expect the report before the recess. I may say at the same time that the last proof of the papers as to which my friend asked a few days ago in regard to the interprovincial conference, was corrected to-day. We hope to have them before the end of the week.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like also to know when the report of the Department of the Interior will be down and whether the report of the Insurance Commission has been received and if so when it will be laid on the table?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I cannot answer definitely but the report of the Department of the Interior is in the Printing Bureau and I am anxious to have it as soon as possible. I shall lay it on the table as soon as we receive it from the Printing Bureau where it has been for some time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the report of the Insurance Commission will be laid on the table of the House after the recess.

WRECK ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make an explanation with respect to a matter that came under the consideration of members of this House the other day in connection with a wreck on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. Minister will have to follow the new rule, rule 37.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House in Committee of Ways and Means.

On subsection (c) of section 4 of resolution 1:

That the Governor in Council may by order in council—

(c) from time to time, in consideration of benefits satisfactory to the Governor in Council, extend the benefit of the intermediate tariff, in whole or in part, to any British or foreign country the produce or manufacture of which have previously been subject to the rates of customs duties set forth in the general tariff, and from and after the publication of such order in the 'Canada Gazette,' the rates of duty set forth in the intermediate tariff, so far as they are mentioned in the said order, shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British or foreign country, when imported direct from such foreign country or from a British country, subject to the provisions of these resolutions.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this resolution is one that should not receive the sanction of this committee or of this House. To my mind it cuts entirely too deeply into what I have been taught to regard as the chief prerogative of parliament, namely, the right to fix and determine the taxation of the people. As everybody is aware the principal taxation of this country is levied by means of customs duties. By this resolution parliament is asked to prescribe no less than three several scales of duties, namely, the British preferential tariff, the intermediate tariff and the general tariff, varying on different articles in many instances, as members of this House will see on examination of the schedules, from 15 per cent in the preferential to 30 per cent in the general and, in many other cases, from 22½ per cent, in the preferential to 35 per cent in the general. In addition to this there is a surtax under which, as against all foreign countries, the duties may be increased by one-third, or 33⅓ per cent over and above the general rate, and it is left to the Governor General in Council to apply these varying duties as they see fit after secret conference behind the backs of the representatives of the people. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that is a power which this parliament should be very loath to part with. I think if hon. members will carefully examine the resolution they will see that such will be the practical and certain effect of its adoption. In the first place this resolution gives full and plenary authority to the Governor General in Council unreservedly and unconditionally to extend the benefit of the preferential tariff to any British country not named in subsection 1; in the next place, it gives full and plenary authority, without any reservation, except as regards the United Kingdom itself, to withdraw the benefit of the British preferential tariff from any British country to which this parliament has explicitly applied it; in the third place, it gives the same arbitrary authority to the Governor General in Council from time to time to extend, in whole or in part, the intermediate tariff to any British or foreign country, to any country in the world; in the fourth place, it gives similar absolute authority to the Governor General in Council to withdraw the benefit of the intermediate tariff from any country to which it has been previously applied. Now it seems to me that is a power which is entirely too large for this parliament to delegate to the Governor General in Council. In addition to that we are asked in a subsequent resolution to delegate to the Governor General in Council the power to apply the surtax to any foreign country in the world, by which, as I have said, the duties may be increased by one-third, or 33⅓, above the general tariff.

Now, the Finance Minister, in endeavouring to meet this criticism which was so effectively made by the leader of the opposition the other night, and by the able and eloquent member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), said that there was after all nothing new in these provisions, and that at most they amounted to but very little, only to authorize the Governor General in Council to reduce the duties. I cannot see how the Finance Minister can justify such a statement as that in the face of these resolutions whose effect I have just pointed out, delegating such ample powers as I have described. 'Nothing new' the Finance Minister says. When, I ask him, have we had any such tariff scheme as this before in this country? It is true that we had the preferential tariff brought down a few years ago by this same administration, but in that case parliament fixed the duties, and it specified particularly the countries to which it should apply; but it has never been proposed until the present that parliament should hand over to the Governor in Council power to withdraw it from the countries to which this parliament has expressly stated that it should apply, a power which is unquestionably given by these resolutions. Nor did the government have power to add to the countries designated in the preferential list, as these resolutions provide they shall have. With re-

spect to the Finance Minister's contention that there is after all only a power to reduce the duties, I have already referred to the provisions of this resolution by which the Governor in Council may not only extend the benefits of these two tariffs at their own will to any countries they choose, but to withdraw those benefits also at pleasure. Now, while it is true, as the Finance Minister says, that the application of the preferential tariff to a British colony, or the application of the intermediate schedules to any country in the world, does involve only a reduction of duties, it is equally true that the withdrawal of those schedules which the Governor in Council has power to order must necessarily increase the duties. Therefore, we clearly have, under these resolutions, delegated to the Governor in Council not only power to reduce the rates of duties and the taxation of the country, but also the power to increase the duties and to increase the taxation of the people. If these resolutions were law, there can be no doubt that the Governor in Council tomorrow could withdraw the preferential tariff from every one of the seventeen or eighteen countries which are set out in a previous subsection of the resolution under consideration; they could also apply tomorrow the intermediate tariff to any country in the world, British or foreign, and the following week they could withdraw it. I cannot see, therefore, how it can be contended for a moment, as the Finance Minister has sought to convey to the House, that the resolutions give simply authority to reduce the duties. There is no question to my mind, and I think there can be no question in the mind of any hon. gentleman who will carefully examine this resolution, but that it conveys an absolute authority to the government to increase taxation as well as reduce it, and to give the Governor in Council a completely free hand as between these varying schedules.

Now admitting for the purpose of argument, a contention which I think I have clearly shown is not even admissible, that there was conveyed to the government by these resolutions only an authority to reduce the duties, that consideration does not render the resolution much the less objectionable. It is true that taxation is of prime importance to the people of this country, and ought to be an absolutely inalienable right of every free parliament. But at the same time the trade of the country, the industries and business interests of the country, are another subject of the greatest concern to the people, and both ought to be regulated and controlled entirely in the open light of parliament, and not in secret by the Governor General in Council. The producing interests of the country are as much concerned with respect to the reduction of duties as the consuming classes would be in reference to the increase of duties. The power, therefore, conveyed by this resolution to the Governor in Council to reduce duties is just as serious a menace to the industries and business interests of the country as the power to increase duties would be to the consuming public. The hon. Minister of Finance in his budget speech, spoke of this power and particularly of the intermediate tariff, as an instrument of negotiation. While, it is true, Mr. Chairman, that it may be an instrument of negotiation it is equally true that it may also be a weapon of intimidation to hold over the heads of the industries and the manufacturing interests of the country. I do not necessarily mean to say that this government will use it as such, but this resolution certainly puts it in the power of an unscrupulous administration, bent only upon clinging to office, to use it, if it so minded, for the accomplishment of its own sinister designs. In view therefore of these considerations it seems to me that this resolution cannot be justified upon any ground. For my part, I feel that I would be grossly betraying the trust, which my constituents have placed with me, if I, presuming to act as their representative, should assent to a proposal which seems to be so utterly out of harmony with the free government of a free people—a proposal that parliament shall resign and abdicate to the government, to be exercised in secret, the power which parliament alone should possess of regulating and absolutely controlling the taxation of the country, a power which the constitution of every free country contemplates should be exercised only by the consent of the people themselves expressed through their representatives in parliament assembled, and a power which every free parliament has always regarded with the most jealous care. Surely it is a travesty upon the name and the cause of liberalism that such a proposal should come from a government which has presumed to apply to itself the name of 'Liberal.' As one of the representatives of the people, therefore, I do not desire to be understood as in any way assenting to a proposal which seems to be so completely at variance with the principles of constitutional government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Chairman, most of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has said is a repetition of the arguments which were advanced by other hon. gentlemen the other evening and with which, however inefficiently I dealt at the time, and I therefore do not wish to repeat myself. He has, however, brought forth one new point to which I desire to invite the attention of the committee. I refer to the argument that the power which is proposed to be granted by this resolution to the government, is a power to increase duties. The chief purpose is not to increase but to reduce duties. This is a power which the gov-

ernment already possesses and has possessed for many years in certain cases. My hon. friend very properly points out that by the terms of this resolution, when we take power to grant the benefits of this tariff to a country, and when we take power to withdraw the benefits and place the products of that country under a higher tariff, it can fairly be said that we take the right to increase the tariff. I admit there is some force in that, but let us take the case as we find it. Let us suppose that we grant the privileges of this favourable tariff to any country which we may deem entitled to them. Perhaps it would be more convenient to take the case of one of the British countries which for the moment does not enjoy the benefit of the preferential tariff. We have the power unreservedly to extend the preferential tariff to any portion of the British empire. There is nothing new in that; we have had that for many years.

Mr. CROCKET. You had not formerly the unreserved power. There was supposed to be a condition attached to that power by the former Act.

Mr FIELDING. No, if I understand my hon. friend correctly, he is mistaken. There was no condition with respect to the manner in which we should extend it. The Governor General in Council was permitted, in his discretion, under circumstances of which he himself must be the judge, as to whether their tariff was favourable to Canada or not, to extend the Dominion preferential tariff to any portion of the British empire.

Mr. CROCKET. If my hon. friend will pardon me, I have the section he refers to here

> Any other British colony or possession the customs tariff of which is on the whole as favourable to Canada as the British preferential tariff herein referred to is to such colony or possession.

In this resolution there is absolutely no condition of any kind. It is left entirely to the pleasure of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Under the wording which my hon. friend has read he will see at once that there has to be somebody to determine whether or not those conditions exist, and somebody in that case is the Governor General in Council, therefore, whenever, in the judgment of the Governor General in Council, such conditions in reference to the trade of Canada existed, the government were free to bring that tariff into force. There is not much difference between my hon. friend and myself on that point. But in regard to his point that by withdrawing the privileges of the tariff we are granting power to increase duties, let us suppose that, having that power, as we have it now, under the old wording although in slightly different form, we extend the privileges of the preferential tariff to some British country which to-day does not enjoy those privileges. We do it because the relations between that country and Canada are favourable, because we desire to extend our business, because the tariff conditions are favourable, or for some other consideration that in the judgment of the government makes it desirable that we shall extend our trade relations with that country. Therefore, we give them the benefit of that tariff,—perhaps for a consideration not very well specified, but because their trade relations towards us would encourage us to believe that it would be to the benefit of Canada to do it. Suppose, a few months hence that colony changes its policy, suppose that something happens—and such things may possibly happen—that the governing body of that dependency makes up its mind that it does not want to deal so favourably with Canada and it makes changes in its tariff arrangement which are adverse to Canada, would it not be in the interest of Canada that we should have the power to instantly withdraw the benefits that we have extended? Let us give an illustration. I think that the power to withdraw is implied in the existing legislation. It is rather a legal question, and I do not wish to go into legal matters, but it is not too much to say that a strong argument could be made in support of the contention that where the executive has power to grant a privilege of that character it must reasonably be taken to imply the power to withdraw it. There was one case in which we exercised that power for good and sufficient reasons and down to this moment the wisdom of our action has not been called in question. We granted the benefits of preferential tariff to the colony of New South Wales because New South Wales had a low tariff. But, not very long afterwards the Australian Commonwealth was formed and the tariff arangements were changed. They were less favourable to Canada than the tariff of New South Wales had been, and therefore the privileges of the British preferential tariff were withdrawn from New South Wales upon that that colony becoming a member of the Australian Commonwealth. I do not think it can be contended that any harm came to anybody from that. The tariff conditions as respects that colony had changed and we simply adapted ourselves to them. Let me repeat the argument again. If we should grant to some British colony the benefits of this preferential tariff and if, a few months afterwards, that colony should adopt some measures adverse to trade with Canada, would it not be the part of wisdom that we should withdraw the benefits that we had a few weeks or a few months previously granted to it? What great harm could come to Canada from having that power in the hands of the government?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance mentioned the other day in a gen-

eral manner the precedents for this legislation which he says already exist in the statutes of the country. I would like him to tell me the statutes to which he refers, or if he is not ready to do so now, to send me a memorandum later on.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I could state the matter now as fully as in a memorandum. I said that the principle involved, of giving certain tariff powers to the Governor in Council, was already in our tariff to a considerable extent and I mentioned several cases in which the Governor already had such powers. We have had for some years power to abolish duties on, and put on the free list materials entering into given lines of manufacture. The principle of placing in the hands of the Governor in Council the power to reduce or abolish the duty is just as cleary set forth in that case as it is here; it is only a question of degree. Originally we had for many years the power to abolish duties for that purpose; in later years we have taken the power to reduce the duties for that purpose. There might be a case in which you did not want to give a manufacturer the benefit of the free admission of the material, but we might feel that he was burdened somewhat and that it would be advantageous to give him part of the duty, and for several years we have had in the tariff the power to reduce the duty on a given article if it is a material entering into the manufacture of some article produced in Canada. In these two cases it was a power of reduction, but we have in the statute also the power of taxation, because we have, under certain conditions set forth in the Act, the power of levying export duties on a number of articles. By order in council we could to-morrow levy export duties on a number of things which are produced in Canada and which may be shipped abroad. I mention these as an illustration of the principle. If the hon. gentleman desires I will have a memorandum sent to him as to the particulars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be obliged to the minister if he would do so. In this section 4 (subclauses a, b, c and d) are there any changes other than those which concern the intermediate tariff; is it substantially the same as before.

Mr. FIELDING. The powers respecting the extension of the tariff are the same as before. We have put in a special clause to give us by positive enactment that which we thought we had in an implied way; the power to withdraw from any given colony the benefit of the preferential tariff, and in so doing we have made a distinction between the colony and the mother country. We think the policy of the mother country is fairly well fixed on that question and we would not withdraw the preference from the mother country without coming to parliament and obtaining the concurrence of parliament. But a difficulty might arise with any of the colonies and in that case we might wish to withdraw from that colony the benefit of the preferential tariff. I think these are the only changes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have taken power in unmistakable language to withdraw the British preferential tariff from any Britsh country other than the United Kingdom.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You understood you had that power by implication, but you desire to make it perfectly plain now.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In addition to the illustration given by my hon. friend from York, it is to be observed that in withdrawing the British preferential tariff from a country which is entitled to it by virtue of this Bill, and applying to that country either the intermediate tariff or the general tariff as provided in subsection (b) you are taking power to reduce the taxation.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is correct.

5. That in the case of articles exported to Canada of a class or kind made in Canada, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Canada be less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Canada at the time of its exportation to Canada there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected and paid on such article, on its importation into Canada, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption:

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem in any case;

Provided also that the following goods shall be exempt from such special duty, viz.:—

(a) Goods whereon the duties otherwise established are equal to fifty per cent ad valorem;

(b) Goods of a class subject to excise duty in Canada;

(c) Sugar refined in the United Kingdom.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall ask the committee to reserve the first provision under that clause.

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed fifteen per cent ad valorem in any case.

This is the 'dumping clause' so called which the House is familiar with. The only change in that is that whereas under the former rating the dumping duty was the difference between the fair market value and what I might call the unfair market value, with the limitation that the dumping duty should not be more than one half of the ordinary duty, we have made it now to read that the dumping duty shall not be more than 15 per cent ad valorem. Another change and the most important

one is, that formerly this only applied to dutiable goods, but it now applies to all. In case the goods coming in from abroad are of a class or kind made in Canada whether they are on the dutiable or the free list they will come under the operation of this clause as it is now worded.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you reduce the penalty ?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases this may be a reduction and in some cases an increase. We thought it better to have a definite rate of duty.

Mr. BARR. Does the minister pretend that 15 per cent would be sufficient to prevent the dumping of goods into Canada. It seems to me it is a very extensive reduction.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I should say frankly that this will operate more as an increase than a reduction. It was thought better to have a definite rate of duty than to have a proportionate duty. If the duty should be 30 per cent and we add 15 per cent it makes it 45 per cent, and that is a very stiff duty; I think hon. gentlemen opposite will say that ought to be enough.

M. GALLIHER. There is just one point about that. No doubt careful consideration has been given to the effect of the words used in making this apply to free goods as well as dutiable goods. There could be no question under the amendment of 1904 because the words used there were 'any imported dutiable article.' That language is not used here, but I notice that the fifth line of clause 5, read as follows:

> At the time of its exportation to Canada, there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established.

These words naturally refer to a dutiable article. I only want to make certain that the effect of that has been thoroughly considered, as it is of considerable importance to us in British Columbia in regard to rough lumber.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that point, because it reminds me of a slight change that should be made in this clause. It should read : 'in addition to the duties otherwise established, if any.' Under the old arrangement, if there were no duty, a dumping clause which levied one-half the ordinary duty would levy nothing. Now the difference in value becomes a measure of the dump, provided it does not exceed 15 per cent ad valorem. So I think with the addition of the words 'if any,' the point raised by my hon. friend will be met.

Mr. LALOR. Am I to understand that the dumping clause applies only to goods made in Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. Goods of a class made in Canada ?

Mr. LALOR. Has that been the law in the past ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. LALOR. If that has been the case, a good many mistakes have been made by the different collectors of customs in collecting duties on goods not made in Canada because they happened to be purchased at a lower price than the list price in the United States. I desire to call the attention of the minister to the experience of a business I am interested in, the canning business. We have imported for use in our factories a great many machines known as capping machines. We buy them in the United States at $600 each, but when we come to enter them for duty, we are told by the customs officer that the list price in the United States is $1,000, and we are compelled to pay duty on $1,000. I would like to know if that is the proper interpretation of the law?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not like to change this resolution at the table, and we will at the present time pass the item without inserting the words 'if any,' and I will consider the point raised by my hon. friend from British Columbia and try to meet it. With regard to the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), that is not a case of a dump, but a case of valuation. Under the customs law as it is now and as it has been for ages, the valuation for duty must be the fair market value of the goods, which is established by ascertaining what is the ordinary selling price of the goods in the country of production. Even without a dumping clause, the Customs Department has frequently had to revise values, because where there are ad valorem duties there is a tendency on the part of every man to get his goods in at as low a rate as possible. The dumping duty is added for the purpose of guarding against what is commonly called slaughtering goods in competition with the home industry. If the goods were not made in Canada, there would be no object in having the dumping duty, but if the same kind of goods are made in Canada, a great trust in the United States might be able, by engaging in the slaughtering business, to crush out a home industry. If the dumping clause has been employed in such a case as the hon. gentleman refers to, it is certainly a strained and improper interpretation of the Act. In order to apply the dumping clause, it is not enough that the goods are made in Canada. There may be a case in which goods are made in Canada, but are not available to the general public. A man may make in Canada some article which he does not put on the market ; he may use it as a raw material in his own business, and carry it forward to a more advanced stage. There would be no object in applying the dumping clause in a case like that. In order to

carry it into effect, it must be applied to goods made in Canada and offered for sale in the open market under such conditions that any man can buy them.

Mr. LALOR. When a man buys in the United States or in any other country an article not made in this country, even at a lower price than the price at which it is sold in the home market. I do not see why he should pay duty on almost double valuation. Our company has imported about twelve of these machines, for each of which we paid $600, and we had to pay duty on $1,000, which seems to me to be a hardship.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must have been getting a great bargain if he was able to purchase for $600 a machine which was worth $1,200 in the United States.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. minister misunderstands me. I said the purchase price was $600, which was the price quoted to us, and the price at which the manufacturer was anxious to sell the machine ; but when we went to pay the duty, we were told that the list price in the United States was $1,000, and we had to pay duty on that.

Mr. FIELDING. The Customs Department does not always insist on the list price, because every man in trade knows that the list price is often subject to discount. But there is nothing new in the law in that respect. The law to-day to which my hon. friend refers did not arise under this tariff, but has been in existence for a great many years. Section 58 of the Customs Act reads :

> Whenever any duty ad valorem is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, the value for duty shall be the fair market value thereof, when sold for home consumption, in the principal markets of the country whence and at the time when the same were exported directly to Canada.

Whatever is the customary selling price in the United States of goods imported from that country would be the true value, according to the Customs Act, for duty purposes.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I wish to corroborate what the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) has said. These machines are listed in the United States at $1,000, we pay exactly what my hon. friend has stated, and nobody can make me believe that they are sold in the United States at $1,000, though they are listed at that. I do not believe that any one in the United States pays a cent more for them than we do, but we have to pay duty on $1,000.

Mr. FIELDING. In the case to which my hon. friend refers, we would not be tied entirely to the list price, if it could be shown by actual transactions, by the hand of the purchaser, what is the usual selling price of these goods in the United States. The question is what is the actual bona fide selling price in the United States ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It is very difficult for us to find that out. Every one uses his own judgment. It is preposterous to suppose that the American buyer would pay $400 more than we do for this machine. The difference is too great.

Mr. FIELDING. The difference is very considerable, but these cases are always investigated by the Customs Department. Officials of that department go at times to the United States and visit the factories where the goods are produced, and ascertain from an examination of their books what is the selling price for home consumption. And if in the particular case referred to, representations are made the Customs Department, they will either refund the duty or say that is the bona fide selling price in the United States.

Mr. LAKE. How is it found in general practice ? Does the Canadian purchaser prefer to pay the American manufacturer the full value which is fixed by the Customs Department or prefer to pay the extra duty to the Customs Department on the goods he brings in ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Canadian purchaser generally would like to get off as cheaply as he can.

Mr. LAKE. In the particular case referred to by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), the Canadian importer, who brought in $600 worth of American goods, if they were subject to the dumping clause, would be charged, I presume, the proportion between the $600 at which he purchased and say the $1,000 selling price. In many cases, if the difference were not so great, it would be the extra $400 he would have to pay the Customs Department in addition to the duty. Do you find in practice that the Canadian purchaser prefers to pay that to the Customs Department on goods brought from the States or pay the manufacturer the full list value ?

Mr. FIELDING. The purchaser would want to make as little outlay as possible. In the particular case referred to, the valuation would be made a higher one, and the importer pays the duty on that besides the difference for the dumping. He would pay the amount of that dumping provided it did not exceed 15 per cent of the value. If the difference between the home price and the selling price in Canada, were as great as the hon. gentleman says, the duty would be a pretty smart one, and the purchaser would not like it.

Mr. BARR. In the matter of medicines and other things, the Americans are pretty

sharp on the Canadians. Very often they have their listed prices and give 40 per cent and 50 per cent reduction as well on the other side as here. We know that the custom of the Americans is to have certain listed prices and then sell 40 or 50 per cent below these.

Mr. FIELDING. On both sides of the line.

Mr. BARR. Yes, that is not an unusual state of affairs. From my experience as a medical man and also as a druggist, I know it is not unusual in the case of patent medicines, and I think probably it is just the same in the case my hon. friend referred to. That is the course pursued by the Americans.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, not the listed prices but the real prices would be taken by the Customs Department. The list price is useful but it is not the only test. If it is known that there is a large discount on that price, not only when the goods enter Canada but when sold in the country of production, the real selling price becomes the value for the duty.

Mr. BARR. How does my hon. friend find out ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is the business of the customs officers, and they do find it out in a great many cases.

Mr. LALOR. I have an invoice and a letter in my desk from one of my constituents who uses a good many electric light bulbs. He thought he was paying too much locally and wrote to a dealer in Boston for a quotation. He imported them at eight cents each, which was the price asked and did not ask any concession. At the custom house he was informed that the price was twelve cents in the United States and he was charged duty on that valuation besides a fine of $10 for buying them at eight cents each. That is a striking example of the injustice of the dumping clause. While in some instances it may be all right, in many others it works great inconvenience to the purchaser and is hardly fair to the consumer.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, it is not a question of dumpage but of fair market value. The only reason why he would be charged duty on a valuation of twelve cents would be that the department have ascertained that twelve cents is the selling price in the United States.

Mr. LALOR. But he was fined $10.

Mr. FIELDING. Outside the dumping clause, the only question would be one of valuation and there would be no fine. He would be charged a duty on the fair market value.

Mr. TALBOT. The Customs Department is too strongly protectionist for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LAKE. I presume the reason for the dumping clause is to take away the manufacturers' argument that the exporter always pays the whole or a portion of the duty. That was found to be the result by the Chamberlain Commission in the old country, and that was one of the strong protectionist arguments. I presume that the dumping clause is intended to sweep away that argument and insist that the exporter shall not pay any portion of the duty but that the importer must pay the whole duty himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand the operation of this dumping clause as distinguished from the general Customs Act. Under the general Act, is there not a provision that makes the duty payable on the fair market value ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is then the law without the dumping clause ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it goes further. In the case of dumping you charge a special or dumping duty over and above the duty on the fair market value or, as some hon. gentlemen think, the unfair market value. Over and above that you charge the dumping duty, and the measure of that dumping duty is the difference between the fair market value and the unfair, but the dumping duty shall not exceed 15 per cent of the value.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apart from this clause altogether, when you propose to charge duty upon goods imported into Canada, you are not bound by the price at which the importer has purchased in the foreign market but you ascertain the ordinary selling price in that market. You do that apart from the dumping clause altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the effect of the clause this, that whenever there is any addition of that kind to be made in the value for duty, you at once, under this dumping clause, charge the additional duty but that addition is not to exceed 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FIELDING. It is an additional duty over and above the original duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the effect of the dumping clause is just that. I knew, from experience under the Customs Act, that the Customs Department does not propose to be bound by the actual price at which the article is imported but that it makes inquiries if necessary or follows the judgment of its officers and fixes what it

regards as a fair selling value. That was the law before we heard anything of the dumping clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am asking merely for information, whether in every case of that kind where you do not adopt the price at which the goods have been purchased, but fix a higher price as the fair selling price in the country of exportation, you do, as a matter of fact, in the ordinary course charge the special duty upon these goods ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or is it only on a portion of the cost ?

Mr. FIELDING. If it is a case of goods which are manufactured in Canada with which the foreign article comes in competition, then we charge the additional duty just as the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has descibed.

Mr. R L. BORDEN. Even, if for example the actual selling price in the country of exportation to the importer is say 5 per cent below the ordinary market price?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there a limitation of that kind?

Mr. FIELDING. No, there is provision that by regulation the minister may make allowance for some small percentage which is apt to occur by fluctuations in trade and by regulation it has been provided that a difference in value of 5 per cent shall not be deemed to be a violation of the dumping clause. You have to allow a certain latitude in that way and a trifling difference would be taken by the department as quite legitimate and not as an evidence of dumping.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN It seems that you have fixed on a limitation of 5 per cent which I used simply as an illustration without knowledge. As a matter of fact it would work out in this way, would it not, that if I go to the United States and buy an article at 6 or 7 per cent below what would be regarded as a fair selling price it would be better for me to pay the higher price to the American seller than to buy the goods at the reduced price and pay the dumping

Mr. FIELDING. It might be so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Rather a curious result.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be a necessary one, but it is a rather curious operation of the law.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that we are just bringing out by piecemeal what the real state of affairs is. Now the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) tells us there is only 10 per cent between them, that there is 5 per cent as come and go, leaving 10 per cent. Now we want to know who applies the law ? As a druggist, running a drug store and a medical man, I have found in connection with patent medicines along our lines that often it would run to one half. Now I do not know how we will find the true state of affairs and why it is that when it is only really 10 per cent they should charge these different amounts. Who applies that law? If it is the customs officers they go into the United States and ask what is the selling price of certain things. Now we know the Americans have a sliding scale on almost everything and, therefore, if they applied the actual price as it is in the catalogue I think great injustice might be done to the purchaser, and has been done often with 15 per cent and how much worse will the state of affairs be when there is only 10 per cent, that is 15 per cent with a sliding scale of 5 per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL. As regards the importation of machinery the sliding scale is no doubt correct, that is, machinery can be purchased in the United States for exportation to Canada at a less price than it can be purchased for use at home. I have known people to go so far as not only to take the price of reduction on machinery going out of the United States, but even ask the manufacturer to make a net invoice after deducting the discount and getting the machinery in not only at a less cost than they were selling in their own country, but also less the discount, and it was only when they came before the customs here that they found that the department had made inquiries and had the prices of this machinery.

Mr. BARR. Would that not be the actual price the man is paying?

Mr. CALDWELL. The actual price is what the Customs Department charge after proper investigation irrespective of the price the man may have bought at.

Mr. BARR. And that is right.

Mr. LALOR. Would not the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Caldwell) consider it a great injustice if he was bringing a machine to this country and had to pay not only the duty but also the fine on an article brought into Canada?

Mr. CALDWELL. But the manufacturer in the States would not sell at the price he sells to his own people; you are preventing people dumping goods in your market at less than they sell them in their own market.

Mr. LALOR. I do not think the member for Lanark (Mr. Caldwell) or myself

will object to the Americans being prevented from dumping goods in our market, but we want to get our machinery cheap.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are the rates of duty collected at all customs offices in Canada the same? For instance, do customs officers in the eastern provinces collect the same amount of duty on all articles that they do in the western provinces? Take the wagon industry; wagons in the eastern provinces may be valued by the customs officers at a much lower rate than they are in the western provinces. I would like to know whether there is a uniform rate?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a uniform principle, but all customs laws, like all other laws, have to depend on human intelligence in their administration, and it is possible that two customs officers in different portions of the Dominion may have different ideas as to the interpretation of the law. The law is the same, the instruction is the same, the same circular is issued to all agents, and in many cases that is referred to Ottawa, the law is applied uniformly. It is quite possible that two customs officers, one at a large port and the other in a small place with limited information with a very paltry salary, and a position not calling for much knowledge, may differ in their judgment as to the meaning of one clause, and in that way I can understand the possibility of even something inequitable, but where anything can be referred to the department at Ottawa there is a uniform interpretation of the law and a uniform practice. And then, too, there is supervision; experts in the department here examine all entries and compare those of one port with those of another, and where there is any reason to believe that owing to this difference in human judgment, the same rule is not applied uniformly, it is the work of the Customs Department here to examine into the matter and see that the rule is applied.

Mr. LAKE. In reply to a question which I asked the other day the Minister of Customs stated the customs valuations on certain specific articles about which I inquired, Deering and McCormick binders. The minister stated that in 1895 the customs valuation of those articles varied according to the quantities which had been purchased, but during the last two years and previously the customs valuation had been one figure, one price, no matter what the quantity of articles purchased. I assume that the manufacturer in the United States of these articles does sell at different values, according to whether he is selling a single article or 200 or 300. On what principle is the one valuation fixed for customs purposes in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. In most cases you are not called upon to have any arbitrary fixing of values because the actual selling price in the country of production can be ascertained and that is the true value. There is, however, a difficulty in reference to the class of articles mentioned, because I think I am correct when I state that in regard to a very wide range of agricultural machinery it is not sold at a wholesale price at all. Wholesale prices are taken principally as the standard valuation; we do not want to value an article at the price a man pays for a pound; we value on wholesale transactions. The difficulty in the case of agricultural machinery is that these things are not sold to the wholesale trade; the manufacturer sells through agents and he has a standard retail price at which he sells his articles, and the cost of handling it is the expense of the agent there and any other charges. There being no wholesale trade, and no wholesale price that you can get to fix the valuation, the Customs Department is obliged to look into the matter and make a discount and say what is a fair value for that article. They do that from time to time, varying the valuation when circumstances seem to require. That is the reason why there has to be a valuation of that class of goods, and that is the method which is applied.

Mr. LAKE. I would ask with reference to this particular class of goods, the reapers and self-binders, whether the same valuation is applied to all makes, whether the Deering, or McCormick machines, or any others which are imported into Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. I am advised that the practice is to ascertain what is the list price of each of these articles and allow what is deemed to be a fair discount. If there is a varying price in the United States, then there would be a variation in the value in Canada.

Mr. LAKE. I am aware that these articles did vary in price in the United States some years back, although these figures do not seem to bear that out. There is another question I wish to ask, a question which I have heard argued, and I only ask for information. If I go into the United States on a bargain day and buy a certain article over the counter at a bargain, at very much less than its proper or ordinary valuation in that country, and if I bring that article into Canada, supposing it is an umbrella, for instance, will I have to pay both the duty on the customs valuation of that article, and also the difference between what I paid and the tariff valuation?

Mr. FIELDING. I think in a small transaction like that it is not likely the question would be raised. But in the case of large shipments, the test would have to be, not what was the bargain day price, but what was the ordinary selling price. But I do not imagine any collector of customs would raise trouble over any small purchase of that kind. In large transactions certainly

they would have to ascertain, not the bargain day price, but the ordinary selling price.

Mr. LAKE. That does not carry out the old doctrine of the Liberal party that they wanted to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

Mr. FIELDING. But my hon. friend is not carrying out the old doctrine of the Conservative party which demanded higher duty. He complains that we charge him too much.

Mr. BARR. We complain of the discrimination under certain circumstances.

Mr. LAKE. I was not making any complaint, I was simply asking, as I said, for information. I reserve my complaint until a later date. What I wish to know now is this: Can the minister tell us how much has been collected under this dumping clause, in dumping fines, as they may be called? I have not seen any statement, and it would be interesting to know the amounts which have been collected.

Mr. FIELDING. I am advised that in the year 1905, the collections amounted to $100,000, and in 1906, to $74,000.

Mr. LAKE. Fines or overvaluations?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount of the special duty, what is called the dumping or special duty. I think the value of a duty of that character, after it has been in operation for some time, may be compared to the value of a court of appeal; it is not always the cases it hears, but it is the number of bad judgments it prevents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is not very flattering to the courts, it seems to me, to say they would be more likely to give bad judgments if there were no court of appeal to which recourse could be had. I must disclaim that idea on that part of the profession. I would like to say this: It is against the provisions of the Customs Act, no doubt, when one buys goods at 90 per cent of their selling value. to enter them in the customs as purchased at 100 per cent of their fair selling value. Suppose that a Canadian imports goods from the United States at a price which might be regarded as 90 per cent of their fair selling value, under the customs law he is bound, I presume, to enter those goods as purchaed, at 90 per cent and not at 100 per cent; because that is a very important consideration as to the application of this dumping clause.

Mr. FIELDING. He has to enter them at the fair market value. Of course it is possible that the customs officer might think that the price actually paid was, in his judgment, the fair market value. But a man handling large transactions, and accustomed to deal with the custom house, would learn that the price he paid was not a test of the market value, and if he failed to make a proper entry the Customs Department would have to call him to account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In that case, if he purchased goods at 75 per cent of their fair selling value in the United States and entered them in Canada at 100 per cent of their fair value, then the special duty would apply, if I understood the minister correctly.

Mr. FIELDING. He would have to show his actual payment, he would have to show what he was paying.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He would have to file his invoices in addition, and in that way you would apply the dumping clause to it.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to understand the difference between this clause and the former provisions. Previous to this, you added, as a special duty one-half of the customs duty upon the article, as to most articles.

Mr. FIELDING. Not exactly; we added the difference in value not exceeding one-half the duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difference in value not exceeding one-half the customs duty as to the majority of articles, but as to certain articles, not exceeding 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. No, the 15 per cent is a new feature. There was one exception in the case of wire rods; in the case of goods which were receiving a bounty, there was a special provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the difference is that you make 15 per cent the limit now, instead of one-half the customs duty?

Mr. FIELDING. That is it, and we apply it to every case.

Mr. LALOR. Is that 15 per cent applied to the invoice price or to the American value?

Mr. FIELDING. To the true value.

Mr. BOLE. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the provision at the top of page 6:

> Provided further, that excise duties shall be disregarded in estimating the market value of goods for the purposes of special duty when the goods are entitled to entry under the British preferential tariff.

When this tariff was brought down, I was under the impression that the excise charged in foreign countries would be disregarded in respect to all duties. I find now that it applies only with respect to special duties. I would like the minister to consider this feature of the subject. I want to point out this fact, that with respect to a great many goods, for instance,

spirits of nitre, chloroform, ether, and all preparations of that kind which are imported to a large extent into Canada, this provision will drive Canadian purchasers into the American market, for the reason that the excise duty in England is very much higher than it is in Germany. It will therefore pay the Canadian importer better to buy in Germany and pay the surtax and the larger duty, rather than to buy in England and get the benefit of the preferential and pay these excise charges. I would like the minister to consider that before he finally makes this the law.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as there is any change in that respect, it is not adverse to the British shipper. In the case of British goods coming out that value does not include the excise duty.

Mr. BOLE. With respect to the special tax only.

Mr. FIELDING. But in the other respect there is no change in the law; the result is in favour of the hon. gentleman's view. But whether or not the excise in the country of production should apply to the value of the goods when they go abroad, we won't debate that, but we have not thought it well to depart from the established law.

Mr. BOLE. My contention is that it will not only benefit the Canadian purchaser but it will benefit British sentiment. For instance on chloroform the excise tax in Great Britain is one shilling, or about twenty-one cents, while in Germany it is only six or seven cents. The result is that Canadian purchasers are driven to the foreign market to buy these things.

Mr. FIELDING. Not by anything in this Act.

Mr. BOLE. I understand that, but I advocate the elimination of the excise charge in determining the value for duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What articles are there outside of spirits, malt liquors and chloroform, that are subject to excise duties in other countries.

Mr. BOLE. I do not refer to malt liquors. There are a great many products of the still which are chemicals or medicinal products—chloroform, ether, spirits of nitre, and things or that kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do they export them in bond without paying the excise duty?

Mr. BOLE. They are all purchased in bond. They are exported in bond but we have to pay the duty on the in-bond price and the excise charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the excise charge actually paid by the manufacturer in Great Britain?

Mr. BOLE. No, they are sold in bond and we pay the duty on the in-bond price and the excise charge additional.

Mr. BARR. Is this not a departure from what we have had in the past? Now we are told by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) which, of course, we, as doctors and druggists know is a fact, that we can purchase from the United States chloroform coming from Germany at a much less price than we can purchase chloroform on the English market. But, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says we must tax the doctors and retail druggists—not the wholesale druggists—in order to preserve the market for Great Britain. I think that is a departure from the principles laid down by reformers in the past. I think that they advocated the cheapest market for Canadians and I do not know but that they were right in that respect. It is a well known fact that we can purchase these articles which have been named cheaper from the German market and probably had it not been for the blunders of the reform government in causing the surtax to be put on we could have obtained a good many things cheaper. But here my hon. friend wants to go one step further and still further tax the doctors and retail druggists.

Mr. BOLE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me? If he does I want to correct him. I want to get these things cheaper for the doctors.

Mr. BARR. No, no, for the wholesale druggists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the point that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) has referred to. When you import into this country goods, which, in Great Britain are subject to excise duty, these goods, as I understand the hon. member, are purchased in bond and exported to this country in bond so that they do not pay the excise duty in Great Britain, but when you come to pay the duty in this country you pay not only on the actual price but you pay upon that price with the excise duty added. I suppose that is under the provision of the general customs law which requires you to pay on the fair market value in the country of production. Is that the sum and substance of the matter?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You eliminate that excise duty under some circumstances.

Mr. FIELDING. In dealing with the ordinary duty the excise duty is included. There may be some room for criticism of that policy, but it has been the practice heretofore and we have not proposed to make a departure from it. But, when you come to the special duty we do not include it in

collecting the duty under the dumping clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And your elimination of it is ?

Mr. FIELDING. Entirely in reference to the special duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the point which the hon. member for Winnipeg made was not that at all.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend from Winnipeg wishes to go further. He wishes to strike it out in regard to the ordinary value of goods apart altogether from the dumping clause. Suppose goods are exported from Great Britain under the well established law of Canada the excise duty will form part of the value for duty. He thinks that is wrong and that the excise duty should not form part of the value for duty. Although we have met the case in regard to the dumping clause he wishes to go further and say that the excise duty shall not be counted as part of the value.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so, but the point that the hon. member for Winnipeg makes is this : I do not know whether this is a practical illustration or not, but if business is done in this way it is. Suppose you buy United States goods which are subject to excise duty ; you buy them in bond and bring them into this country. You are bound, under the general customs law, to pay duty not only on the price but to pay duty on the price with the excise duty added. That is all right. Under this particular clause you would be bound to pay the special duty.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we would not apply the dumping clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why not ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say the dumping clause altogether because there might be other conditions, but if in valuing the goods you included the excise duty as well you would be charging what we think would be an excessive duty. We think that the excise duty, whether or not it is a fair part of the valuation for ordinary duty, would not be a fair part of the valuation for the dumping duty which is a penalizing duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. minister is right then I am wrong, but I want to understand it. The clause to which the hon. member for Winnipeg called attention is this :

> Provided further, that excise duties shall be disregarded in estimating the market value of goods for the purpose of special duty when the goods are entitled to entry under the British preferential tariff.

He points out therefore that you are not to take the excise duty into consideration for the purpose of the special duty if the goods are entitled to be entered under the British preferential tariff; but the very terms of that exception imply that you are to take it into consideration in all other cases. Is that the point that the hon. gentleman for Winnipeg is making?

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend from Winnipeg is entirely in accord with this as far as it goes, but he wants us to turn back to the Customs Act and say that in making the valuation, not for the dumping duty, but for ordinary purposes, the excise duty shall not be included.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, that is the larger question.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the question he wants us to consider and if possible adopt his suggestion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But is it not true that you must take the excise duty into consideration for the purpose of determining whether or not there shall be a special duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be, but for this provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But this provision applies only to the preferential tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, if it applies only to the preferential tariff you do take it into consideration ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I mean.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, that seems to be extreme. It is a very much more severe application of the principle than the one to which the hon. member for Winnipeg called attention.

Mr. FIELDING. As respects cases outside of the British preference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. Put the British preference to one side, leave out that exception and then you have this position that although you are not required in purchasing for export from the foreign country to pay the excise duty, although you import your goods in bond, nevertheless, when you come into Canada, the special duty is imposed upon all the goods upon which excise duty would have been payable if consumed in the foreign country. That seems to be an extreme application of the special duty. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. FIELDING. I see the point ; the point is that the excise duty ought not to be counted whether under the British preference or not in determining the special duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a very severe application of the law.

Mr. FIELDING. The effect is to give the preference to the British article. I quite see the point which the hon. member is making.

Mr. BARR. Does it not have the effect of making us pay just so much more ?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, well !

6. That articles which are the produce or manufacture of any foreign country which treats imports from Canada less favourably than those from other countries may be subject to a surtax over and above the duties specified in the said schedule 'A,' such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty specified in the general tariff in the said schedule 'A.'

(1) That any question arising as to any foreign country or goods coming under the operations of the provisions in regard to the surtax shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final :

Provided, that the Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purposes of this resolution in regard to such surtax, and may, by order in council, from time to time suspend the surtax from application to the goods of any country.

Mr. FIELDING. That contains the direct power to suspend, which before was only implied.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give us any encouragement to hope that the surtax may be removed ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a difficult question to answer. We have had informal—shall I say negotiations—conversations with gentlemen interested in the German trade who encourage us to believe that some friendly arrangement may be made at no distant date, but I would not feel justified in saying more than that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has it been found that a large quantity of German goods have been filtering into this country through British middle men and thus avoiding the surtax ?

Mr. FIELDING. The impression has always been abroad that there has been evasion of our customs laws in that respect, but the best information we have is that it is not so. The matter has been carefully looked into and we think it is not correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the amount of the tax levied under this provision during the last two or three years ?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount collected last year under the surtax was $550,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Altogether from Germany ?

Mr. FIELDING. The duties on goods from Germany amount to a much larger sum ; that is the surtax portion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But it only applies to Germany.

Mr. FIELDING. To all goods of German origin although they may come from other countries.

Mr. LALOR. Does Germany apply the surtax on all goods imported from Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. They apply what they call the maximum tariff to Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. Have they not a surtax also ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand they have the power to impose a surtax in addition to the maximum tariff which they at present impose.

Mr. FOWLER. What difference is there between the German maximum and minimum tariffs ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not a flat rate, it varies a good deal and in some cases it is very considerable.

Mr. LALOR. Are United States goods under the same tariff as Canadian goods in the German market ?

Mr. FIELDING. The United States have made a temporary treaty for a year with Germany under which they get as respects some articles better consideration than we do.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that the surtax is not applied against Canadian goods going into Germany ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand there is no surtax in the sense in which we use it, but they have a maximum tariff which is applied to the goods going in from Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And that is only applied to Canadian goods ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the maximum tariff and we would prefer of course to have the minimum.

Mr. LALOR. It is practically the same as a surtax ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood the minister to say that there was no great evasion of the surtax by reason of German goods passing through England. Nevertheless, in considering this whole question of the British preference we cannot forget that under this preference we are practically giving a preference to Germany, to Russia, to Austria and to Belgium, on a very considerable amount of their manufactures. I do not know whether it would be possible to avoid this or not so long as we continue the British preference, but it seems to me it is more than a British preference, and so long as we continue to admit British goods with only 25 per cent of labour put upon them in Great Britain it is practic-

ally a preference to almost any European continental country.

I was surprised during the past summer, on visiting a large linen factory in Scotland, where table linen and other linen goods were extensively woven, to learn that they did not spin any of the yarn used in the factory, but imported it already prepared from continental countries, very largely from Russia. Now, that yarn has a very considerable amount of labour put upon it, and to the extent of the value of that yarn, which is imported into Great Britain free, we are giving a preference to Russia, just as much as we are giving a preference to England or Scotland, where the yarn is woven into cloth. The same thing applies to Saxony yarn imported from Belgium into Scotland for the manufacture of the fine tweeds which we import from Scotland. The spinning of fine Saxony yearn in Scotland has largely passed away. So that in that article we are giving to the cheap labour of Belgium as great a preference as we are giving to Great Britain. It seems to me that if we are going to call this a British preference, we should devise some means by which we shall not give the same preference to these continental countries as we are giving to Great Britain, especially when different duties are imposed upon our goods going into some of those countries. My idea is that we ought to make a change in the value of labour put on the goods in England to entitle them to the preference. I should say that instead of 25 per cent it ought to be made 75 per cent, so that it will be to a larger extent a British preference, and not a preference which will bring the cheap labour of continental Europe into competition with the labour of our own people, when we, on the other hand, are treated as we have been by Germany in having a higher rate of duty imposed upon our products than the rate imposed on the products of almost any other country. This is a question which I think we should take seriously into consideration before we finally pass this tariff. I am aware that the resolutions before us do not fix the amount of British labour. I understand that is done by order in council. This is another case in which I fear we are leaving too much to order in council. I quite endorse what has been said by the hon. member for York that we ought to hold very firmly in our own hands all matters in regard to taxation and tariff regulation, and I think the government should submit to parliament before the final passage of these resolutions the question of whether 25 per cent or 75 per cent should be the amount of British labour to be put on goods to be entitled to the preference.

Mr. FIELDING. While we regulate the matter by order in council, I have already stated to the House, what it was we proposed, that is to say, that whereas the order in council has been held to mean that the 25 per cent of British labour included the merchant's profits we intend that it shall not do so, but that there must be 25 per cent of bona fide British labour. That to some extent, though not wholly, meets the criticism of my hon. friend. When he says that we ought to require 75 per cent of British labour, that is equivalent to saying that we should not have a preference at all. England is not a country that produces raw materials to any degree. The manufacturers of England manufacture or assemble the materials which they gather all over the wide world, and to suggest that they should not have a preference without 75 per cent of British labour would be practically to destroy the preference altogether. The question of how much British labour should be put upon goods in order to entitle them to the preference is a fair subject for discussion. We thought in the past that 25 per cent was enough, and when we find that too broad an interpretation has been given to that, we propose to qualify it by saying that it shall be bona fide British labour.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not see that you do any wrong to the British preference so long as you give a preference to the labour of Great Britain and to what is produced in Great Britain ; but I do not think we should continue the system of giving a preference to Russia, Germany, Austria, Belgium and other continental European countries, where people work long hours and at low wages, and which hold out no compensating benefits to us. It is enough to give a preference to Great Britain without receiving compensating benefits, for patriotic reasons, but I do not think we are called on to deal with these other countries on the same basis. In the working out of the preferential tariff, we are to my mind giving as great benefits to those other countries than we are to Great Britain.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister, in the 25 per cent of British labour will there be computed the cost of packing cases and the work of filling those cases for shipment to Canada ? What has been the rule heretofore, and what will be the rule in the future ?

Mr. FOWLER. I might supplement that by asking, does it include the profit made by the middleman ?

Mr. FIELDING. Where the goods are handled by a merchant who includes his own profit as part of the 25 per cent, we would cut that out. It must be 25 per cent of bona fide labour. Where the package is included, as it sometimes is, in the cost of the article, the package would be included as part of the 25 per cent. If the package is made a separate entry, as it sometimes

is, it will have to be determined on its merits. But as a rule, I think the labour on the package would be included, of course, if made in Great Britain.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that a great many woollen goods are brought to England, where very little change is made in them. My attention has been particularly called to cases of mantles brought to Great Britain, upon which very little work is done beyond sewing on the buttons and the trimmings. As a matter of fact, we know that lumber laid down in England must be very expensive. If in the computation of this 25 per cent, you add the labour of putting these woollen goods in paper parcels, or in a class of paper made waterproof, and then add the cost of the wood which goes into the packing case, you enhance the value considerably. A regulation should be made so as to exclude entirely the cost of packing the article and the material used in packing, whether paper in the inside packing or boards in the outside packing. It must be quite plain that the cost of boards laid down in the old country and used in packing cases and then the cost of binding the cases with iron bands, must be very considerable. And for the very purpose of swelling the amount, a large allowance may be made for the cost of packing. I think it should be specifically stated that the cost of packing should be entirely eliminated in the computation of this 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. All I can say is that if any particular case, such as the matter of mantles referred to, be brought to the attention of the Customs Department, it will be investigated. Foreign materials brought into England, on which some little work, such as the sewing on of buttons, is done, should not come under the operation of the preferential tariff. The question of package, is one the officials will have to consider and it is a pretty large question.

Mr. BENNETT. Could it not be declared by order in council that in the computation of the 25 per cent, no attention whatever will be paid to any cost of packing in the point of labour or the material that enters into the packing.

Mr. FIELDING. If the packing is British labour, on what principle could it be excluded? What we want is the assurance that a certain amount of British labour is in the shipment. The case of the mantles or other goods, which are but slightly improved, would be an evasion of the Act, but to exclude generally all packages might be too severe. These packages are made by British labour, why should they not be considered?

Mr. BENNETT. To my mind, the whole idea of the preference is this, that while favouring skilled artisan labour of Great Britain, you should not go beyond that. You should not take into account rough labour, such as the work of making packing cases, which can be distinguished from the finer work of the skilled artisan. Yet you are placing on the same level, the rough labour of the man who handles an axe or a saw and the skilled labour of the artisan who is producing the goods.

Mr. FIELDING. We have not undertaken to descriminate between the different classes of British labour. All we do is to see that there is a certain percentage of British labour. If an article costs $3 and is brought to England for manufacturing purposes, it must have one-third of its value in British labour added. That makes it worth $4. The one-quarter of $4 is equal to 33 per cent of the original cost, so that you have to add 33 per cent of British labour to the foreign labour. The value is then made $4, and that brings it in the condition that 25 per cent must be British labour.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me call attention to the matter of glass. One of the great items of cost is the case itself because it is very heavy and nailed up with great care and bound with iron bands. In the working out of the Customs Department, what happens? A declaration has to be made by the exporter showing how much work was done in Great Britain and how much on the continent. As regards the work done in Great Britain, is there a distinction made between the artisan labour and rough labour?

Mr. FIELDING. A case of that kind would not come within the preferential tariff at all. In that case, the plate glass is not manufactured in Great Britain but simply packed there.

Mr. FOWLER. It is made there entirely.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is, then the question of 25 per cent does not enter. If it is a foreign article, simply passing through London, it would not be entitled to the preference even though the packing case might be of considerable value.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not very happy perhaps in the selection of plate glass. I merely gave it as an illustration of how expensive cases may be. In many instances, they cost a considerable amount of money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the hon. minister any officers in Great Britain looking after the valuation of articles shipped under the preference clause? If so, how many ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have no special customs officers over there, but we utilize our staff of Canadian officials in England to some extent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What officials ?

Mr. FIELDING. Occasionally we make inquiries at the High Commissioners office.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are they allowed to go to the factories and examine the goods there and see if they are properly valued and not imported from Germany and then fixed up a little in England ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not anticipate any difficulty in getting access to any factory if necessary. We have found cases nearer home, in the United States for instance, where this inquiry was objected to, but we had the remedy in our own hands. The next time these parties sent goods, the goods were held up, and then they were very glad to come over and submit to our conditions. The system of undervaluing is by no means so common in the English trade, and there is less reason for watching the British exporter in that respect than in watching some others.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might it not be possible for the German exporter to ship his goods through the English manufacturer?

Mr. FIELDING. We have had that suggested often in the press and occasionally by hon. gentlemen in this House who received that impression, but wherever we caused the matter to be investigated we found that the impression was a mistaken one and that there was little or no evidence to support it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that goods going from Canada into Germany enter that country under the maximum tariff and have also to pay a special tariff over and above what United States goods or the goods from any other country have to pay going into that country.

Mr. FIELDING. The German tariff contains a minimum tariff, a maximum tariff and a clause which gives them power to impose a surtax. Our goods are subject to the maximum tariff ; the United States has a special arrangement for one year under which as respects a list of articles they get advantages which are not extended to Canada. I do not understand that there is a surtax over and above the maximum tariff in any case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And the Canadian exporter has to pay an extra surtax.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a great question as to who pays these duties.

Mr. BLAIN. What notice was given by the German government to Canada that their maximum tariff would be applied to Canadian goods, and what notice was given by this government to Germany that the surtax would be applied on German goods entering this country ?

Mr. FIELDING. Answering the first question from memory I do not recollect precisely whether notice was given us but I should say not. I think the probability is that the maximum tariff was applied against Canadian goods at the moment when the German government deemed proper. Canada adopted the British preference, Germany took offence and so soon as the denunciation of the German treaty took effect, I think on the 1st of August, 1898, the German government applied their maximum tariff against us. We certainly gave no formal notice to the German authorities of the particular moment when we would impose the surtax. What we did was to remonstrate with them and to endeavour to persuade them, to show from our point of view that they were dealing unfairly with us, and to ask them to reconsider their action and treat us more liberally. This involved negotiations of many months and in the end the surtax was adopted, but I do not think we gave any formal notice ; like other tariff matters it came into effect when the Tariff Bill was introduced into this House.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Then I understand that our products do pay an additional surtax ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not ; if my hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) says so I must not contradict him, but I understand that after the denunciation of the treaty, after we gave the preference to Great Britain which was followed by the denunciation of the treaty which stood in the way of the fulfilment of our policy, on the 1st August, 1898, when we were no longer getting the benefit of whatever privileges were in this treaty, and the treaty was at an end, they made a new arrangement with Great Britain, which did not include Canada and in the new arrangement they extended the most favoured nation treatment to the mother country but left Canada out. That continued many months, it was long after that date and after our persuasions and remonstrances without success that Canada adopted the surtax. I do not think there was any further surtax imposed by Germany.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This occurred in 1898, the maximum tariff was then imposed. There was certainly another move by Germany which took place on the 1st of March, last ; that must have been the imposition of a surtax.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish to speak positively. It is quite possible my hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) has had an opportunity of studying the recent action more closely, but what they did in March was to adopt a new tariff differing to some extent from their former tariff, but they still impose on Canada the maximum tariff and not the surtax. The surtax is a power which they have in their tariff just as we have but that clause has never been enforced against Canada.

Mr. BARR. The high rate was not extended to the other colonies of Great Britain but only to Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Canada had the difference with Germany; it was Canada that gave the preference, it was against Canada that they were offended, and it was Canada they penalized.

Mr. LALOR. May I ask if Canada lost export trade to Germany to any large extent through the imposition of the surtax ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not to any large extent. Of course we do not want to undervalue trade anywhere. We are glad to encourage trade, but as a matter of fact I do not think any one in Canada suffered at all from the action of Germany. I think, on the whole, if any one has suffered it has been rather the German merchants than the Canadian traders. My own judgment is that Canada has lost very little ; unless if we could make some friendly arrangement and have some extension of markets, even although we could get along without it, we would be all the better to have it.

Mr. BARR. Surely my hon. friend does not contend that Germany having that high tariff has not affected Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think if the German tariff had been lower we would have sent more goods to that country but, although we did not send to Germany we found excellent markets elsewhere and I do not think any one suffered badly, but I do not go so far as to say that we should not trade with Germany. We should seek new markets wherever we can get them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that the percentage of British labour which the minister requires in the resolution, 25 per cent, is too low, because we know as a matter of fact that at the present time German goods are being filtered into Canada to the great injury of some of our manufacturers at the rate specified. I know of two industries in my own town that are suffering, I also think that 75 per cent suggested by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) would be too high because the cost of the raw material or partly manufactured material that the British manufacturer imports from Germany would not be covered by the 25 per cent which would be left over the 75 per cent of British labour. I would suggest a compromise between the two, 50 per cent, that should be the proper amount; I think that would effectually stop the German goods filtering into Canada through the British market.

Mr. FIELDING. It would stop the British goods too.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it would give them 50 per cent of British labour to put on the goods they buy in Germany partially manufactured. Twenty-five per cent is not enough because we know as a matter of fact that to-day British goods are coming in with a very small percentage of British labour and it is Germany that is getting the whole benefit, to the great injury of some of our manufacturers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why did this government apply the surtax against Germany in 1903, when apparently, by what the minister says, the German government did not do any more than put us on the maximum tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. We had been on the minimum tariff and Germany took exception to our action in giving a preference to Great Britain. We thought that that was a very unfair act on the part of Germany, We did not deny to Germany favoured nation treatment. We were willing to give to Germany every consideration that we gave to any foreign country. For example we had a treaty with France ; for certain considerations we agree to give the products of France certain advantages on our market ; we gave the benefit of that treaty to Germany, we gave her everything that we gave to any foreign country, but she took offence because we would not treat her as we did the United Kingdom. We thought that unfair. We thought it was the result of misunderstanding on the part of Germany, that Germany thought we were treating her less favourably than we were treating other foreign nations. We endeavoured to explain, first by correspondence through the usual official channels to the Canadian Commissioner, from him to the Colonial Office, thence to the Foreign office, thence to the British ambassador at Berlin, thence to the German foreign office, thence to the German Department of Customs, through all the official channels. We spent some months in trying to explain the matter in this way but without success. Then we took up the matter informally and unofficially with the German consul general in Montreal, Mr. Bopp, who is no longer the German consul general in Canada. Finally we took the somewhat unusual course of addressing him an official letter. We found we could not reach the German government rapidly through the ordinary official channel, so we prepared a memorandum of our case, and sent to Mr. Bopp, asking him to lay it before his government. We pointed out to him that the people were complaining of this unfairness; we pointed out that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House had complained that we were too patient in our treatment of Germany. We said, we still wished to be patient, but we thought that Germany was treating us very ungenerously and unfairly, and we begged them to reconsider the matter and put us in the same position as we occupied prior to the denunciation of the treaty. If we had treated Germany in a less favourable manner than any other foreign country, Germany would have a right to complain; but we tried to point out

to Germany that we had not done so. We said, we have given to you everything that we give to any foreign country, what we are giving the French people, although they gave us some concessions in return, and you did not. We think you should leave us where we have been for years. The German government did not do so, they still imposed upon us the burdens of their maximum tariff, and under these circumstances we adopted the surtax.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Canadian exporters to-day are certainly at a disadvantage in Germany in that they have to pay a higher customs duty in that country than in any other country.

Mr. FIELDING. Just how much we pay is a matter of debate, but the fact that Canadian products are at a disadvantage as compared with the products of the United States, under an arrangement which will end the current year, is undoubtedly true.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the practice, when goods are exported to Canada, there is a declaration accompanying the shipment that there has been a partial make up, so to speak, in Great Britain. I desire to ask the minister : Does that entry show what part of the work has been done in Great Britain, and what part has been done in a foreign country?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is not necessary to show the precise proportion, but the declaration must show that 25 per cent of the value is of British labour. If it is more than that, they are not bound to show it, but they must show that the amount of British labour is not less than 25 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that when the government arrived at this 33⅓ per centage, one of the institutions most damaged in Canada was the woollen industry. I do not profess to be conversant with all the facts, but I have made some inquiries, and I am informed on several points. It is claimed, particularly by the manufacturers of knitted goods, that this very packing case entry cuts a very large figure in connection with the preference to continental countries. Now the minister knows that any lumber that is shipped from Canada must be of a very high class. You cannot ship to the old country thin lumber, it must be lumber an inch or an inch and a quarter thick. I understand that in the old country they have not the means that we have here of thinning down boards, and as a result these packing cases are all made of a superior grade of lumber. As that lumber leaves this country worth probably from $40 to $50 a thousand, it must be apparent that the use of lumber of that class runs into considerable money. Take the very case of these knitted goods. In the first place, they are encased in a most expensive wooden box, and for the sake of safety in transit, that box has to be guarded with hoop iron of a strong nature. In the next place, owing to the fact that these woollen goods are, we will say, various kinds of underclothing, they are arranged by sizes, they are arranged by colours, and as a result each one is in a separate cardboard box. Now these cardboard boxes are all manufactured, the bulk of them, from pulp wood exported to Great Britain. That runs up to a considerable figure also. And if you take an ordinary fair sized case, there is, first, the expense of the outside case manufactured of wood, then there are the inside cases manufactured of pieces of cardboard, and these in turn are all bound up securely in pulp exported from Sweden, or Norway or Canada. It must result that the cost of these packing cases and the interior cases goes a long way towards 25 per cent. I think it should be the duty of the department to supply the House with information as to the relative proportions of the cost of the outside case, then the cardboard box inside, and the hoops that go to complete that package for shipment. Now if a large proportion of the cost is run up in that way, there is no protection at all to the woollen manufacturer, to the woollen artisan in this country, as against the English artisan and the manufacturer of woollen goods. He is in a contest not only with the woollen manufacturer but with the rough labour that is used in making up the boxes. May I ask the minister if there is any information at all in the Customs Department—it may not be used in making the declarations—but is the Department of Customs in possession of any information which would show the House how the 25 per cent is made up, having regard of course to this cost of packing ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Commissioner of Customs informs me that these packages vary so much that we cannot give a general answer. All the department requires is a declaration to the effect that a substantial portion of the labour in one or more of such countries, that means British countries, has entered into the production of every manufactured article included in said invoice to the extent in each article of not less than one-fourth of the value of every such article in its present condition ready for export to Canada. Now that 25 per cent would include undoubtedly British labour in different forms. But we have not made any attempt to discriminate between skilled labour in a factory and the labour of the man who makes up the case. I think the Customs Department have made an honest effort to apply the law intelligently. If you require 50 per cent of British labour, there will be no preference whatever. I think a fair proportion of the labour entering into manufactures imported from abroad would probably not be much over 25 per cent. If you make it 50 per

cent, you shut out the products of British factories altogether.

Mr. BENNETT. I think you should entirely eliminate the cost of the package, because it must come to a large amount. The minister knows that in the first place only a high grade of lumber can be shipped from Canada to Britain, and in the next place it would be utterly impossible to ship faulty lumber, because in storing it in the holds the presence of knots would in all probability break up the lumber. I think that in Great Britain they have not the appliances we have in saw-mills of thinning these boards down, and even if they had, it would be impossible, having regard to the safety of goods of this class, that they should be placed in thin wooden cases. I am informed that the very best lumber is shipped from this country for that purpose, running from $40 to $50 a thousand, and when landed in Great Britain it is that very class of lumber which is used for cases. Then we know that these cardboard boxes cost considerable money, owing to the fact that they have to go out of Great Britain to purchase the pulp, and owing to the very nature of these cardboard boxes and their bulkiness, they cannot be shipped from this country or any other country to Great Britain. So the woollen manufacturer of this country is fighting first, the high grade lumber that of necessity must go into the work of that packing case on the outside, and the high priced cardboard boxes that contain the article. I think the department should make a ruling that for the future no reference shall be made to, and no competition shall be allowed in, the cost, either of the outside wooden boxes or of the interior boxes made of cardboard, or of any labour that is attendant upon the construction of these boxes.

Mr. LOGGIE. I confess that I must take issue to some extent with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) when he speaks as to the value of this lumber. I can tell the hon. member that from the Miramichi country there are a great many millions of feet of spruce deals exported and these deals are largely used in the way of making packing boxes after they reach the British market. There are in the United Kingdom mills especially equipped for the purpose of cutting three-inch deals into half inch or three-quarter inch boards as the case may be. As to the value of these deals they are sold for about $15 per thousand, firsts, seconds and thirds, free on board the steamers, and then the freight will be in the vicinity of $5 or $6 per thousand. So I think the hon. member when he speaks of the cost of the outside package is rather extreme.

I would like also to say to the hon. minister when I am on my feet that I understand the German government placed during the last summer a special duty on canned lobsters, and that we are not only at a disadvantage with those engaged in the trade in the United States, but also with Newfoundland. I know of an order which was cancelled because the duty was increased from Canada and the indication was at that time that the trade in future would go from Newfoundland instead of from Canada. I presume they must have in that case applied the surtax.

Mr. FIELDING. No, it might be the maximum tariff.

Mr. LOGGIE. The only thing that makes me say that it was not the maximum tariff was that it came into effect in August.

Mr. FIELDING. The Germans have revised their tariff in the past season. That we are at a disadvantage I quite realize.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the hon. minister if the declaration he read is made by the British exporter himself or by a broker?

Mr. FIELDING. The form of it is that the exporter declares :

> I, ..., the exporter of the articles included in this invoice, have the means of knowing and do hereby certify that said invoice is true and correct.

I do not know that the practice is that the exporter must necessarily go to the customs office himself. I suppose it will be done by a junior member of the firm.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Customs Department certainly have the invoices and they may be able to state whether this declaration is made by the firm or an agent or broker. I am informed that these declarations are made mostly by brokers, the same as we have brokers here making entries for incoming goods.

Mr. FIELDING. An hon. gentleman asks me whether the exporter swears to it. The exporter does not swear to it. The importer is required to swear to the truth and correctness of the whole transaction, but the exporter is not.

Mr. LALOR. I should imagine that it would be necessary for the exporter to make some sort of a declaration as to where these articles have been manufactured, whether they are of British origin and if not wholly of British origin the extent to which they are of British origin. I notice that the hon. member for Northumberland speaks of cheap lumber and cases made from it, but I do not know whether he has ever imported dry goods or woollen goods from Great Britain or not. If he has he will know that a very large price is paid for packages. I know of as high as £1 a piece having been paid for ordinary wooden cases for packing goods shipped to this country. I am surprised to find that

the package is figured as a portion of the cost in ascertaining the percentage of British labour put upon these goods. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is perfectly right in his argument when he states that if you take paste board boxes in which low-priced goods are placed, such as hoods and scarfs which are of a low value, and put these into a wooden case they will represent half the valuation of these goods, and I imagine that such packages as these form a large proportion of the British labour put upon these goods. I imagine that in this way you have German goods upon which a very small amount of British labour has been put shipped into this country under the preferential tariff. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance will take that into his serious consideration and see if he cannot make a provision whereby the British labour required to be put upon these goods shall not include the labour put upon the packages.

Mr. FIELDING. Goods sent in from the continent and merely cased in England would not come under the operation of the preferential tariff. There would have to be a bona fide manufacture of the article itself. My hon. friend mentions a packing case which would be worth probably £1, which is probably not too much. What would probably be the value of the articles placed in that case?

Mr. LALOR. That would depend largely on the class of goods in it. If you put in linens or silks the valuations would be high. But if the goods were clouds, scarfs and light weight woollens I imagine the value of the case would be 15 per cent of the value of the goods.

Mr. FIELDING. I think you will find that it works out automatically. As a rule an expensive case is only used for expensive goods and then the value of the case, although it may be considerable in itself, is a very small percentage of the value of the goods. You do not see expensive goods in a cheap case, but the moment you an expensive case is only used for expenthat you are going to get an expensive article out of it; so that the percentage of the value of the case in proportion to the whole value is very small.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no record, I suppose, of the origin of the goods that come in under the British preferential? Suppose that an article, 75 per cent of the value of which is produced in Germany and 25 per cent produced in Great Britain, comes into this country, are you able to tell by reference to any records in the Customs Department that the 75 per cent has been produced in Germany?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a regulation in the case of goods liable to the surtax which enables them to trace the origin, but in the other case there is none. In the other case all you require is a declaration that 25 per cent of the value is the product of the British labourer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What occurred to me was that it would be a very interesting comparison to see what quantity of goods of German origin come in under the British preference and what quantity under the operation of the surtax. One would think that the imposition of the surtax itself on the one hand as contrasted with the British preference on the other would lead German manufacturers to do business in that way.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a strong temptation undoubtedly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Therefore we might expect that a large proportion of the goods that come to us under the British preference are really of German origin.

Mr. FIELDING. The temptation undoubtedly exists and that being the case the customs officers have watched them very closely and their impression is that the law is not evaded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was a resolution of the House passed two years ago which does not seem to have been taken very much in account by those who prepared these resolutions. I refer to the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) on the 20th July, 1904, to this effect:

> That in the opinion of this House, the preferential tariff should only apply to importations through Canadian seaports.

That resolution passed the House unanimously. The hon. Minister of Finance said this about it:

> It is a subject on which there is need of education, not only outside of the House, but, possibly inside the House. I am aware that possibly, from some points of view, objections may be raised to the motion of my hon. friend. But, for my own part I am heartily in favour of it, and, if he decides to divide the House upon it, I shall have pleasure in giving my vote in support of the motion.

The right hon. the Prime Minister strongly supported it also. He said:

> Upon the general principle of this resolution there cannot be any difference of opinion.

Further on he said:

> Therefore, I think it is quite proper that this discussion should take place and that all parties should understand that the government would be actuated and guided by it as to what its future course should be.

This is the third session since that resolution was passed unanimously and the words of the Prime Minister were very emphatic indeed. I desire to know whether or not the government have taken that resolution into consideration, and whether or not they propose to give any effect to it

in dealing with this tariff before we finally get through with it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has a notice on the paper which will bring up the whole question and it will be considered and dealt with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not asking about the intention of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) because while he is very able and very capable of dealing with the matter he is not the government.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will have ample opportunity of discovering that intention as the session goes on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Considering this is the third session since the Prime Minister said the government would be guided in its future action by that resolution; considering that the tariff has been so much under consideration that the minister could not even appoint a Solicitor General in Ottawa or a judge in Nova Scotia during the past six months, one would naturally suppose that this resolution which was to guide the future action of the government would not have escaped their attention. The index to 'Hansard' is not very good sometimes, but it is good for this particular year, 1904, and there was not the slightest difficulty in finding the resolution when one thought of it. It is a remarkable thing that this resolution should have absolutely escaped the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a very early stage of the session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The tariff is only just in the making, I suppose.

Mr. FIELDING. There are some features of it that will have to be considered yet.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it permitted to import into Canada free of duty a ship that has been registered in Newfoundland.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume my hon. friend means a foreign built ship.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The old law did permit that, but there has been a change during the last few years. It was found that American vessels were being taken to Newfoundland, registered as British vessels and taken into Canada thus escaping the intention of the Canadian law. A change was made under which a system of licensing vessels was adopted and all foreign built vessels have now to pay duty.

Mr. BENNETT. The popular way of escaping the duty now is to bring them in under a ninety-nine year lease.

Mr. FIELDING. A foreign built vessel cannot come in and engage in our coasting trade now without paying duty in the form of a license.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a popular practice on the lakes now to bring in a private yacht under a ninety-nine year lease and thereby escape the payment of customs duty.

Mr. FIELDING. I have stated the general law and if there is any new and exceptional circumstance we shall have to ask the Customs Department to give attention to that.

11. That whenever from or as a result of proceedings in any court of justice, it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement of any kind among manufacturers of such articles or dealers therein to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended that in respect of proceedings against say half a dozen manufacturers out of twenty-five, the existence of a conspiracy or combination amongst the six should operate to give this power to the Governor General as to all these manufacturers ?

Mr. FIELDING. Unless there was evidence that there was a combination generally to affect prices it would be very unfair to punish one manufacturer merely because another one did wrong.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what occurred to me.

Mr. FIELDING. We would not so interpret it. It would be only in case where the effect of the whole thing was to advance the price and where the remedy might be found by a reduction of the duty. In such a case as my hon. friend mentions I would not understand that the Act would apply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It perhaps may be open to the limited meaning which the Minister of Finance attributes to it, but I think it ought to be carefully guarded so that men should not be subjected to a penalty without an opportunity of defending themselves. It is a very legitimate thing to use against a man evidence that is brought out in a court of justice when the man is there present to defend himself. But it does seem to be going a little further than would be right or usual that, against certain members of a class, you should utilize evidence brought out in a proceeding against certain others of that class and in respect to which the first-mentioned persons had no opportunity of appearing or defending themselves at all. I would like

the minister to sufficiently guard it in that respect. I am not prepared to criticise it at the moment, but I hope that he will take that into consideration. Then there is the expression 'any court of justice.' That is very comprehensive; it might include preliminary proceedings before a magistrate, although the case might not be absolutely determined one way or the other upon these proceedings.

Mr. FIELDING. You think we should define the character of the court, that is worthy of consideration.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 17, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INSPECTION OF BARGES.

Mr. F. A. LAURENCE (Colchester) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 35) to provide for the Official Inspection of Barges.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. member be kind enough to explain the Bill?

Mr. LAURENCE. The purpose of the Bill which you have in your hand, Mr. Speaker, is fairly well indicated by its title; it is to provide for the official inspection of that class of vessels used in the transportation business of the country, known as barges. As every hon. member of the House is aware there are very many of these vessels in use in the transportation business of Canada, on the Atlantic coast, on the great lakes, in the gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Pacific coast. No doubt very many of them are seaworthy vessels and of a character that ensures comparative safety to the crews who manage them, but I am persuaded, Sir, from the history of this class of vessels in Canada and in the United States, that many of them, at least a certain proportion of them are unseaworthy and many of them are sent to sea overloaded. The object of this Bill is to make an attempt at least to ensure some official or governmental inspection of this class of vessels with a view to secure seaworthiness upon the one hand and to guard against overloading upon the other. These vessels, as hon. members are aware, are largely used in the transportation of non-floatable cargoes, such as ore, coal, grain, and gypsum, and I am sure it is within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen and within general knowledge that every year there is a most appalling record of loss of life occasioned by disasters and wrecks to these vessels. This Bill is an attempt to fix a load-line with respect to these barges and to secure and provide for an inspection that will secure seaworthiness so as to provide against casualties and to protect the lives of those who navigate them.

Mr. FIELDING. Does it apply to both inland and seagoing vessels?

Mr. LAURENCE. The Bill applies to the great lakes, the gulf of St. Lawrence, the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PREVENTION AND SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 36) to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lock-outs in coal Mines and Industries connected with Public Utilities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he could not strike out the last three words and call his Bill an 'Act to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lock-outs' without mentioning coal mines. Then, it would be available for the settlement of any strike.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was just going to say in answer to the request by some hon. members for an explanation of this measure that when I move the second reading of the Bill, I will ask the House for permission to amend the title so that it will read 'An Act to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lock-outs in Coal Mines and Industries connected with Public Utilities.' The reason why I propose to amend the title of the Bill in that way is that since I have given notice that I would introduce it, many representations have been made from all parts of the country and from several members of the House that we should extend the operation of such a measure to all public utilities and services. Such public utilities would include not only coal mines, but such things as steamship transportation, telegraphs, telephones, water supply, gas supply, electric lighting and street railways, to mention a few only.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not general railways?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have already a Bill which provides for the settlement of labour disputes in connection with railway companies.

Mr. BERGERON. That would not touch manufacturers, or the employees of factories, or anything like that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, utilities only which will be more clearly defined when we are

at the second reading of the Bill. The purpose of this measure is to prevent any strike or lock-out in a coal mine or any other public utility from being declared until the difference or difficulty existing between the employers and employees has been submitted to a board of arbitrators. I introduce the Bill as the result of the investigation which took place lately by the Deputy Minister of Labour during the Lethbridge coal strike. Hon. members of the House have probably read the report which was laid on the table of the House the other day with the recomendation made by the Deputy Minister of Labour. After having related what took place at Lethbridge and the difficulties which he encountered in bringing about the settlement of that terrible strike he says:

The purpose of parliament in enacting both the Conciliation and the Railway Labour Disputes Acts might, it seems to me, be considerably furthered were an Act, applicable to strikes and lock-outs in coal mines, similar in some features to the Railway Labour Disputes Act, also enacted. Inasmuch as coal is in this country one of the foremost necessaries, on which not only a great part of the manufacturing and transportation industries but also, as the recent experience has shown, much of happiness and life itself depends, it would appear that if legislation can be devised, which, without encroaching upon the recognized rights of employers and employees, will at the same time protect the public, the Sate would be justified in enacting any measure which will make the strike or lock-out in a coal mine a thing of the past. Such an end it would appear, might be achieved, at least in part, were provisions made whereby as in the case of the Railway Labour Disputes Act, all questions in dispute might be referred to a board empowered to conduct an investigation under oath, with the additional feature, perhaps, that such reference should not be optional but obligatory ; and pending the investigation and until the board has issued its finding the parties be restrained, on pain of penalty from declaring a lock-out or strike.

As the House knows our present labour legislation consists chiefly of two Acts, one adopted by this House in the session of 1900, and generally known as the Conciliation Act. It is a purely voluntary measure by which the parties can agree to have matters arbitrated by persons appointed one by the employers, the other by the employees and the third by the Minister of Labour or the two parties themselves. That was one step in labour legislation, but as I said a moment ago it is a purely voluntary measure. The Railway Labour Disputes Act goes one step further. It enacts that whenever there is any strike or lock-out in connection with the railway an investigation will take place. First of all an offer of conciliation will be made and if the offer of conciliation to adjust the difficulties between the employers and employees has no effect the Minister of Labour steps in and appoints a board of arbitrators. This board of arbitrators is composed of three persons, one appointed by the employer, by the railway company, the other appointed by the railway employees and the third one by these two, or if they do not agree upon the third arbitrator, then he is appointed by the Minister of Labour or by the Governor in Council, then after that an investigation takes place. It is a compulsory investigation and in this the measure goes one step further than the Conciliation Act. This compulsory investigation consists, as it is described in section 10, in the following procedure:

Forthwith after the appointment of the board the chairman shall promptly convene the same, and the board shall in such manner as it thinks advisable, make thorough, careful and expeditious inquiry into all the facts and circumstances connected with the difference and the cause thereof and shall consider what would be reasonable and proper to be done by both or either of the parties with a view to putting an end to the difference, and to preventing its recurrence, and shall with all reasonable speed make to the minister a written report setting forth the various proceedings and steps taken by the board for the purpose of fully and correctly ascertaining all the facts and circumstances, and also setting forth said facts and circumstances, and its findings therefrom including the cause of the difference and the board's recommendations with a view to its removal, and the prevention of its recurrence.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that before or after the men have struck?

Mr. LEMIEUX. During or before the strike.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought it might be done before the men had struck so as to prevent the strike.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am explaining the features of the Railway Labour Disputes Act in order to show wherein this new lgislation will differ from that Act. If a strike is threatened or takes place on a railway conciliation is tried. If it does not succeed then the minister may appoint a board of arbitrators.

Mr. BERGERON. But the men have struck by that time?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The men may have struck by that time.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After the investigation has taken place, witnesses have been summoned, books, documents and correspondence have been filed and the arbitrators have signed their report it is immediately transmitted to the Minister of Labour and is published in the 'Labour Gazette.' Since the Act was passed by the House in 1903, one strike was threatened on the Grand Trunk—a strike of telegraphers. I may say that the telegraphers on the Grand Trunk Railway system are regarded as railway employees because they belong to the system. This is the only instance of where the Act has been applied since 1903. The House

will remember the circumstances. The men were asking for a minimum rate and the company objected. Then, the arbitrators were appointed. I remember that Mr. Shepley was appointed to represent one of the parties and Mr. Justice Teetzel was appointed as third arbitrator. After the investigation took place a report was published and subsequently the company settled according to the terms of the award made by the board of arbitrators.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this obligatory upon the company or is it only optional ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the case of the Railway Labour Disputes Act it is not obligatory, except if the minister decides there must be an investigation. The difference between this Act and the Railway Labour Disputes Act is, that this will be made obligatory while the other is optional. For instance, if a strike is threatened at Lethbridge, the Minister of Labour will at once notify the parties that a board of arbitrators will be appointed ; he will ask the company to appoint one arbitrator, the employees to appoint another ; these two to agree on a third arbitrator. An investigation will proceed and pending this investigation a lock-out or strike will not be permitted under penalty. Then the award will be rendered by the board of arbitrators and that award will be made public. This award cannot be enforced by any process of law but as has been the case in other countries, especially in several states of the Union, it is expected that this award will carry with it a moral force backed up by public opinion, which in 99 cases out of 100 will it is hoped, bring a settlement of the difficulty. On the second reading of the Bill I will explain at greater length the features of this legislation.

Mr. BERGERON. Now that the Minister of Labour proposes to revise the whole of that law, why does he not incorporate in this Bill, the Railway Labour Disputes legislation?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The legislation passed in 1903 has been successful as regards railway labour disputes and we thought it would be better to apply this legislation only to the public utilities I have mentioned. It might be that during the course of the discussion we may amend the Act so as to include the legislation of 1903.

Mr. BERGERON. But the law which the Minister of Labour presents to the House now would not cover such a case as the Buckingham strike ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is different.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a dispute between employers and employees just the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have the Conciliation Act for such disputes as that; we must confine ourselves to public necessities.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. TISDALE. Does the minister know whether the railways and the railway employees prefer to keep the Act governing them separate from this legislation ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have met Mr. Hall, who represents the railway employees and he seems to favour the Bill as it is. I have not had an opportunity to discuss with him this new feature suggested by my hon. friend, but I may say that generally speaking this legislation is favoured by the public. I shall be glad to have suggestions from members on both sides of the House during the debate.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think the minister said it was not intended that the award should be compulsory, but rather that information should be obtained, a report presented, with probably a recommendation, and that then it would be optional for the parties to agree with it or reject it. I understood the minister to say also, that there did not seem to be any way by which the award could be made binding. I don't quite understand how that is. I quite see the distinction between the different kinds of employment; if the minister and an employee of his cannot agree as to wages that is their own concern and no outside body has any right to interfere. But, when you come to a case like the Buckingham affair it is quite another matter. Strife arises, one thing is added to another until the peace of the community is disturbed and its welfare menaced. There arises a period in a strike of that kind when the public, through the law, can properly interfere. How far they may interfere is a question, but in the interest of peace and good order there is the right of the public to have some say in a matter of that kind. In the case of a railway company, or a steamship line, or a telephone or a telegraph service, there is a third party interested and that third party is the public as a whole. It is not right that because employers and employees in the case of a public utility cannot see eye to eye, that they should carry their quarrel to the point of cessation from work and so visit the great brunt of the calamity upon innocent people who are not in any way a party to the difference between the employers and the employees. If you disturb a line of railway the whole current of commerce is affected; the country is deeply interested, the country has granted the franchise, made it valuable, made it possible for the employers to carry on their business and the employees to get work, and it does not seem right that the public, this innocent third party, should stand idly by and see the other two quarrel, whilst its rights are being sacrificed. It seems to me that the public has the right to step in in such a case as that. I do not know where the legal right is just now, or whether it can be applied, but there ought

to be a power in parliament to apply it. In such a case as a coal strike where the industries of the country and the hearths and homes of the people are vitally concerned, and in connection with which great distress to the people and great loss to business occurs, parliament ought to have the power to say in the first place, that there shall be no strike until the third party is consulted. The employees may say: We want 10 cents a day more from your company for mining coal, and the company may say: We will not give you the 10 cents, and you can stop mining the coal if you like. But in the meantime all this great loss and distress in the country takes place. I hold that somewhere there is the right of the third party, which grants the franchise and makes it possible for it to be existent and operative, to step in to the extent of saying, you may have your difference, but before you stop the work of this public utility to quarrel over that difference, you have to submit to arbitration. There should be a power somewhere to judge between them and make a reasonable award. In the meantime no disturbance takes place, and the public weal is not injured.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Suppose the men stop work?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are ways, I think, in which even that could be taken up. There ought to be power somewhere. The men, we will suppose are all members of the union, and they say they will not work. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred there are some men who will work, and there may be enough to carry on the industry in the meantime. At any rate, there ought to be a power which could step in, in the first place, and say: Make your difference plain; agree if you can, and if you cannot, submit your difference to arbitration, and let the commission of arbitration have the power to make a reasonable award which shall be binding. That is pretty drastic, you may say, and there may be a great many objections to it, legal and otherwise; but on the question of actual right, has not the great public, which is the chief sufferer in any strike of this kind, some rights in the matter? How far do those rights go? How far ought they to be pressed? My own opinion is that the time has come when it is monstrous and outrageous that such an event should take place as took place at Lethbridge—an event which under our present laws might be duplicated on every mining property in the west, and the whole country thus brought to the verge of a fuel famine, with consequent suffering and distress, and may be death—that that should be possible in this country, without some power being resident somewhere to prevent the loss and disaster which occurs because two parties disagree. It may be said, can you make a law to compel a man to work if he does not want to work, or to work for certain wages if he does not want to? Well, I think we may go a little distance on that road. A man contracts to work, and is bound to carry out his contract; and where there is a public utility of such commanding extent as the one in question, it seems to me that the employer and employee might come together by way of contract. When they agree upon a certain scale of wage, that should be for a certain length of time, neither party should have the right to violate that contract during that time; and there should be space enough to have an arbitration and a reasonable award, and that award should be compulsory. These are just crude ideas which I have, not on the legal line, because I am not a lawyer; but there does seem to be a good deal of common sense in my contention that the third party, the public, has some rights in this matter, and they ought to be exercised effectually.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has travelled very far afield and has given expression to some very radical ideas—more radical, at any rate, than the parliament of Canada has thought fit to apply in its legislation up to the present time. If my hon. friend means anything, he means simply that we should have compulsory arbitration in all disputes between employers and employees, and that parliament should, with all the power with which it is vested to enforce its views—

Mr. FOSTER. I think I shall have to call my hon. friend down a little. He must not widen the proposition more than I did. I confined it to public utilities; I did not refer to all disputes between labour and capital. That narrows it somewhat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. My hon. friend is more conservative than I thought he was; I gave him the credit of being more radical. Let us see how far we have gone in the attempt to settle disputes between employers and employees in this country. Some years ago we introduced the Conciliation Act, which I think has on the whole worked very satisfactorily to the country at large. As it has been applied by the Department of Labour, I think it reflects great credit on the minister; and certainly Canada has escaped many such labour disputes as have endangered society in other countries. Three years ago we passed another Act, applying a little more drastic legislation to disputes between employers and employees on railways. This year it is proposed to advance a little further, and my hon. friend the Minister of Labour introduces to-day legislation which is intended to apply to labour employed on public utilities—coal mining, transportation and connected industries. The proposal of the government to-day is simply to make an investigation compul-

sory. We do not propose to make arbitration compulsory. We say that it will be sufficient for the time being to provide for a compulsory investigation. The moment there is a strike threatened in a coal mine, the Minister of Labour steps in and orders an investigation into the causes of the dispute between the employers and the employees. This is a step in advance, and a very considerable one. The investigation takes place. The points in dispute between the men and their employers will be exposed to the public. The public will follow the investigation from day to day and satisfy themselves as to the merits of the case as it enfolds. I believe this a great guarantee of the final settlement of the dispute. My hon. friend goes further. I do not intend at this moment to engage in controversy with him. He says the award made by such a board should be compulsory. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that; but, on the other hand, I must remind my hon. friend that in this country up to the present time we have not been in favour of compulsory arbitration. That has been tried in other countries, and my hon. friend knows as well as I that it has not been an unqualified success. It may be that when the causes of the dispute are exposed from day to day by the arbitrators, the public will satisfy themselves where the truth is, and that when the award is rendered, it will carry with it the verdict of the public, and peace will follow. On the other hand, it may be that the award will not be obeyed, either by the men or their employers. But it is very important to have public opinion on your side in these cases. Burke has said somewhere 'you cannot bring an indictment against a whole nation,' nor can you against a whole class of the community. If the award be not in accordance with the verdict of the community, it will have to be amended in some way. But if it be in accord with that verdict—which I believe would be very likely—there would be no difficulty in giving it effect. At all events this is what we have to propose at this moment, and I think that the House will find, when it comes to investigate the Bill, that it is a very satisfactory measure.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose in a case of the direst kind affecting a great public utility, an investigation into the cause of the strike is ordered and an award made, and suppose that one or the other of the parties absolutely refuse to obey the award. The two parties get no closer together, the dispute continues until there is the gravest danger and great harm is done, and there is still no prospect of agreement. In such a case what will my hon. friend do? Will he remain still and let them fight it out to the injury of the public? Will he say that there is no help, no arm, no hand that can be raised to put an end to the conflict?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is supposing a case that will not occur once in a thousand times.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the very case my right hon. friend will have to meet before he can be logical in his deduction.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The government could undertake the responsibility of administering and running the public utility itself. When the Minister of Labour proposes to deal with street railway strikes has he in mind that some of the provinces have already made provision for such action by the provincial authorities, and would there not be danger of clash of authority between the federal and local powers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In such a case the federal power would help the provincial authorities. In the city of Hamilton strike the Department of Labour was ready to interfere, but we learned that the Ontario government was trying its hand to effect a settlement. In any event I ask hon. members of both sides to give their best study to this legislation in order that we may devise a measure which will be beneficial both to labour and capital.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:—

GREY:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with much pleasure the address which you have adopted in reply to the speech from the Throne and thank you for it sincerely.

Government House,
Ottawa, December 15, 1906.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not find any mention of the Auditor General's Report in the returns laid on the table.

Mr. FIELDING. We have no command to lay that on the table to-day. On my way here I called at the Auditor General's office and was informed that the report was not ready.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend said some time ago that he expected it would be ready before this. He does not get accurate information.

Mr. FIELDING. I never gave any definite assurance. The Auditor General expressed the opinion that one volume of the report would be ready at the close of last week, but that expectation has not been realized. On Friday he informed me that the last proof had gone to the King's Printer and he hoped one of the first days of this week to have that report ready. I give that information subject to the possibility that we may not have it to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope there is no conspiracy to keep members from having this report before their Christmas dinner.

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion that the King's Printer would enter into a conspiracy is very unfair and far-fetched.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. BARKER. Have the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway made their annual report? If so, why has it not been laid on the table within fifteen days from the beginning of the session?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways). It has been.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILROAD AND STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

Mr. W. McINTYRE moved second reading of Bill (No. 25) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). I do not wish to oppose the second reading as the Bill will go before the Railway Committee in the ordinary way. But when such great powers are given some restrictions should be put on passenger and freight rates. At present the Canadian Northern are charging four cents a mile for passengers through the western country. There should be a limitation put upon that and also on freight rates. I hope that when the Bill comes back it will contain some such limitation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What would the hon. gentleman make the passenger rate in the west?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Manufacturers Bank of Canada.—Mr. Kemp.

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

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Northwestern Trust and Loan Company.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

QUESTIONS.

NORTHWEST QUARTER SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 43, RANGE 2, WEST OF THIRD MERIDIAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. Are there any persons in the vicinity of New Ottawa, in the province of Saskatchewan, who have held lands for several years without performing any settlement duties, or without performing full settlement duties?
2. If so, how many such persons?
3. What are the names of such persons?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I understand that the question relates to the Northwest quarter of section 12, township 43, range 11, west of third meridian. I find that entry was made for this section as a homestead by Robert Baird on the 2nd of March, 1904; that on the 2nd of May, 1906, our inspector visited the homestead and reported that Mr. Baird had been in residence from the 15th of July, 1905, to the 1st of September, and that he had a frame house upon the land and a sod stable, and forty acres of cultivation.

GRAIN RECEIVED AT MONTREAL FROM LAKE SUPERIOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. How many bushels of grain have been received at Montreal from points on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, in unbroken bulk up to date, in the season of navigation of 1906?
2. How many bushels have been received at Montreal, which were transhipped at Kingston, also at Prescott?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The following quantities of United States grain reached Montreal in direct shipments by vessels:

	Bushels.
From Chicago	584,036
" Duluth	303,160
" Superior	228,987
" Ogdensburg	216,370
" Toledo	27,600
" Cleveland	12,500
Total	1,372,653

2. The quantities of United States grain which reached Montreal, after transhipment at the ports named, were as follows:

	Bushels.
Transhipped at Kingston	3,912,392
Transhipped at Prescott	674,015

INCREASE IN IMPORT OF BRITISH TEXTILE GOODS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What has been the percentage of increase in the imports of British textile goods to Canada from 1897 up to 1905, inclusive, (a) in the case of cotton ; (b) in the case of wool ?
2. What does the total of said increases amount to during the above period as compared with the previous corresponding period, in cotton and wool respectively ?
3. What has been the percentage of increase and the total imports up to the end of the last fiscal year, in woollen goods, since the change of duty on woollen goods in 1905?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

	Percentage.	
1. (a) Percentage of increase in imports British cottons, 1905 over 1897	113·9	
(b) Percentage of increase in imports British woollens, 1905 over 1897	136·9	
2. Total imports British cottons, 1888 to 1896		$28,956,078
Total imports British cottons, 1897 to 1905		41,294,440
Increase during period of 1897 to 1905 over period 1888 to 1896		$12,338,362
Total imports of British woollens, 1888 to 1896		$78,558,828
Total imports of British woollens, 1897 to 1905		80,213,236
Increase during period 1897 to 1905 over period 1888 to 1896		$ 1,654,408
3. Total imports of British woollens, 1905 and 1906		27,929,807
Total imports of British woollens, 1903 and 1904		23,831,999
Increase for years 1905 and 1906 over 1903 and 1904		$ 4,097,808
Percentage of increase	17 p. c.	

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has quoted in answer to the third question, the figures for 1905 and 1906 compared with the returns for 1903 and 1904. Do I understand that is for two years in each case, or is it for the year 1905-6 and the year 1903-4—one fiscal year in each case ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, that is for two years. The question asked is 'What has been the percentage of increase and the total imports up to the end of the last fiscal year, in woollen goods, since the change of duty on woollen goods in 1905 ? I suppose the question has reference to the change that was made in that year, and the answer furnished me by the officers of the department evidently is a statement for two years, for the purpose of comparison. If we have misunderstood the intention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk)—

Mr. MONK. The object of the third question was to find what had been the decrease since the change in the duty on the woollen goods.

Mr. PATERSON. So I presumed. And, evidently, the officers have taken this way of answering the question, putting two years together—as the change was not made at the end of a fiscal year.

LEATHER GOODS, SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the percentage of increase of shipments of leather goods to Canada from the United Kingdom, from 1897 to 1905, inclusive, as compared with the corresponding period preceding?
2. What does the total of said increase amount to ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

	Percentage.	
1. Percentage of increase in imports of leather goods from United Kingdom during period 1897 to 1905 over period 1888 to 1896	45·5	
2. Total of said increase		$702,480

GLASS, IMPORTS OF BRITISH GOODS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What has been the percentage of increase in the imports of British glass goods to Canada from 1898 to 1905, inclusive ?
2. What does the total of said increase amount to, as compared with the previous corresponding period ?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Percentage of increase of imports of British glass, 1905 over 1898	122·30	
2. Total imports British glass, 1898 to 1905		$3,092,535
Total imports British glass, 1890 to 1897		2,292,058
Increase during period 1898 to 1905 over period 1890 to 1897.		$ 800,477

WINTER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to take steps to ascertain whether an all-winter open route of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Nova Scotia coasts between Georgetown or Souris and Cape George ?
2. If so, what means of testing said route are proposed ?
3. When will the test be made ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1 and 2. Date as will be obtained from competent authorities at both places, so that the department can have full information before taking action.

3. At the most convenient opportunity during this winter.

MODUS VIVENDI, LICENSES AND FINES OF UNITED STATES VESSELS.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. How many United States fishing vessels took out licenses under the provisions of the modus vivendi during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1906 ?

2. What was the gross amount collected from these licenses ?

3. What amount was collected in fines from vessels belonging to the United States during the year 1906 for violation of the Canadian fishery laws, and what are the names of the vessels and the amounts collected from each ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. 119.

2. $14,568.16.

3. $2,700 : 'Partha', $1,000 ; 'Raymah', $1,000 ; 'E. C. Ogle', $700.

DUTY COLLECTED ON SUGAR.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the total amount of duty received by the government in the fiscal year 1906 on sugar, n.e.s., not above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour, as fully described in item 436 of Tariff Amendment Act of 1895 ?

2. What would have been the total amount of duty received in the same period—fiscal year 1906—had the tariff now proposed by the government, item 135, new Customs Tariff, been then in force ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The total duties collected on sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour for the fiscal year 1905-6, were $2,176,832.27, less amount refunded on sugar during same period, $49,589.24, $2,127,243.03.

2. The duties on the same importations, from the same countries, under the resolutions now before parliament are estimated to be $2,471,054.23.

DUTY ON SUGAR.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the total amount of duty received by the government in the fiscal year 1906 on all sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in colour, as fully described in item 435 of Tariff Amendment Act, 1895?

2. What would have been the total amount of duty received in the same period—fiscal year 1906—had the tariff now proposed by the government, item 134, new Customs Tariff, been then in force?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

	General.	Preferential.	Surtax.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1. Sugar, No. 16 D.S. in colour and over, fiscal year 1906, under old tariff.....	23,220 34	223,010 56	7 41
2. Sugar, No. 16 D.S. in colour and over, under new tariff, for the same quantities from the same countries. estimated....	23,220 34	223,010 56	7 41

ACCIDENT TO TROOPER ARMSTRONG.

Mr. HUNT—by Mr. Galliher—asked:

1. Is the government aware that Trooper Armstrong, of the 7th Hussars, met with an accident which resulted in his death while on duty at the Laprairie camp, 1905?

2. Were the usual Medical Boards of Inquiry held?

3. Has the government taken any action in regard to compensation to family or dependents of deceased?

4. If so, is it the intention of the government to grant an indemnity to family of deceased? If not, why not?

5. What is the policy of the government in indemnifying of members of the active militia injured in camp of instruction or while on active service?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. The claim has been investigated and a ruling thereon by the Deputy Minister of Justice obtained.

4. The man's enlistment was irregular he being ten years over the age limit. The Department of Justice has given a decision that there was no liability of any sort in the actual case.

5. Compensation is paid in accordance with regulations, which have the effect of law. The regulations do not provide compensation in a case such as this.

OFFICERS OF PERMANENT FORCES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What officers of the permanent force have qualified for tactical fitness for command, by actual examination, since 1900?

2. Has any qualification other than by actual examination, been accepted? If so, under what conditions and in whose favour?

3. Were any of the officers qualifying by examination already qualified by actual service, or otherwise?

4. In what cases has the age limit been extended in the permanent force since 1900, and for what reasons?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia):

1. The following is a list of officers of the permanent force who have passed the examination for tactical fitness for command, since 1900: Colonel Drury, C.W., R.C.H.A., Bvt.-Colonel Lessard, F.L., R.C.D., Lt.-Colonel Hodgins, W.E., D.O.C., Lt.-Colonel Rutherford, R.W., R.C.A., Lt.-Colonel Benson, T., R.C.A., Lt.-Colonel Fages, J.A., R.C.H.A., Lt.-Colonel Wadmore, R.L., R.C.R., Bvt. Lt.-Colonel Hemming, T.D.R., R. C. R., Bvt. Lt.-Colonel Ogilvie, G.H., R.C.A., Lt.-Colonel Pelletier, O.C.C., R.C.A., Bvt. Lt.-Colonel McDougall, J.C., R.C.R., Bvt. Lt.-Colonel Chinic, J.E., R.C.R., Bvt. Lt.-Colonel Denison, S.J.A., R.C.R., Bvt. Lt. Colonel Williams, V.A.S., R.C.D., Lt.-Colonel Dunbar, J.S., D.A.A.G., Major Maunsell, G.S., R.C.E.

2. Yes, in the case of Brevet Colonel T. D. B. Evans, who has been accepted as qualified, under the provisions of Army Order 217, 1902, by the imperial authorities.

3. No.

4. The following officers at present employed on regimental duty with units of the permanent force, are over the age limit prescribed by the regulations for their respective ranks:—Lieut.-Colonel J. V. Graveley, O.S.C., Major A. J. Armstrong, O.S.C., Captain J. H. Wynne, O.S.C., Lieut. J. J. Fitzpatrick, O.S.C.

CANADIAN COASTING TRADE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Barker—asked:

1. Are there any treaties now in force which prevent the parliament of Canada from enacting legislation to exclude foreign vessels from the coasting trade of Canada.

2. What are such treaties?

3. Upon what notice can they be denounced?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) to accept this general answer to this question.

1. The government is not aware that any treaties are now in force which prevent the exclusion of the vessels of the following countries from the coasting trade of Canada, viz.:—Germany, Austria-Hungary, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, The Netherlands, Denmark, Argentine Republic, Italy.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister has not answered the other parts of the question.

Mr. PATERSON. I simply made the specific answer with reference to those upon which there is no doubt. I think that these are the countries now that under order in council are permitted to engage in the coasting trade.

CONTRACTS BY E. A. WALBERG.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What contracts, if any, in connection with the government railway system have been, or are, at the present time, being executed by E. A. Walberg, or by any company with which he is associated or identified?

2. Where is the principal office of the said contractor or companies?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. December 1, 1903. Heating Chaudière Junction Engine House.

October 20, 1904. Provide and erect all pipes, fittings, valves, &c., in connection with engine houses at Ste. Flavie, Chaudière Junction and Rivière du Loup.

November 10, 1904. Erect fan system heating for engine houses at Ste. Flavie and Rivière du Loup.

November 10, 1904. Erect fan system heating for two car shop extensions at Moncton, N.B.

December 20, 1904. Erect an 80,000 gallon water tank at Ste. Flavie and at Chaudière Junction, Quebec.

January 3, 1906. Mumford boilers, heating apparatus, &c., for engine house at Truro, N.S.

January 22, 1906. Fan system of heating for car shop at Moncton, N.B.

February 1, 1906. Erect 50,000 gallon water tanks at Gibson, Upper Cross Creek, &c.

February 1, 1906. Erect engine house at Pictou, N.S.

February 1, 1906. Erect 80,000 gallon water tank at Truro, N.S., and Rivière du Loup, Quebec.

April 5, 1906. Erect addition to engine house at Stellarton, N.S.

April 19, 1906. Erect umbrella roofs over platforms at Sydney, N.S.

September 18, 1906. Erect freight car repair shop at Moncton, N.B.

October 29, 1906. Erect paint shop, repair shop and office building at Moncton, N.B.

March 20, 1906. Erect stone passenger station and baggage room building at Charlottetown, P.E.I.

November 12, 1906. Erect brick car shop at Charlottetown.

Not executed. Construction of an erecting, machine and blacksmith shop at Charlottetown, P.E.I.

2. Head office in Montreal.

NEW BRUNSWICK SUPPLY COMPANY.

Mr. AMES asked:

Does the Intercolonial Railway purchase supplies of any kind from a firm known as the New Brunswick Supply Company? If so, where are the headquarters of said company, and who is its representative with whom the Intercolonial Railway transacts business?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The Intercolonial Railway does not purchase supplies of any kind from a firm known as the New Brunswick Supply Company.

SLATE QUARRIES AND IMPORTS OF SLATE.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. How many slate quarries are there in the Dominion, and where are they located, and about what quantities are they producing ?

2. How much was imported the last fiscal year, and at what ports ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. One, reported in census, 1901; located at New Rockland, in Richmond county, Quebec; quantity produced, 5,000 squares.

2. The imports of slate and manufactures of slate during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1906, were $112,695. Imports of slate or manufactures thereof were made at the following customs ports, viz :—

Ontario.—Amherstburg, Belleville, Brantford, Chatham, Cobourg, Collingwood, Cornwall, Galt, Gananoque, Goderich, Guelph, Hamilton, Ingersoll, Kingston, London, Niagara Falls, Oshawa, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Paris, Peterborough, Picton, Prescott, St. Catharines, Sarnia, Simcoe, Stratford, Toronto, Trenton, Wallaceburg, Whitby, Windsor, Woodstock.

Quebec.—Cookshire, Montreal, Paspebiac, Quebec, St. Hyacinthe, St. Johns, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers.

New Brunswick.—Chatham, St. John, Woodstock.

Manitoba.—Emerson, Winnipeg.

British Columbia.—Kaslo, Nanaimo, Rossland, Vancouver, Victoria.

Prince Edward Island.—Charlottetown.

Yukon Territory.—Dawson.

Nova Scotia.—Amherst, Halifax, Sydney, Truro, Yarmouth.

ARRIVAL OF IMMIGRANTS SINCE 1904.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Wilson—asked :

1. What was the total number of immigrants who entered Canada during the years ending 30th June, 1904, 1905, 1906 ?

2. What were the numbers destined for the different provinces during each of these years ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Total number of immigrants who entered Canada during the year ending June 30, 1904, was 130,331 ; in 1905, 146,266 ; in 1906, 189,064.

2. For the year ending June, 30, 1904, the destination of immigrants was as follows :—

Maritime provinces	5,448
Quebec	20,222
Ontario	21,266
Manitoba	34,911
Northwest territories	40,397
British Columbia	6,994
Not stated	1,093

For the year ending June 30, 1905 :—

Maritime provinces	4,128
Quebec	23,666
Ontario	35,811
Manitoba	35,387
Northwest territories	39,289
British Columbia	6,008
Not stated	1,977

For the year ending June 30, 1906-:—

Maritime provinces	6,381
Quebec	25,212
Ontario	52,746
Manitoba	35,648
Saskatchewan	28,728
Alberta	26,177
British Columbia	12,406
Not stated	1,766

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—NEW POSITIONS CREATED.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. Ames—asked-:

1. In respect of each of the following positions on the Intercolonial Railway,—inspectors of car cleaners, inspector of air-brakes, inspector of cars, inspector of bridges, inspector of coal, inpector of locomotives; (a) when was the position created ; (b) who is the present incumbent ; (c) what is the salary ?

2. How were the duties in each case performed before the creation of the present inspectorships ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. (a) The position of inspector of car cleaners was created in October, 1898, the present incumbent is M. L. Tracey, present salary, $85 per month ; previous to this the duties were performed by the foreman of the mechanical department, at the various stations.

(b) The position of air-brake inspector, was created September, 1898, present incumbent is C. S. McCarthy, present salary, $91 a month, previous to this the duties were performed by the foreman of the mechanical department at the various stations.

(c) The position of general car inspector was created in August, 1900, present incumbent, D. White, present salary, $100 a month ; previous to this the duties were performed by the foreman of the mechanical department at the various stations.

(d) The position of inspector of bridges was created in November, 1874, present incumbent is A. E. Killam, present salary, $150 a month ; previous to 1874 the duties were performed by the engineers and roadmasters.

(e) The position of travelling inspector of fuel was created in 1891, and continued until 1897, when it was abolished; it was re-established in July, 1904, when M. C. Lockhart, the present incumbent was appointed inspector of coal, present salary, $75 a month ; previous to this the duties were performed by the foreman of the mechanical department at the various stations.

(f) There is no such position as inspector of locomotives.

2. Answered by number one.

MINIMUM VALUE OF HORSES.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Has the government placed a minimum value for tariff purposes on inferior horses imported into Canada ?

2. If so, what is the sum so fixed ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1 and 2. The minimum value of horses over one year old subject to duty is fifty dollars each, for customs purposes.

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked :

1. Have any communications passed between the government of Canada and the British government, or any member thereof, through the usual channels, with respect to the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle landing in Great Britain?

2. If so, what is the nature of such communications ?

3. Has the government any reason to anticipate the removal of this embargo at an early date ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes.

2. On the part of the imperial authorities, pointing out that the importation of Canadian cattle into Great Britain would be a menace to the health of cattle there; on the part of the Canadian authorities, that there was no disease in Canadian cattle, and that therefore such a menace could not exist, also protesting against the unjust and unfair imputation cast upon Canadian cattle and also supplying important facts in connection with this question.

3. It is not considered expedient to express an opinion.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACCIDENTS AND COMPENSATION.

Mr. LAURENCE asked :

1. Have many accidents occurred on the Intercolonial Railway since opened, occasioning death to passengers or other persons, not employees ?

2. How many accidents on said railway occasioning physical injuries to passengers or other persons, not employees, in the same period ?

3. In what number of such cases was compensation, as the result of legal proceedings in the courts of law, made to the legal representatives of persons killed ?

4. In what number of such cases was any compensation made without legal proceedings in the courts of law, to the families, relatives or dependents of persons killed?

5. In what number of such cases was compensation as the result of legal proceedings in the courts of law, made to persons physically injured ?

6. In what number of such cases was compensation made, without legal proceedings in the courts of law, to persons physically injured ?

7. What are the names of the persons in such accidents killed, to whose representatives compensation, as the result of legal proceedings in the courts of law, was made ?

8. What are the names of the persons killed in such accidents, to whose families, relatives or dependents, compensation without legal proceedings in the courts of law, was made ?

9. What are the names of the persons physically injured in such accidents, to whom compensation was made as the result of legal proceedings in the courts of law ?

10. What are the names of the persons physically injured in such accidents to whom compensation was made, without legal proceedings in the courts ?

11. What were the amounts of compensation to such persons, to whom paid, date and place of the accident, and briefly stated the circumstances of such accident in each case referred to in question No. 3 ?

12. What was the amount of compensation to each person, to whom paid, date and place of the accident, and briefly stated the circumstances of such accident in each case referred to in question No. 4?

13. What was the amount of compensation to each person, to whom paid, date and place of the accident, and briefly stated the circumstances of such accident in each case referred to in question No. 5?

14. What was the amount of compensation to each person, to whom paid, date and place of the accident, and briefly stated the circumstances of such accident in each case referred to in question No. 6?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The information would be too voluminous in the form of the answer to a question. If in the form of a return to the House while the expense would be very great and the time required to prepare it would be very considerable, of course, the question could stand, I think, under the rules as a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can direct it to stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not all that information, or a great deal of it, given in the report ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know if it is. It will take a great deal of time to get it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE CLEMENT TO SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Was Judge Clements, of British Columbia, a county court judge prior to his elevation to the Supreme Court of that province ?

2. Has it been the practice in Canada to promote judges of the county courts to superior courts ?

3. If not, why the departure in the case of Judge Clements ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice).

1. Yes.

2. It has been done occasionally but not generally.

3. Because Mr. Clement was considered the best man available for the position.

EXPENDITURE AT HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT.

Mr. MONK asked :

What is the total amount expended by the government of Canada in connection with the military and naval stations of Halifax and Esquimalt, for whatever object, from the 30th June, 1904, to the 1st December, 1906 ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). The total amount expended by the Department of Militia and Defence, in connection with military and naval stations, from 30th June, 1904, to 31st October, 1906, at Halifax and Esquimalt, respectively is:

Halifax	$982,468 34
Esquimalt	161,209 13

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ON SPIRITS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN asked :

1. What is the duty on spirits under the new Customs Act ?

2. What is the excise tax on the same ?

3. What is the customs duty and the excise tax on the same in the United States ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The customs duty on spirits under item 156 of the new tariff resolutions is $2.40 per imperial gallon of the strength of proof (no reduction being computed for duty purposes below 15 per cent under proof.)

2. The excise duty in Canada on spirits, per imperial gallon of the strength of proof, is as follows; $1.92 when manufactured from grain, $1.93 when manufactured from saccharine matter taken to the distillery in bond; $1.90 when manufactured from other saccharine matter.

3. According to tariff hand books the customs duties on whisky and other spirits distilled from grain or saccharine matter in the United States is $2.25 per United States proof gallon or $3.09 per Canadian proof gallon (no reduction being computed for duty purposes below United States proof.) The United States excise tax on spirits distilled from grain or saccharine matters appears to be $1.10 per United States proof gallon or about $1.51 per Canadian proof gallon.

THE HERALDIC COLLECTION OF CANADA.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE—by Mr. Ethier—asked:

1. Has the government been made aware of the following item which appeared in 'Le Canada' on Thursday, 13th December instant:—

HERALDIC COLLECTION.

It will be sent to the Massachusetts Historical Museum of Boston.

The Heraldic Collection of Canada will soon be sent to the Massachusetts Historical Society of Boston, because we have no building in Canada wherein it could be decently placed. This Heraldic Collection, which is the only one in America, is at present in the hands of the Vicomte de Fronsac, and is packed into half-a-dozen boxes deposited in the sheds of the Fraser Institute in Montreal ; for the past six months the Vicomte has had to pay the cost of storage. In vain have attempts been made to secure from the government at Ottawa, a room in the Parliament Buildings in which this collection might be placed.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has offered an entire room in which this Heraldic Collection might be conserved, and steps are being taken to have it sent there. This collection contains the Heraldic Archives of the founders of America, with their coats-of-arms and armorial bearings, of about one hundred Canadian Seigneuries, about one hundred and fifty Nova Scotia Baronies, and some seventy Demesnes, granted by the Stuarts ?

2. Does the government intend taking any steps to have these historical relics retained in this country ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The government is not aware of the item quoted.

2. The government does not take any steps in regard to objects the historical value of which it is not aware of.

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Since 1900 has the government sent any agents to the United States to encourage repatriation of Canadians ?

2. Who are those agents ?

3. What are the different places visited by them and what is the number of lectures delivered ?

4. Into what parts of Canada have they directed such repatriation ?

5. What is the number of Canadians repatriated since 1900 ?

6. What amount of money has the Canadian government expended since 1900 for the repatriation of Canadians?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. It is a part of the work of all immigration agents sent into the United States to encourage repatriation of Canadians.

2. Since 1900, i.e., from 1st January, 1901, the agents employed and territory assigned to each have been as follows : McInnes, M V., Michigan; Laurier, C. A., Michigan; Grieve, J. W. Michigan and Washington ; Crawford J. S., Missouri; Currie, T. O., Wisconsin; McLachlan, J. M., Wisconsin and South Dakota; Holmes, B. T., Indiana and Minnesota; Bennett, W. V., Nebraska; Pilling, Chas., Minnesota and North Dakota; Williams, H. M., Wisconsin and Ohio, Broughton, C. J., Illinois; Davies, Benj.,

Minnesota and Montana; Rogers, W. H., South Dakota and Indiana; Jones, C. A., Pennsylvania; Hetherington, Thos., Massachusetts; Duncan, Thos., New York; Blais, Rev. Father M., Gouin, Rev. Father H. L., Vachon, Rev. Father, Laganiere, Rev. I., Corbeil, Rev. O., Ribout, A., Gauthier Damase, Brisson, Dr. T. A., Dupont, Rene, Eastern States; Laurier, C. A., Michigan; Laurier, R., Massachusetts; Talbot, L. B., Massachusetts; Tesier, O., Michigan; Boileau, F. X., Eastern States; Ayotte, A., Montana; Baumunk, W. E., Indiana; Parker, J. H. M., Minnesota; Duncan, J. C., Nebraska, Indiana, Pennsylvania; Ritchie, Wm., North Dakota; Bartholomew, N., Iowa; Barrett, E., Texas; Clements, Zotique, Massachussetts; St. John, M., New York; Burriss, R. A., United States; Unruh, Tobias, Missouri; Young, Joseph, Ohio.

3. The departmental records do not admit of an answer being given as to the points visited and the lectures delivered, but if the hon. gentleman desires detailed information in that respect the agents will be asked to report and the reports will be produced upon an order of the House issuing.

4. The agents leave the choice of location, in all cases, to the immigrants or returning Canadians. They do not direct them to any special part of Canada.

5. The record of immigrant arrivals in Canada shows 26,547 returned Canadians from the United States January 1, 1901, to October 30, 1906.

6. Impossible to separate the expenditure for the repatriation of Canadians from the general expenditure of immigration.

THE CANADIAN FAST MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Barker—asked:

1. Was the 'Empress of Ireland,' which left St. John, November 30, delayed at Halifax seven hours waiting for the mails? If not for seven hours how long was she so delayed?

2. Are the mails for England by the 'Empress' steamers sent by Intercolonial Railway or by Canadian Pacific Railway?

3. At what hour on Fridays are the English mails closed at Montreal? If sent by Canadian Pacific Railway, when could mails close?

4 If these mails were sent by Canadian Pacific Railway, would not business men and others in Montreal and west have the advantage of practically a whole day extra for their transatlantic correspondence?

5. If the English mail had left Montreal on Friday night, November 29, by Canadian Pacific Railway, and been taken on board 'Empress of Ireland' at St. John, and that steamers sailed direct without calling at Halifax, would she not have arrived at Liverpool a full day earlier than was the case?

6. Is it the intention of the government to continue to require the 'Empress' steamers to call at Halifax for outgoing mails? If so, what purpose is served by so doing?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Intercolonial railway train was two hours and ten minutes late.

2. Intercolonial railway.

3. 10.30 a.m. If mails were despatched by the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaving Montreal 7.25 p.m., mails would close at Montreal about 6 p.m. A supplementary mail via Canadian line could be sent by the 7.25 p.m. Canadian Pacific Railway train if the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers would await the arrival of this train at Halifax the same as the Allan line steamers now do. A supplementary mail now closes at Montreal at 6 p.m., for despatch via New York by Cunard line steamers, leaving New York on Saturdays. Therefore there would be no advantage, in so far as time is concerned, in sending a supplementary mail by the Canadian Pacific Railway train leaving Montreal 7.25 p.m., for Halifax.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Part of a day.

6. Yes. Halifax is the recognized mail port and the contract requires the mails to be landed and despatched from that port.

ROBBINS IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. AMES asked:

On what date was the scheme of the Robbins Irrigation Company authorized by the government, under the provisions of the Northwest Irrigation Act of 1898?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). A return to an order issued on the motion of the hon. gentleman in this matter is being prepared. It will disclose the information in the possession of the department on the subject.

Mr. AMES also asked:

1. Have the plans of the proposed works contemplated by the Robbins Irrigation Company, or their assigns, been as yet filed with the Commissioner of Irrigation? If so, are they available to members for examination, and where are they to be seen?

2. Has application been made on behalf of the Robbins Irrigation Company, or their assigns, for the water rights under the provisions of the Irrigation Act? What are the main particulars of said application?

3. Has the scheme yet been advertised, as required by law? If so, when, where and how?

4. What disposition does the government intend to make in respect of the school lands within the Robbins area?

Mr. AMES also asked:

1. At the time that the lands were sold by the government to the Robbins Irrigation Company, what knowledge was in the possession of the government as to the constitution of the said company?

2. Was it an incorporated company? If so, when and where was it registered, where was its head office, and who were its officers, directors and shareholders?

3. If it was not an incorporated company, of what persons was it composed, and what are the names and addresses of such persons?

Mr. AMES also asked :

1. Were the lands, or any portion thereof, sold to the Robbins Irrigation Company, on June 26, 1906, at any time prior to that date applied for by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a part of their irrigation tract? If so, when and to what extent?

2. Were any offers, written or verbal, made by or on behalf of the Alberta Irrigation Company, to the Minister of the Interior himself, or to any person connected with his department, for additional lands, to be by the said company irrigated in the neighbourhood of Forty-Mile Coulee? If so, when, by whom, and to whom were said applications made?

3. Have any offers at any time since 1898 been made to the government by any persons or corporations other than those referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 to acquire for irrigation purposes, the land in whole or in part, sold on June 26, 1906, to the Robbins Irrigation Company? If so, by whom, when, and how were such offers made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The answer to the previous question answers these three questions.

Mr. AMES. These questions could be answered in a very few words, and if answered we would have the information before the Christmas holidays ; otherwise the information will not be in our possession until after the recess. It does not seem justifiable to refuse to answer four questions on the ground that a return will be brought down some time in the year 1907. I trust the minister will reconsider his decision.

Mr. FOSTER. The questions can stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have been answered.

Mr. AMES. I ask that the questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. All I can do is to accept the answer of the minister.

Mr. AMES. I will put them on the order paper again—Do I understand the minister to say he will answer none of these questions ?

Mr. FOSTER. He says he has answered them.

GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What grazing leases, open or closed, were in force in June, 1906, in respect to lands situated in townships 12 and 13, ranges 8, 9 and 10, west of the 4th, in so far as these townships lie north of the South Saskatchewan river?

2. When and to whom was each of these leases granted, for what area, and when will each lease expire?

3. Have any of these leases been transferred to others than the original applicants? If so, to whom have such assignments been made?

4. Has the government notified the holders of any of these leases of its intention to terminate the same? If so, who have been thus notified, and for what reason?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1, 2 and 3. Ranch No. 1986, comprising section 19, and the north half of section 20, township 12, range 10, west of the 4th meridian, was granted to Thomas Bell, of Medicine Hat, on 1st March, 1902, and will expire on 1st March, 1923. Area, 827 acres. No assignment. Open lease.

Part of ranch No. 2194, comprising sections 6, 7, 17 and 18, township 12, range 10, west of the 4th meridian, granted to Grand Forks Cattle Company, of Medicine Hat ; 1st July, 1905 ; will expire 1st July, 1926 ; area, 699·9 acres. Assigned to company by J. D. McGregor, of Brandon, Manitoba. Closed lease.

Ranch No. 2366, comprising north half of section 6, township 13, range 9, the north half of section 2, and all section 12, township 13, range 10, west of the 4th meridian, granted to Ezra Pearson, of Medicine Hat ; 1st September, 1903 ; will expire 1st September, 1924 ; area, 1,280 acres. No assignment. Open lease.

Ranch No. 2657, comprising section 6, township 13, range 8, and east half section 1, and all section 12, township 13, range 9, west of the 4th meridian, granted to R. H. Roe, Medicine Hat ; 1st March, 1904 ; will expire 1st March, 1925. Area, 1,272·6 acres. No assignment. Open lease.

4. No.

NOVA SCOTIA ELECTION ACT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Barker—asked:

1. Is the government aware that by judgment rendered on the 6th day of November, 1906, by Mr. Justice Townsend, a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, in an action for penalties brought by Avard L. Davidson, plaintiff, against Zaccheus Hall, defendant, the said Zaccheus Hall was found guilty of corrupt practices within the meaning of the Nova Scotia Election Act, and was fined the sum of $400 and costs, for that offence ?

2. Is the government aware that the said defendant, Zaccheus Hall, at the time of the commission of the said offence, was postmaster at St. Croix Cove, in the county of Annapolis, N.S.?

3. What action does the government intend to take in the premises?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The government have no information on the subject. They are aware that reports of the nature described have appeared in the press, and understand that the matter is still before the courts.

YUKON OFFICIALS.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Referring to the question answered on December 12, respecting the Yukon officials, is the government not aware that Mr. Aimé Dugas is now or has very recently been in Ottawa ?

2. For what purposes are Mr. W. B. McInnes, commissioner; Mr. Justice Dugas, senior judge;

Mr. Justice Craig, junior judge; F. T. Congdon, legal adviser; Mr. C. B. Burns, territorial secretary; Mr. H. Brown, clerk, and Mr. Lalliberti, territorial librarian, absent from the Yukon?

3. Who are at present performing the duties of Mr. J. E. Girouard, registrar, and Mr. Aimé Dugas, clerk?

4. What is the total amount of the salaries and allowances of the Yukon officials now absent from that territory?

5. How long have these officials been so absent, and when is it expected they will return to their duties?

6. Is the absence of any or either of them authorized by order in council, or by other official sanction?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government is not aware that Mr. Aimé Dugas is now or has very recently been in Ottawa, and did not know until the arrival of Commissioner McInnes in the Capital, which was subsequent to the 12th instant, when the hon. gentleman's former question upon the same subject was answered, that Mr. Dugas was absent from the Yukon on leave.

2. Commissioner McInnes is here for the purpose of conferring with the government respecting Yukon affairs. In the Yukon the court takes the long vacation in the winter, and the justices mentioned are on holidays. The rule as to the leave of absence of officials in the Yukon is that they may accumulate the three weeks' leave to which they are annually entitled, and Mr. Congdon, Mr. Dugas, Mr. Burns, Mr. Brown and Mr. Laliberti are now taking the leave of absence that has accumulated for each. Some of them have authority to remain out somewhat longer, but for any period of absence beyond that to which they are entitled under the rules of the service, their stipends are to be stopped.

3. The commissioner reports that Mr. Girouard was in the Yukon when he left there, which was on the 14th of November. It is not the practice to appoint any particular person to perform the duties of a clerk ; therefore Mr. Dugas' work is being done by the staff of the office.

4. The annual salaries amount to $26,200, and the annual living allowances to $23,200.

5. The commissioner states that with the exception of himself the persons referred to came out of the Yukon by the boats leaving shortly before the close of navigation, and will return at the expiration of their leave. The commissioner left on the 14th of November and will return as soon as his business here is completed.

6. The absence in each case is officially sanctioned.

WHARFINGERS IN MUSKOKA.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT asked :

1. Have wharfingers been appointed for the government wharfs at Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge, in the district of Muskoka ? If so, what are the names and salaries in each case ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. At Baysville Mr. James Daniel Smith is wharfinger; remuneration, 25 per cent of collections.

No appointments have yet been made to the positions of wharfingers at Huntsville and Bracebridge.

MADOC—ELDORADO RAILWAY.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

Is the government prepared to take the necessary steps to enforce the provisions for the operation of the railway from Madoc to Eldorado, in the county of Hastings, which is contained in the agreement under which the subsidy for the construction and operation of such railway was paid ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). No action has been decided upon.

THE WRECK OF THE 'SOVINTO.'

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked :

Has the Minister of Railways received any report or communication from Superintendent Sharp, of the Prince Edward Island Railway, relative to the sending of a special train from Charlottetown to Souris, with a life-boat, in connection with the wreck of the barque 'Sovinto,' on the north side of Prince Edward Island ? If so, what is the nature of the report or communication ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Yes. The following letters will give the information referred to :

Intercolonial Railway of Canada,
Office of the General Manager
Moncton, N.B., December 13, 1906.

M. J. Butler, Esq., C.E.,
Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer,
Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Butler,—As directed by you on the 7th, I telegraphed to Mr. Sharp asking him for full particulars, and an explanation in regard to the carriage of a life-boat from Charlottetown to Souris, about which some complaint had been made to the department. I send you herewith his reply, two letters, dated December 7th and December 8th, and I must say that his explanation is clear and satisfactory.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) D. POTTINGER.

Prince Edward Island Railway,
Office of the Superintendent,
Charlottetown, P.E.I, December 7, 1906.

D. Pottinger, Esq., I.S.O.,
General Manager,
Canadian Government Railways,
Moncton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your message, asking : 'Why a life-boat that was offered for transportation to Souris, some time ago, when there was a wreck near that place, was not for-

warded by the railway ? As complaints have been made to the department about it, please send full particulars and explanation,' I beg to say on Thursday, November 8th, about 4 o'clock p.m., Mr. Lord, agent of the Marine Department, made inquiry from our office by telephone what the charge would be for a special train—engine and one car—from Charlottetown to Souris, for the purpose of sending a life-boat, Mr. McDonald, my chief clerk, referred the matter to me, and the answer was given to Mr. Lord by telephone that we would charge the regular rate, viz., one dollar a mile, which would mean sixty dollars, the distance being sixty miles. Mr. Lord seemed to think the charge pretty high, but I informed him that that was our regular schedule rate. He made reply, ' All right,' or something to that effect, and our conversation over the telephone ended, and I supposed he intended to engage a train, but he did not do so. That same evening about 7 p.m., Mr. Hyndman, who I believe is Lloyds' agent, inquired also the cost of a special train, and our answer was the same as to Mr. Lord. Mr. Hyndman asked if I would take his cheque for the amount—it was after bank hours—and I answered, ' certainly I would,' and did so, and the train was made ready and started from Charlottetown at 10.15 p.m.

This was all we had to do about the matter, but there was a great deal said in the newspapers about it which was not correct.

Herewith a letter from Mr. McDonald, my chief clerk.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) G. A. SHARP.

Prince Edward Island Railway,
Office of the Superintendent,
Charlottetown, P.E.I., December 7, 1906.

G. A. Sharp, Esq.,
Superintendent.

Dear Sir,—Well on in the afternoon of November 8th, Mr. Lord, agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department, telephoned the office to ascertain the cost of sending a life-boat from here to Souris by special train. You were not in the office at the time, but I located you by telephone, and you advised me that the charge would be one dollar per mile. I then called Mr. Lord up and informed him that the charge for special train to Souris would be $60. He thought the amount high, and said half of it should be enough. He wished to speak to you himself about the matter, and I gave him the telephone number.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) A. McDONALD.

Prince Edward Island Railway,
Office of the Superintendent,
Charlottetown, P.E.I., December 8, 1906.

D. Pottinger, Esq., I.S.O.,
General Manager,
Canadian Government Railways,
Moncton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—With further reference to the matter of a special train for the Marine Department, I omitted to state that there was no question raised between Mr. Lord and myself about the pre-payment of the train, the custom has always been between our departments to render bills, and cheques are issued at Ottawa by the Marine Department for any service the railway renders the Marine Department.

I took no thought of Mr. Lord wanting us to reduce our rate, because he nearly always does that when he has anything to ship by rail, such as marine stores and coal. We always pay the Marine Department for anything they do for us, and they handle a large quantity of freight for us in winter, and I could see no reason why they should not pay for a special train if they wanted one in the case under consideration, because it seemed to me to be a marine matter, and as a matter of fact it was being attended to by that department and Lloyds' Agency, and there was no delay to the special train for want of funds to run it.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) G. A. SHARP.

POST OFFICE AT VAULVAGNUS BEACH.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked :

Has the Postmaster General received a petition from a number of people, praying that a new post office be established at Vaulvagnus Beach, township of Saltfleet, Wentworth county ? If so, will the government grant the prayer of the residents there ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). A petition was received at the department asking for the establishment of a post office at Van Wagner Beach, and the subject is now engaging the consideration of the department.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

1. For a copy of all leases and agreements between the government, represented by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and (a) the Athabaska Fish Company (J. K. McKenzie), Selkirk, Manitoba), or their assigns. Messrs. Butterfield & Dee ; (b) A. McNee, Windsor, Ontario; (c) The British American Fish Corporation, of Montreal and Selkirk (F. H. Markey).

2. A copy of all reports, correspondence or documents, relating to or touching upon the application for securing of, transfer of, or enjoyment of any privileges under said leases.

3. A statement of all rentals, bonuses, or payments to the government in respect of such leases to date.

4. All information in the possession of or procurable by the government with reference to (a) the number of tugs, boats and men employed; (b) the quantity and value of nets used; (c) the number and value of fish taken; (d) the quantity of fish exported under each of said leases during the last period of twelve months, for which such figures are available.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertisements for tenders, tenders, specifications, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts and other documents and papers of every kind, touching or relating to the construction of a post office building at Vancouver, British Columbia.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of . 1. All reports made from time to time by the officers of the Topographical Surveys Branch of the Department of the Interior, in reference to land in townships 10, 11, 12 and 13, ranges 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, west of the 4th, and townships 7, 8 and 9, ranges 8, 9, 10 and 11, west of the 4th.

2. Orders in council dated the 13th December, 1886, and 21st December, 1897, setting apart certain lands, viz.: those portions of the south half of section 7, the northwest quarter of section 9, and section 21, lying south and east of the river, township 12, range 12; that part of section 35 lying south and east of the river in township 11, range 13, and those portions of sections 1 and 2, lying east of the river in township 12, range 13, all west of the 4th meridian, as reserved for watering of stock.

3. Report of inspection referred to in order in council of 21st December, 1903, showing that the land referred to in orders in council dated 13th December, 1886, and 21st December, 1897, were no longer required for the purpose for which they were reserved.

4. All other reports made from time to time to date by officers of the Department of the Interior regarding the character and fertility of the soil, climate, rainfall, water supply, or topographical features of the area, or any part of the area described in paragraph 1 of this resolution.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Winnipeg Board of Trade and any other body or individual and the government, or any department thereof, relating to the restriction of fishing on Lake Winnipeg.—Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

For a return showing: 1. The total amount of duty received by the government in the fiscal year 1906 upon the respective articles named in the following items, as numbered, of the new customs tariff, viz.:—

Item 445—Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers.

Item 446—Cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders, weeders and wind-mills.

Item 447—Threshing machine outfit, when consisting of traction or portable engines and separators.

Item 448—Hay loaders, potato diggers, horse-powers, separators, n.o.p., wind-stackers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post-hole diggers, snaths, and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.

Item 449—Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, n.o.p., and pronged forks.

Item 450—Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.o.p., shovel and spade blanks, and iron or steel cut to shape for the same, and lawn mowers.

Item 451—Stoves of all kinds, for coal, wood, oil, spirits or gas.

2. The total amount of duty that would have been received in the same period, the fiscal year of 1906, had the tariff now proposed by the government been then in force, giving such duty for each of the items 445, 446, 447, 448, 449 450 and 451, separately.—Mr. Henderson.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertisements for tenders, tenders, specifications of every kind, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, agreements and other documents and papers of every kind touching or relating to the construction of immigration buildings in the city of Winnipeg, since January 1, 1900.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertisements for tenders, tenders, specifications of every kind, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, agreements and other documents and papers of every kind, touching or relating to any works at or near St. Andrews rapids, in the province of Manitoba, and especially such documents as aforesaid in connection with any tender or contract by or on behalf of Charles Whitehead, or Kelly Brothers, or any subsequent tenderers or contractors.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertiseemnts for tenders, tenders, specifications of every kind, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, agreements and other documents and papers of every kind, touching or relating to the construction of a section of the Transcontinental Railway designated as 'district B,' beginning at the north end of the Quebec bridge and railway company's bridge, in the vicinity of the city of Quebec, to a point near La Tuque, a distance of about 150 miles.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing: 1. The names, ages, sexes and parentage of children attending Muscowequan's Indian Boarding School, specifying whether treaty or non-treaty Indians, the band they belong to, and whether parents alive or not.

2. Amount of government grants made to the school during the years 1904, 1905 and 1906.

3. Amount of treaty money paid to Muscowequan's band at the last payments, to what Indians were the payments made, and the number of children belonging to each.—Mr. Lake.

HYDRAULIC MINING LEASES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between the five companies and the one individual whose hydraulic mining leases were cancelled during the past year, and the government, or any department thereof.

Mr. OLIVER. The documents are now required in the cases under litigation, and under the circumstances it would not be desirable to have them produced.

Motion allowed to stand.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for :

Return showing : 1. All claims made on the government by the North Atlantic Trading Company, since the 31st March, 1906.

2. All amounts paid to the said North Atlantic Trading Company by the government of Canada, (a) on account of bonuses; (b) on account of disbursements, since the 31st March, 1906.

3. A copy of all correspondence had by the government with the said North Atlantic Trading Company since the 31st March, 1906, up to the 1st of December, 1906, and of all letters and accounts received from the said company between the above dates.

He said : The object of this motion is to find out what has become of our old friend the North Atlantic Trading Company. This session we have heard nothing regarding it. Hon. members will remember that the affairs of that company and its relations with

the government came before public notice last session under very exceptional and extraordinary circumstances. We had paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to this company, but when we tried to find out who composed it and who were the unknown persons to whom we had not only paid such large amounts but had handed over the control of our immigration system in eight or ten countries of the European continent, we were met with the extraordinary objection that such information could not be furnished us; and we had the peculiar spectacle of employees of this government, who had contracted with that company and had seen to the payments of these large amounts, and who were the only ones from whom we could extract the information we desire—we had the extraordinary spectacle of these public employees coming before the committee of public accounts and the committee on immigration and telling us point blank that although they knew the parties perfectly well, they would not impart that knowledge to the House or the public.

And, having brought that singular position to the consideration of this House, we had the still stranger spectacle—a spectacle which has not been presented in any other legislature, so far as I know—of the government upholding that contention of these employers. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that on one occasion he offered, in a rather theatrical manner in this House, to impart the names of these mysterious people to the leader of the opposition, but on the condition that nobody else, and certainly not the public, should have the benefit of the information. I remember him holding up a paper on that side of which that was presented to us nothing was written. And, after he had made this offer, which was evidently not acceptable, he happened to reverse the paper, and I think I observed that there was nothing written on the other side either. What you will remember, Mr. Speaker, is that, probably from the pressure of public opinion, the government notified the North Atlantic Trading Company, under this ten years' contract which was going on, that we would cease our relations with that company, and I think that cessation was to take place about the 1st of November last. I remember, seeing among the documents brought down last session, a protest by this mysterious company to the affect that they did not consider that the government had any right to cancel the contract because they were carrying out the conditions to the letter. They said that under the terms of the contract—I am speaking from memory—a four years' notice was required, unless, of course, the company was not fulfilling the terms of the contract, which, it presented, it was. It seems to me that we are entitled to know how this very important matter stands. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has since last session made a trip to Europe, and I believe that one of the principal objects of that trip was to investigate the system of immigration in England and on the continent of Europe. And yet since the session has begun we have had no news from my hon. friend as to what he found out about that company. Did he visit the celebrated office at No. 92 Damarak street in Amsterdam, which was so much commented upon last session? Did he find out how that company with which we contracted and to which we have been paying money for the last four or five years, if not more, suddenly, in the month of June, 1905, became incorporated in the Island of Jersey, through the good offices of the son-in-law or the father-in-law, I have forgotten which, of Mr. Preston, and whose incorporators were all hotel keepers, solicitors' clerks (and I think there were livery stable keepers) and other men of no position whatever? Are we now in a position to know who form that company and who represent it? The contract has been cancelled by the notice given last year by the Minister of the Interior. Under these circumstances is there any reason why we should not know who the parties are whose names were so carefully kept from us last year in violation, I submit, of one of the primary rights of parliament, that we, the representatives of the people, should know to whom we are paying large sums of the public money, amounting in this case to some hundreds of thousands of dollars—for what is really a work of trust, the work of immigration? These parties have not been troubled, nor has the government been troubled, in regard to the work to which they were doing. The government of the several states in which they were carrying on this immigration propaganda have not sued them or endeavoured to punish them on the ground that they have committed an illegal act. Is there any reason then why we should not now be given these names? The object of the motion is to find out also how we stand in regard to claims. Has the company filed a claim for damages? The position it took last year was that the discontinuance of the contract was not justified. Has it filed a claim for damages or for disbursements under the terms of the contract? If so, what is that claim? Has it put in any claim for immigrants since the cancellation? And particularly, what is the result of the investigation made in England and on the continent of Europe with regard to the company? What did the Minister of the Interior find out? What is the balance of the account between us and the company? What is the reason why we should not know to-day who these people are who have benefited by the payments made? And what has become of Louis Leopold, alias Lazarus, who was mixed up with the investigation made in both the Immigration and Public Accounts Committee last year?

What are the arrangements now in force with regard to immigration from the continent of Europe? Have we a contract with the mysterious company the membership of which is not to be revealed? Is that one of the terms under which we are to carry on our work in the future? I think the Minister of the Interior might take the House in his confidence and give us a complete report of the investigation he made while in Europe during the recess.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is no objection whatever to the passage of the motion and no objection to informing the House with regard to all the matters that are referred to in it. As to my investigation into the affairs of the North Atlantic Trading Company. I did make an investigation. I did visit No. 92 Damarak street, Amsterdam, and found the company, so far as I could see, in active operation there. I find no fault with their existence. But, as far as I carried my investigation, I did not see any reason to change my decision previously arrived at to cease business with the company on the 1st of December, and, therefore, the cancellation, so far as the government is concerned, stands.

Mr. MONK. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) if he is not going to give us some information as to who form this North Atlantic Trading Company? Or is it the position of the government that it still refuses, even now that the contract is cancelled, to give us information on that subject?

Mr. OLIVER. Speaking for myself, I never understood that it was any part of the business of the government to act the part of private detective and to discover the personnel of the concern trading under the name of the North Atlantic Trading Company. My hon. friend himself and the members of the House with whom he was acting last summer did their best in that line and if they did not succeed surely I could not hope to.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) whether he has made any investigations during his trip into the conditions before the forming of this corporation when it was a syndicate of individuals, and whom he investigated ?

Mr. OLIVER. I might say I confined my investigations entirely to the question of whether it was in the public interest that the decision arrived at by the government should or should not be carried out. I decided it was in the public interest that the decision arrived at should be carried out and was satisfied with that conclusion.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). It does seem to me that my hon. friend, who is twitting the opposition that it is their part to act as detectives, will agree with me that it will be very difficult for the opposition to make progress on that committee or under any other circumstances when the fact is that the mouths of the witnesses, according to their own statements, were sealed by orders from the government. I was on that committee, and after working day after day, we found it was utterly impossible to get any information and therefore I do not think it is quite fair for those on the government side to accuse us of not doing our duty and to state that we should have acted as detectives. It does seem to me, after the work that we put on that investigation that now, after it is over, the government should give us that information which we believed they should have given us last year, or they should at least have allowed the witnesses whom we brought there, and examined with an expenditure of much time and labour to give us that information. The government can give us information now and they should do so. That is the opinion I hold as a member of that committee.

Motion (Mr. Monk) agreed to.

PAYMENT OF OFFICERS AT PROVISIONAL COURSES.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County) moved for :

Copy of the ordinance or regulation of the Canadian militia by which young men following the three months short course, day attendance, are stipulated as having no right to any indemnity for their services. Also a copy of the ordinance or regulation of the Canadian militia by which young men from the country are not entitled to any pay for provisionary course, night attendance.

He said : The object which I have in bringing this motion before the House this afternoon is to alleviate if possible a grievance and also to allay if possible a certain feeling of dissatisfaction which seems to exist among certain military officers, especially in the district of Quebec. I find in the King's orders and regulations, page 137, article 868 :

Commissioned officers attached for a short course of instruction, pay, $1 per diem, non-commissioned officers attached for a short course of instruction, pay 50 cents per diem.

A short course of instruction is supposed to be day attendance and naturally means a loss of time to the parties following it. I understand that these amounts have not been paid to certain parties. By the regulations, officers are allowed $1 more who provide board and lodgings at their own expense. These allowances are for provisional course officers and non-commissioned officers. I also see in another paragraph, page 130, article 818 :

No pay will be allowed to officers attending for instruction, but there will be paid an al-

lowance of $1 per diem in lieu of subsistence to those officers who obtain certificates and are not resident in, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, the city or town in which the provisional school is being held, and such officers having secured certificates, will also be allowed transport from their homes to the provisional school and return.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the interpretation of these two regulations, and some parties who are following these courses are not receiving the indemnity to which they claim they have a right according to this regulation. These officers claim that the majority of the young men who take these provisional courses lose time and are not in a position financially to afford this loss of time and further more, that it is to the interest of the militia that as these young men belong to the medical class as well as to the labouring classes, many of them—being especially educated men, it might be to the interest of the militia, to encourage these young men as during the time they are in service as they are always agreeable in the time of war, even although they are not in the active militia. I understand that salaries are paid to men who are permanent and these men are not always as desirable from an educational standpoint as those to whom I have referred. I see under another paragraph which I anticipate the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) may give as an answer to my motion :

There will be paid no allowance to any party who does not live in the barracks.

That means if they live in the town or out of the town but not in the barracks. I find that this paragraph is entirely in conflict with the article which I cited a few moments ago, granting one dollar for services and one dollar extra for those living outside of the city, for whom the government provides by paying a part of the expense incurred either for transportation or other incidental expenses. I feel that I have discharged my duty as regards these gentlemen who have asked me to bring this matter up and I hope the minister will give me a satisfactory answer for the information of these gentlemen. I hope the minister will take my suggestion in good faith.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Anticipating the hon. member's motion, I asked the Adjutant General, Col. Vidal, to prepare a statement for me with reference to it, which he has done. This is his statement :

1. Officers making the three months short course at a school of instruction, receive pay for the time that they are at the school.

2. Officers attending a provisional school of instruction who are resident in the city or town in which such provisional school is held, or its immediate vicinity, receive no pay.

3. Officers not residing in the immediate vicinity of such city or town, and who succeed in obtaining certificates, are entitled to an allowance of $1 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, and are also allowed transport to and from their homes to the provisional school.

As regards the last part of this motion, there is no special ordinance or regulation, other than that already quoted, by which young men from the country are not entitled to any pay for a provisional course where the instruction is carried on at night.

It is to be observed that, at most provisional schools conducted in cities or large towns, the greater portion of the instruction is carried on at night, and officers from the country attending the course, would be entitled to the allowance already referred to. (See article 291, Pay and Allowance Regulations.)

B. H. VIDAL,
Colonel,
Adjutant General.

That article reads as follows :

Provisional schools of instruction.

No pay shall be allowed to officers attending provisional school of instruction but an allowance of $1 per diem in lieu of subsistence shall be paid to those officers who obtain certificates and are not resident in, or in the immediate neighbourhood of the city or town in which the provisional school is being held, and such officers having secured certificates, shall also be allowed transport from their homes to the provisional school and return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all laws are supposed to be based upon justice and common sense. As I understand this matter it is this : Canada has provided, at very great expense, to the public, a system of military schools or schools of instruction, located in seven or eight different parts of the country. Those schools are open to officers and non-commissioned officers of the active militia in so far as they are able to accommodate those who wish to attend, and when officers and non-commissioned officers attend the schools, leaving their own homes for weeks and sometimes months in order to do so, and being removed from their business and means of securing a livelihood, the country provides that they shall be paid a small indemnity and that they shall receive rations while at these central schools. Now, it is found that it is often an inconvenience for young men living in cities and towns who are obliged to earn their daily bread to leave home and go to these central schools and depots, and to meet the case of these young men the Militia Department sends a corps of instructors to the town where they live and provides a provisional school for nothing. The government has always supposed that it was doing a great deal for these young men and that there was patriotism enough among the young men, as I am sure there is, to meet the government—I will not say, half way—because the government is doing far more than they are doing when it offers them schools at their doors and arranges the hours to suit them whether it be in the night or the day, but it does not propose

to pay them for attending the school which the government provides for them at their own doors. The government goes farther than that and says, that in the case of such provisional school being established at one of those points where there is no regular school, if there are young men living on the border of the town, or outside the town at a short distance and these young men who choose to come, having to provide themselves with board and lodging in the town, shall receive, after they have secured their certificates, $1 a day during the time that they attend these schools. Now, I do not know that I can make it clearer. I hope I have made it clear to my hon. friend that the young men whom he represents are not suffering any hardship and that the country is doing a very great deal for them when it is providing them with schools by sending these schools to their doors.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. May I add a few remarks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Are there any other members who desire to speak upon this question before the mover has the right to reply.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I have taken into consideration the remarks of the hon. minister but it seems to me that article 868 is quite a comprehensive one. It says :

> Commissioned officers attached for a short course of instruction, pay, $1 per diem.

That means by way of salary. Then it further adds :

> Officers who provide board and lodging at their own expense, $1.

Meaning that where there are no barracks they are allowed an extra dollar, which makes $2. This is for the short course. It does not mention whether it is for day or night attendance. But I have been positively assured that it is for the short course. I maintain that parties taking this course in the city of Quebec should be indemnified for day attendance especially, although I would not lay so much stress upon there being remunerated for night work. These parties will be occupying positions during the day and that fact will offset whatever expense they are put to by taking this course of instruction during the night. But I have found article 818, which has been referred to by the minister, and article 837, very contradictory. It says :

> 818.—No pay will be allowed to officers attending for instruction, but there will be paid an allowance of $1 per diem in lieu of subsistence to those officers who obtain certificates and are not resident in, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, the city or town in which the provisional schiol is being held.
>
> 837. . . . but no person attached for instruction who does not reside in barracks will receive either transport, pay, rations or other allowances as a charge against the public.

In one place it states that officers who are living in the barracks are not allowed any money, but they are free to board themselves outside and they have an allowance for subsistence when they reside outside. In the other we find the contrary—very contradictory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is referring to two different things. There is the school at the depot. That is the school which is provided for in 868, and that is the school at which, if an officer attending does not choose to live in the barracks but resides outside, an allowance is made. That does not refer to provisional schools.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I would ask the hon. minister to look at page 129, where he will see 'provisional schools of instruction, all arms.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I see that ; that does not refer to the same thing as No. 868 refers to. It is an entirely different thing.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I was speaking all the time of the provisional course, if you remember.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No 868 distinctly refers to officers attached. The words 'attached for instruction' are words that are only used to apply to the regular schools and the very fact that barracks are referred to shows that it is a regular school. Where provisional schools are established there are no barracks as a rule. There may be a provisional school where there is a barracks but as a rule there is not.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. If I understand aright the provisional school is carried on in the city as in the country. As the hon. minister will see at page 133 the heading is 'regulations for admission,' and he will remember that the topic of which I treated was the provisional course of instruction, pay and rations being treated on same heading, page 137. The provisional course and the provisional short course are the same thing in regard to the three months attendance, although presumably in Quebec they are given at a different time. Naturally I am of the same opinion as the hon. minister is in regard to the provisional course, but that is not the ground upon which I have introduced this discussion. It is because of that fact that the reasoning which the hon. minister has presented to the House does not appeal to me and I hope that in a private conference he will give me a few further pointers, as I must confess that I am not up on military questions.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACCIDENTS AND COMPENSATIONS.

Mr. LAURENCE. Mr. Speaker, I beg, in respect to the question which you were good enough to say should stand to move for a return of the information there asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER. I directed it should stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. LAURENCE. The rule does not seem to contemplate any delay. It is a mere matter of form to transfer, but I think that under the rule I am required to make the motion at once.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will stand as a notice of motion and the clerk will take notice accordingly.

Mr. LAURENCE. Do I understand that I am not in order to move it now?

Mr. SPEAKER. It stands as notice of motion until another day.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 4) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 18, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CHRISTMAS RECESS.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the House has noticed that the attendance of members is very small, no doubt, in anticipation of the recess that we intended to take on Thursday. There are on the order paper several very important notices of motion which have not been called or discussed because many of the members who have placed these notices of motion on these important questions on the paper feel that it would be hardly fair to bring them up now as several members who wish to take part in the debate upon them are not present. In consequence of this we are a little handicapped because the reports that we expected to have brought down have not yet come down. It has been suggested that the Christmas recess which we are to take and which was to commence on Thursday, might without any inconvenience, take place at the end of this sitting. I propose therefore that when we have disposed of the government business to call up the notices of motion so that any motions for papers may be passed after which I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Questions will be taken ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Questions will be taken. Therefore, I move :

That when this House adjourns to-day it shall stand adjourned until the 9th of January next.

Motion agreed to.

COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P. E. I.). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) who, I am sorry to see is not in his place——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) is out of order. The House will be moved into committee of ways and means in a few minutes and my hon friend will then have an opportunity of bringing up the matter which he desires to call to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. A. Martin) has placed in my hands a notice and I think it perhaps comes within the rule. The notice is that he will interrogate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the accumulation of freight at Charlottetown and Pictou and the movement of steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to bring this matter up now ?

Agreed to.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not wish to detain the House for any length of time. This morning I gave notice to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I would bring up this question on the opening of the House this afternoon and I am very sorry he is not here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Here he is.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I am very much pleased to see him just taking his seat. The question to which I refer is one of great importance to the province to which I belong. It is the question of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. It is the old grievance of winter communication. I have numerous communications saying that freight is piling up at a very rapid rate in Charlottetown without any adequate means to move it across the straits to the mainland. I have also communications pointing out that freight is accumulating at Pictou

at such a rate that boats, the way they are moving at the present time, are unable to carry it. Besides these letters there is other evidence that the dissatisfaction in Prince Edward Island is such as has never existed before. The trade of the province is paralyzed because the government has failed to perform its duty. The newspaper which I have at hand has an article under these headings :

Freight piling up at Charlottetown, and at Pictou, bad condition of affairs; only three trips of steamer per week carrying freight; shippers discouraged; no chance to develop trade under present conditions; some opinions in the matter.

The trouble is and always has been the unreadiness of the winter steamers to take up the service when winter navigation begins. At one time we thought we were nearing a solution of the difficulty so far as another steamer can solve it, but to-day the trade of the province is suffering; the exports are held up at Charlottetown and the imports at Pictou, business is disorganized and there is no hope that this government will come to our relief. I regret that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not carried out the intentions of his predecessor and placed a third and more powerful boat on that route, as we were led to believe would be the case. The minister has now to face the indignation of the whole people of that province; and I can tell him that there are indications of the secession of that province from the confederation unless Canada shows a greater desire to carry out the terms of union. As indicating the state of affairs down there, I may say that a few days ago an official of the government started from Ottawa for Prince Edward Island; his train was fourteen hours late, and when he reached the port the winter service boats were so disorganized that he could not get to the island and had to return to Ottawa. That is a fair sample of the manner in which the government has conducted the winter service between the mainland and the island.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I think my statement will not be controverted when I say that the congestion of freight is due to the unexpectedly early closing of navigation and also in part to the increase of our interprovincial trade. We are all pleased to know that the trade between the provinces is growing both east and west, and there is no doubt that better facilities will have to be provided us if our province is to share in the prosperity flowing from that increasing trade. The Minister of Marine is undoubtedly trying to please all interests, but I think I can say that a mistake has been made in placing the winter boats on different routes. In my opinion the boats should be kept on the same route and thus they would be enabled to do much more work. The great bulk of the freight collects at Pictou and Charlottetown at the close of navigation. Very few shippers send their freight by way of Summerside and Cape Tormentine because there is so much uncertainty in regard to that route, and I think I am safe in saying that nine-tenths of the freight goes by way of Pictou and Charlottetown and Pictou and Georgetown. The department would be well advised to keep both the winter steamers on the route between Charlottetown and Pictou as long as possible, and then both of them should go on the Georgetown and Pictou route. When there is only one steamer plying between Charlottetown and Pictou she can only make three trips a week because the captain finds that he cannot enter Charlottetown in the dark and it is impossible to make a round trip in daylight at this time of the year. With only three trips a week the steamer is not able, particularly this year, to carry anything like the freight that is offered. I would therefore advise the minister to order the 'Stanley,' (if she has not already gone), to the eastern route and to send both boats as quickly as possible to ply between Georgetown and Pictou where they can make round trips daily. This would in a large measure relieve the freight congestion. No doubt, the merchants living in the western part of the island and those living in Charlottetown might have to pay a small additional freight rate because of the extra railway haul, but I am sure they would much rather do that than not get their goods at all. Anyhow, it is somewhat difficult to satisfy our friends of the opposition in this matter. For instance, the Montreal 'Gazette' one of the influential papers of the Conservative party, and a well conducted paper generally speaking, finds very great fault with the government because they are spending so much money on the public services in Prince Edward Island; while the Charlottetown 'Examiner' another paper supporting the Conservative party finds very great fault with the government because they are not spending a great deal more money in the island. I suppose that is a habit of the opposition and their newspapers and one cannot be very severe on them as they probably cannot help it, but at all events it tends to show that it is very difficult to please hon. gentlemen opposite. It should be the endeavour of all of us, particularly the members representing the island, to present our needs in a fair and impartial manner to the government, for I believe that by doing so our case will be all the stronger. It is only fair to say that this year there has been very great difficulty in the way of performing that service. There has been a very early closing of navigation and we have had unprecedented storms; and while this is a powerful government and a good government yet these are things which a government cannot guard against and pre-

vent. I say again that the time has now arrived when a third winter boat is required between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I hope and believe we will get that third boat within a reasonable time, and when we do get it one of the steamers may be sent to test the winter route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. But until we do get a third boat, the minister would be well advised to keep both steamers on the route between Charlotttown and Pictou as long as possible and then send them both to Georgetown.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P. E.I.) The hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) was to some extent correct when he said that part of the freight congestion and the inconvenience to the shippers of the island was due to the early closing of navigation, and part to the increase of our interprovincial trade. But the hon. gentleman forgot to call the government to task for not having the winter boats ready for the service at the proper time and for turning a deaf ear to the petition of the several boards of trade of Prince Edward Island asking to have one boat ready at Charlottetown and another at Summerside by the 1st of December. The boats were not ready at that date. The 'Minto' was undergoing repairs; the 'Stanley' was doing lighthouse service and picking up buoys, and there was absolutely no excuse for the delay. As I stated the other day, if the government has not sufficient boats at their disposal to attend to the lighthouse and fishery service then it is high time for them to get others.

The fault for a great deal of this congestion lies at the door of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in not having these boats there, one at Charlottetown and one at Summerside, to take up the winter service. The excuse the hon. minister had the assurance to give this House was that a private company which operated the summer boats had requested him not to put the boats on. That is a very poor excuse to give to this House and to the people of Prince Edward Island. As a matter of fact, the service at Summerside closed about the 5th of December, and summer service does not last much beyond the middle of December at any time; and the hon. minister is fully aware that the exigencies of closing are liable to happen on the 1st of December and might not happen until the middle of December, and there is no excuse for not having the winter boats ready to take up the service. At Charlottetown the summer boat plies somewhat longer, so that the matter of not having the boats ready at the proper time is no excuse for the hon. minister or the hon. member for King's to put before this House. He says the interprovincial trade has been growing. Of course, it has been growing. Year after year, we have been showing that to this House by statistics, and have been asking the government to provide further facilities; and the hon. member for King's comes down this afternoon in a self-satisfied way and says they are doing all they can. Does the hon. member not know that two or three years ago the late Mininster of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Raymond Prefontaine, came to Charlottetown and told the people there that he was having a third boat built, and $175,000 put in the estimates for that purpose? Does he not know that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries made the definite promise that a third winter boat would be built, and that last year in this House he promised that a third boat would be provided for that service, either the 'Montcalm or the 'Lady Grey'? And now the hon. member says the time is coming when a third winter boat will be required. The time has come, and we need the third winter boat at once. Two boats cannot carry all the freight between the island and the mainland. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made mistakes in the service this year, because he did not let the shippers of Prince Edward Island and the shippers of the west know that this service would be kept up between Cape Tormentine and Summerside, so that freight could be routed that way. Instead of that, he comes down and advises that this western route be abandoned. I want to point out to him that the western route has been absolutely safe and available up to the middle of January, whenever it has been operated. It is the natural route for goods coming from the west, and the round trip can be made in three hours or three hours and a half, whereas the boats running between Georgetown and Pictou can only make three trips per week.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. No, no.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes. That is what the minister admits, and yet he wants to take the boats away from the Tormentine-Summerside route, where the distance is only sixteen miles, and where a boat can make two round trips a day. I do not think the hon. gentleman is very logical. I say again that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Railways had notified the shippers in the west and the shippers on Prince Edward Island that this service would be established the moment the summer boat stopped, a large portion of the freight would have been shipped by that route, from both the west and the east. Fully or more than half the products shipped from Prince Edward Island originate in the county of Prince and in the eastern part of Queen's, and the natural outlet for these products is by Summerside, and not by Charlottetown or Georgetown. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a third boat at his command, and would leave the 'Stanley' at the port of Summerside,

I believe she could ply there all the year round without any difficulty. If there is congestion of trade, the minister has only himself to blame. If he will only let it be understood by shippers that he will keep that route open just so long as it is safe and feasible for the steamer to run, and not leave the decision in the hands of the officers of the boat, who have several times abandoned the harbour of Summerside when they could have run several weeks longer, I think the congestion will be largely overcome. If he cannot do that, let him send the 'Montcalm' or the 'Lady Grey' to the Charlottetown and Pictou route for another month, to relieve the congestion at that point. The hon. member for King's says the members of the opposition have been complaining year after year because there is not enough money spent on Prince Edward Island. While the hon. gentleman may be satisfied with the expenditure on Prince Edward Island and with the way the people there have been treated by this government during the past few years, I want to tell him that the members representing Prince Edward Island on the opposition side are not satisfied. If he would go into the figures, he would find that the money spent on public works and public utilities in Prince Edward Island is far below what we contribute as our quota to the Dominion revenue. We have been getting very little attention, and on this very serious question which has been agitating the people of that province for several years, we have been getting really no attention at all. When I came to the House this year, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not tell me what disposition was going to be made of the boats. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Martin) has said, we may possibly take occasion at a later time to bring this matter up more fully. Meantime, if the minister will adopt the suggestion I have made, and let the people understand which way goods can be routed, and if necessary put on another boat on the eastern route; and then, if he will take up the question seriously, as I believe the members of his government are ready to deal with it, of a third winter boat, and have an investigation made as to the size of the boat necessary and the equipment of such a boat, and get tenders for it at once from the builders, we may possibly in three or four years have a fulfilment of the hon. minister's promise. We might have another boat next year.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I am sure that the House will agree with the statement that it is a difficult matter to please the hon. members on the opposition side of this House who are interested in this question of communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. A week ago my hon. friend who has just sat down very indignantly demanded of the minister why the steamer 'Stanley' had not been sent to Summerside. About the same time I was pointing out to the minister, from information which I had under my hand, that there had already arrived at Pictou forty or fifty carloads of freight for transportation to Prince Edward Island.

I pointed out it would be a wise and prudent course for the department to send both boats to Pictou in order that the freight congestion there might be relieved. My hon. friend the minister said he was disposed to carry out the assurance he had given the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) and other gentlemen from Prince Edward Island who apparently wanted the 'Stanley' sent from Summerside in the beginning of the season. I told him that inside of a week he would find representations made in the House—if not by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) by some other members of the opposition on the island—that grave injustice was being done Prince Edward Island because this very congestion existed at Pictou. What I anticipated has occurred. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin), in his most assertive tones, has declared that the department is lax in its duty because this freight which came to Pictou has not been carried across the strait of Northumberland. I am sure the House will agree with me when I say it is extremely difficult to satisfy my hon. friends from the Island with regard to this question. Neither the present minister nor any other will be able to satisfy my hon. friends as to how winter communication may be best maintained. But in all fairness, having regard to the situation as it is, it must be apparent to any one acquainted with present business conditions that the wise and prudent thing to do with these two boats is to put them from the first of the season on the route between Pictou and Georgetown and Pictou and Charlottetown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they on that route now?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Only one of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then my hon. friend is not satisfied himself.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend that I am not. I pointed out to the minister a week ago that because he was endeavouring to please the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) he was bound to create a position of difficulty. I pointed out to him further that if he were to follow the lead of the hon. gentlemen from the island, who sang one song one week and another song another week, a condition would result productive of complaints at all times, and he should deal with the situation apart from representations of that character by placing two boats on the route I have mentioned for passengers and freight throughout the

whole season. Pending the obtaining of a new boat—the proposition for which has my support—you have to deal with conditions as they are, and I hope my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) will be frank enough to admit that the proper and sensible thing to do is to take the 'Stanley' and put the two boats on the Pictou and Georgetown route to-morrow. If that be done I have no doubt that inside of a week all complaints on the ground of freight detention will be removed and a satisfactory service provided throughout the whole winter.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Judging by the discussion we have had it is rather difficult to satisfy our good friends from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And Pictou.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not so much Pictou as Prince Edward Island. Some time ago I was asked by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) to put one of the boats on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine and at the same time I received from the Board of Trade at Summerside strong letters urging me to do so. It was represented to me that there was a great deal of freight by that route and that it would be injurious to the trade of the island if that route was not kept up some time even after the summer boats had left. I thought that my hon. friend from Prince was pretty well aware of the situation and knew that the requirements of the trade of Prince Edward Island demanded that the route should be kept up between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. True at the time my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said to me that I would probably be committing a mistake and that in a short time I would find some of the members from Prince Edward Island complaining about the other routes not being properly equipped. I find to-day that the prediction of my hon. friend from Pictou was absolutely correct. On the one hand I find the hon. member from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) urging that the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route should be kept up and on the other my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin) complaining about the boats not being on the route between Charlottetown and Pictou or Georgetown and Pictou. It is hard to satisfy both those gentlemen and it seems to me that the best way out of the difficulty is to deal with the question in a business like way, and that is what I intend doing in the future. When we decided to put a boat on the Summerside route to satisfy the board of trade of that place and my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), I was then told that there was a large quantity of freight at Pictou waiting to be shipped over to the island. I had inquiries made by the department to find out what quantity of freight was at Summerside and what quantity at Pictou in order that we might give the best facilities possible. The report has not yet reached me, but I understand, by correspondence in the department, that the quantity of freight at Pictou is very heavy, and the people of Prince Edward Island would have reason to complain if the boat were not immediately removed from the Summerside route and put on the Georgetown route. I understand that to-day the 'Minto,' which was plying yesterday between Charlottetown and Pictou, was, on the advice of the captain, removed to the Georgetown route, and we may expect that instead of making only three trips a week we will have at least six a week, and besides by putting the 'Stanley' on the route between Georgetown and Pictou we may expect that this freight now waiting at Pictou will be carried across in a very short time. That is the intention of the department, and I propose to follow that policy in spite of the requests made me because I know that if we do not carry that freight there will be complaints that we are not fulfilling the conditions of the Confederation Act. We want to carry out those conditions, and I am pretty well determined to see that this route is kept up in a business-like way in order to give the island the best possible facility.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am glad you have changed your mind and are going to deal with the question in a business-like way.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and I may add that if I had not listened to the representations of my hon. friend who is pressing so strongly to have the Summerside route kept up I would probably not to-day have the complaints which are now being made. I will be very careful in the future not to heed the representations and requests of my hon. friend and will see to the necessities and wants of the island generally and not only those of a small part of the island. I shall see that the island is properly served as far as facilities for the carrying of passengers and freight is concerned, and have the traffic handled in a most expeditious way. My hon. friend has said that we might have sent the 'Lady Grey' down there. Well, I had the superintending engineer of the department on the St. Lawrence route investigate and report whether the 'Lady Grey' could be sent there. In his report of the 4th December he says that the 'Lady Grey' is a light draught vessel and not suitable for heavy weather in the winter season. Therefore, it is impossible again for me to meet the wishes of my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey).

Mr. LEFURGEY. How about the 'Montcalm ?'

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Montcalm,' I may say, was designed for a particular work.

We know that, in former years, the water of the St. Lawrence was raised to flood height by the fact of the ice taking at Cap Rouge thus preventing the outflow of the water in the spring. Representations were made to the government urging that a strong ice-breaker should be provided to prevent the ice bridge from forming at Cap Rouge. The 'Montcalm' was especially designed for that work, and it is intended that she shall continue to do this year the work that she has done in former years. Consequently, it will not be possible to meet the wishes of my hon. friend in connection with that. The object of the department is to do its best to provide all needed facilities for communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland; and I am sure that, with the two powerful boats we have, if they were immediately put on the route which is the best available for the purpose, whether between Charlottetown and Pictou, or between Georgetown and Pictou, there would be no criticism in any way of the action of the government. It would seem that my hon. friends themselves have not been able to agree, as one urged that we should continue communication by the Summerside route, while the other contends that we should take the Georgetown route. I feel sure that these hon. gentlemen will ultimately reconcile their differences and will help the department to give the island the best facilities possible.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Will the hon. minister permit me one question? He has spoken of the 'Montcalm,' saying that she was built for the special purpose to which he has referred. Does he know of any representations having been made by the people of Quebec that the 'Montcalm' was doing more harm than good by preventing the formation of the ice bridge opposite Quebec, and that the government would do well to take her off that work?

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as I am aware, no such representations have been received at the department.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion of that point is hardly relevant to the motion.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) made some reference to a supposed delay of fourteen hours in connection with the train service. I would like to understand whether he referred to the Intercolonial Railway train service?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can only say that I have not heard of such delay. I may explain that, since the hon. gentleman's statement was made, I have inquired of the deputy minister, and his reply is that there has been no such delay or anything approaching such delay, on the Intercolonial Railway, even this winter though there have been two very severe storms. Not since the winter before last has there been any great delay in the train service of the Intercolonial Railway.

Reference has been made to the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the winter months. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) is a great advocate, I know, of the Summerside and Tormentine route. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin), naturally, backed by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), is a very strong advocate of the route between Georgetown and Pictou. Of course, these hon. gentlemen represent certain particular communities. In a sense they represent sectional interests. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is to be governed by business principles in this matter, there is one route, and only one, that should claim his attention. It might not suit my hon. friend from Queen's, I am sure that it would not be approved of by my hon. friend from Prince, but that route is between Carleton Head and Cape Tormentine. The distance is only about eight miles and there is practically throughout the year open water which would allow a ferry service of at least two round trips a day. That is the ideal route. Of course, the difficulty in connection with this Summerside route rises out of the fact that the harbour is practically an inland bay which freezes up, so that the boats have great difficulty in approaching the wharf. The boats can get off the harbour readily and with ease, but the difficulty is in going up the harbour and reaching the wharf. The Charlottetown and Pictou route is a long one, the distance between the terminal points being very great. A boat cannot make more than one round trip a day, even if that, while between Carleton Head and Cape Tormentine, they could without difficulty make two trips a day, and this could be done, practically almost every day throughout the winter months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke of the difficulty of satisfying hon. gentlemen on this side, and incidentally, all the members from Prince Edward Island. He might have added the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). And, in view of what has just fallen from the lips of the Minister of Railways and Canals, he might also have added that he was unable to satisfy that gentleman; for, though he tells us that he is going to adopt businesslike methods in this matter, the remarks of his colleague indicate the route which he proposes to use is not the one that the Minister of Railways and Canals would adopt if he were in control of the

Department of Marine and Fisheries. Now, this question of winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland has been one perennial discussion. We have had it week after week nearly every session. And for good reason; because, very often, the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland has been interrupted or broken. I think that, at one time, there was no communication for a space of three or four weeks. If my memory serves me correctly, we had the spectacle presented to us, through speeches of hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island, of one government vessel drifting around the Straits of Northumberland helpless, and another vessel, sent to aid her, also becoming helpless—the two left within sight of each other. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, speaking for the department, may very well indeed criticise the efforts of the past by saying that, in future, he will adopt business methods. It seemed to me there was a criticism of the previous administration of the department in the language which the hon. gentleman used. But we shall hope for good things in the future. The hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten one resource. What has become of that gallant steamship 'Arctic'? We know her capacity for carrying freight, for we have the record of it in the Auditor General's Report and in the report of the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. Why not put on the route a vessel of that kind, one that could carry such astounding quantities of freight as were shipped aboard the 'Arctic.' She would be doing infinitely better work than she has done in the past. On previous occasions those on board her undertook to reach the north pole by the 'Arctic' through Hudson's Bay. Would it not be quite as reasonable to propose to reach the north pole by the 'Arctic' through the Straits of Northumberland, leaving her to ply her majestic way, loaded deep with freight from the mainland to Prince Edward Island and back from Prince Edward Island to the mainland? If the hon. minister really wants to establish a business method in this service, he will recall the 'Arctic' from her present voyage, if it is of no more avail than the previous one and put her on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the debate is closed, I would like to add a few words—and I will be very brief. I wish to tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that he had better not be guided altogether by the hon. member from King's county (Mr. J. J. Hughes). The hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) have always poured smooth words into the minister's ear. I have read, and I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, you have read, about a certain king, and a certain false prophet who always prophesied smooth things to the king; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that only for the smooth words that these two gentlemen have been pouring into the minister's ear, we would have a third boat on that route to-day. If the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for King's county had stood up in this House last year, and the year before last, and told the minister of the necessity for a third boat, instead of saying that everything is all right, we would have had a third boat to-day. Everything is all right, they say, only you cannot please the members of the opposition. I want to tell the minister and the government that it is not the members of the opposition they need to please, but the people of Prince Edward Island. Let me read some newspaper extracts showing the feeling in Prince Edward Island on this subject, and then I think the minister will admit that it is not merely the members of the opposition that he needs to please. Here is what is said about the service by an independent paper, not a Conservative paper:

> The service is a regular farce, but what is the good of talking. . . . It is no wonder that our young men get out. It is enough to make any one go. If this sort of thing keeps on the Island will be depopulated.

Mr. BRODEUR. To which service does that refer? To the service for Summerside?

Mr. A. MARTIN. No, that refers to the service in Prince Edward Island. I am not here as an advocate for any service from any particular point. I am here advocating a service that will satisfy the business interests of Prince Edward Island. I never advocated one route more than another.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend believe in the Summerside route?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Well, it would take me a long time to tell you all I believe. I believe, for instance, that you are not doing your duty very well, and that you are failing to manage this communication according to business methods. As I have said, there is an agitation going on, an agitation that is only beginning, and it is not confined to Prince Edward Island. In British Columbia years ago this great confederation had to come down to its knees because British Columbia threatened to secede. Prince Edward Island has so far been more patient, but I may tell this government that the sacred compact they made with Prince Edward Island has not been fulfilled; and if British Columbia had reason to raise the flag of secession, if this government still persists in treating Prince Edward Island the way it does, Prince Edward Island will also raise the flag of secession. Here is another extract from an independent paper in Prince Edward Island, and I will read it to show the feelings that animate the

people of that province, and unless the government amend their ways they will have more trouble with that province than they think. Here is what the press says :

We give the ministers fair warning that Prince Edward Island cannot be kept in the Dominion on such terms, especially under the exasperation of promises of better things, such promises being made only to be broken. This is plain speaking, but it is painfully true; and so painfully realized here, that the government will do well to heed it.

Now, I wish to refer to a certain statement I made of which the Minister of Railways said he heard nothing. I am not responsible for his not hearing about it, I have it from an official here in Ottawa. He went down to Prince Edward Island from Ottawa to attend a meeting, the train was fourteen hours late, and when he arrived there the boat service was disorganized.

Mr. EMMERSON. When was that ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. A week or ten days ago.

INQUIRY FOR REPORTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask if there is any further news of the report of the Department of the Interior ? Some hon. gentlemen on this side have asked about it. Also what about the Auditor General's Report and the Trade and Navigation Returns ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). My impression is that the report of Trade and Navigation—I think that is what the hon. gentleman means—was submitted some time ago. With regard to the Auditor General's Report, as I mentioned to the member for North Toronto a moment ago, the Auditor General expects that the report will be ready on Thursday. I have sent him a request that the report be distributed at once so that hon. gentlemen will get it during the recess. I presume it will be distributed in the usual way, and put into the members boxes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I also ask that the presentation of the Returns which have been moved for should be expedited as much as possible during the vacation. I mention this with the desire of expediting the work of the House after we resume.

CONSERVATORY AT RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) if the press report is true which states that the dome of the conservatory in course of erection at Rideau Hall, collapsed the other day. If it is true, have inquiries been made by the acting minister, and is he able to inform the House as to the extent of the damage, and the responsibility for the accident ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ward) I may say that it is not true that the dome of the conservatory has fallen in. The conservatory consists of a high central structure with two wings stretching out on each side, one towards the house and one away from the house. A small portion, about twenty feet of the roof of one of these wings, gave way under the weight of wet snow during the night of Friday. The damage is very slight, and will be repaired in a few days. The accounts that have appeared in the newspapers, I must say, are greatly exaggerated. I may add that the construction is being done by men who are specially engaged in constructing buildings of this kind, the plans and specifications were prepared by them, and the work consists largely of patented structural pieces. The accident appears to be due to defects in some of these pieces. I do not think that the officers of the department are in any way to blame.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30th, 1906. —Hon. Wm. Templeman.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) when we may expect the Bills in regard to cold storage and canned fruit products ; whether we will have them before the recess is over sent to our homes or whether we will not get them until we come back ?

Mr. FISHER. They are in the hands of the printer and no doubt they will be printed in a few days. I will give instructions to see that they are sent out to members during the recess so that members may get them before returning.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 22) to amend the Naturalization Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the explanation of this ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The object of this Bill can be explained in this way : By the general law of the land—I think the law that prevails all through the British empire—naturalization conferred upon an alien in any part of the British empire is effective and can give political and civil rights only in the territory which is covered by the legislature which enacts the law. For instance, if an alien is naturalized in

Great Britain the rights which are conferred upon him extend only to the limits of the United Kingdom. The same thing in Canada; if an alien is naturalized in Canada his rights do not go beyond the limits of Canada. It is the same if he is naturalized in Australia or any other British colony. The object of this Bill is to enact that if a man has been naturalized in any part of the British empire, under the law of any part of the British empire and if he wants to enjoy the results of that naturalization in this country, he shall not be required to submit to the condition of residence which is now imposed. If a man comes from New Zealand, Australia or Great Britain and is the bearer of a certificate that he has been naturalized under the law of New Zealand, Australia or Great Britain, then he shall be admitted to naturalization in this country immediately without the three years' residence, which, under the law, is requisite before an alien can be naturalized. He has only to comply with the formalities of the law, take the oath of allegiance, have his certificate recorded according to the law and then he becomes a British subject as far as Canada is concerned. The case has arisen in the Northwest, in the new provinces, where men who had come from British colonies—New Zealand and Australia—could not be admitted to the privileges of subjects although they had been British subjects in those countries and could not therefore take the oath of allegiance at once and enjoy the privileges of citizenship. The object of this Act is to facilitate a man who is a British subject in any other country becoming a British subject in Canada without having to reside for three years as he is now required to do under the law before he can secure a certificate.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two observations upon this question. I think that my right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will agree that the question of naturalization, both in the mother country and in the colonies, is in a very unsatisfactory condition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. STOCKTON. And that there should be some general movement made, both in the mother country and the colonies, to rectify what is certainly an anomaly with respect to naturalization. If a party is naturalized in the mother country he is not a British subject. He only possesses the rights of a British subject within the United Kingdom. If an alien comes to Canada and is naturalized within Canada, he is not, to all intents and purposes, a British subject; he is only entitled to the rights of a British subject in the Dominion of Canada. So, in respect to the other colonies. It seems to me that when a man is naturalized and takes the oath of allegiance he should be a British subject throughout the length and breadth of the British empire, and that all that should be necessary for him to do would be to take his certificate of naturalization from the part of the British empire in which he had been naturalized to any other part of the British empire. It should be a certificate of British citizenship in any part of the empire. I submit to my right hon. friend that that would be a very important subject to come under the notice of the meeting that is to take place in London in April next. Now, take it in respect to naturalization in Canada. An alien comes to Canada and he is naturalized. That does not make him a British subject. That only gives him, according to the law, the rights and privileges of a natural-born British subject so long as he remains within the limits of the Dominion of Canada. The moment he goes outside he is an alien not only in respect to Canada but in respect to any other part of the British empire. Therefore, I say that the condition in which we are to-day in respect to naturalization is a very unsatisfactory one and that there should be some concerted legislation between the mother country and the different self-governing colonies of the empire to say that when any one authority grants a certificate of naturalization it shall not only give a man the rights of a natural born British subject within the limits of the authority granting him the certificate, but that it, to all intents and purposes shall make him a British subject through the length and breadth of the empire. As at present constituted it does not.

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

On section 2,

Mr. STOCKTON. I desire to say to my right hon. friend that in so far as that amendment of the law is concerned it only makes a change in respect to residence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is all.

Mr. STOCKTON. Nothing else. The law is not changed in any one particular in respect to the rights of the person. If he comes here, presents his certificate, takes the oath and then goes outside of the limits of the Dominion he ceases to have the rights of a natural born British subject. It is on that account that I say it is a most unsatisfactory condition of affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) has brought to the attention of the House a very important subject indeed and one which engaged the attention of the conferences which met in 1897 and 1902, but as to which the conference, on neither of these occasions, came to any conclusion.

Mr. FOSTER. What seemed to be the trouble about coming to a conclusion ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I cannot say that I can state exactly myself what it was, but I think the trouble rather came from the United Kingdom. I did not see any particular inclination there, on a certificate given in New Zealand or any of the colonies, to admit, a person to the right of citizenship or to political rights in Great Britain. The question is new ; it has not enlisted much attention yet, but I have no doubt it is one of the questions which will come up for discussion again at the next conference which is to meet in April. We have not the power to make provision for such an imperial citizenship as that which is spoken of by my hon. friend. We should only deal with this question in so far as our own country is concerned and the sole object of this Bill has been rightly apprehended by my hon. friend as being simply to provide that a man who is already the bearer of a certificate of naturalization shall not be required to reside for three years in the country in order to secure naturalization.

Mr. STOCKTON. The difficulty suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is, that becoming naturalized within the United Kingdom or within a colony does not relieve a person of his allegiance to the country of his birth, and unless you have a treaty right between the mother country and the country of his birth as soon as he leaves the territory of the United Kingdom or the territory of the colony he becomes an alien and his nationality as of a foreign country attaches. That is the difficulty with respect to the negotiations. But I cannot see why we should not have some modification of the law so that when a man is naturalized either in the mother country or in one of the great self governing colonies of the empire, I cannot see why that should not be within the British empire a certificate of British citizenship.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has just suggested the difficulty which may arise. He has no objection to give this universal imperial citizenship to a certificate of naturalization given in Great Britain or one of the great colonies, but there are small colonies which would have the same right and to which he would not be disposed to give the same privilege. The question is one of difficulty and it must engage the serious attention of those who have to deal with it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the status in Great Britain of a person who has obtained letters of naturalization in Canada ? Is he simply in the same position as if he had never come to Canada at all and obtained letters of naturalization.

Mr. STOCKTON. Precisely so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is an alien.

Mr. STOCKTON. And if he gets naturalization in the United Kingdom he is an alien here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have there been any negotiations with the imperial government in regard to this proposed legislation ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but this Bill is modelled on the law which has been passed in New Zealand. These things are not settled in a day, but there is a tendency at present to enlarge the effect of a certificate of naturalization in any of the British colonies. The law in New Zealand is :

> If any person resident in New Zealand who has previously obtained any certificate of letters of naturalization in Great Britain or Ireland or any part thereof, or any British colony or possession, desires to be naturalized in New Zealand he shall submit such certificate of letters of naturalization to the governor together with a statutory declaration to the effect that he is the person named in the certificate.

Under this, a man who is naturalized in Canada can go to New Zealand and be naturalized there by the production of his certificate. Our law acknowledges what should be the comity between the different parts of the British empire.

Mr. STOCKTON. I think this legislation is in the right direction because it broadens the lines of naturalization between the different parts of the empire: For my part I would go much further, but we cannot do so without the consent of the mother country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is somewhat along the general lines of the legislation which was initiated in the mother country some twelve years ago with regard to the probate of wills. In how many of the British possessions is there a statutory provision such as we are enacting to-day ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of any except New Zealand.

Mr. STOCKTON. I think New Zealand is the only one.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I had the privilege of drawing the attention of the House to this question two years ago in debating the resolution of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) on the question of a full partnership between the mother country and the colonies. The naturalization laws have been discussed by the chambers of commerce of the empire on at least two occasions, and in 1903 at the congress held in Montreal the following resolution was passed unanimously :

> It is resolved that in the opinion of this congress the naturalization laws of the different parts of the British empire should be so unified as to make any citizen who has been duly natu-

ralized in any part of His Majesty's dominions a British subject wherever the flag waves and entitled to the full rights and privileges of a native born.

Naturalization laws are at present in a very unsatisfactory condition and I am afraid it is not competent for this parliament to set them right. It appears to me that the right hon. gentleman when he goes to the imperial conference to be held in London next spring, should take the matter up with the British authorities and endeavour to arrive at some regulation so that whenever certain conditions are uniformly followed in any part of His Majesty's dominions, these conditions should be ample to make a man a citizen in any part of the empire. Such is the law now that a man who is fully naturalized in Canada may not hold ownership in British ships because he is considered an alien in the eyes of their law, and there are other impediments such as in the matter of the transmission of property. I trust that my right hon. friend will bring this matter before the imperial conference.

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that a person naturalized in a British colony cannot be the owner of a British ship. In the Merchants Shipping Act of 1894, there is a special provision applying to that.

On section 5,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of the note at the end of that section :

This form may be altered so as to apply to the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory.

I do not understand why you require to alter it for the new provinces especially.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention has not been drawn to that and I cannot answer, but I will give my hon. friend the information on the third reading.

Bill reported.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Finance Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means. He said : I would say by way of explanation, in view of the arrangement already made, that it is not in contemplation to proceed with business in the Committee of Ways and Means, but intimation has been given to me that several hon. gentlemen wish to bring up matters this afternoon which can be most conveniently discussed under this motion. It is for that reason only that I make the motion.

THE WRECK OF THE 'GOLSPIE.'

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I desire to occupy the time of the House for a few moments in connection with the lamentable wreck of the steamer 'Golspie' off the Island of Michipicoten on the 4th inst. I cannot better introduce the remarks I have to make to the House than by reading from the Toronto 'Globe' of the 17th inst. a quotation from an article headed 'The Wreck of the Golspie was a Horrible Affair. Whose the Burden of Guilt.' The quotation is as follows

The people of Sault Ste. Marie are justly indignant over the horrible case of neglect revealed by the arrival there on Friday of five members of the steamer 'Golspie's' crew, so terribly injured by exposure to the weather on the north shore of Lake Superior after the wreck of their ship on December 4 that each one of the five has had his feet amputated, while one has lost his hands also.

Were such a tale to come from an exploring party in the Arctic we would be shocked, and would probably denounce the folly of exploration at such cost. This dreadful story, however, is from our own province. The people of Ontario will hold to a complete accounting the men responsible for the disaster, if any such there be, apart from the poor fellows themselves.

These five men were all from the old country, and knew little of sailing on the lakes. When the crew left the 'Golspie' they, with others, rowed as long as they could. When in the zero weather they could row no longer the boat was beached, and, it is asserted, because of their own obstinacy, they were left with some supplies, blankets and an axe, while the remainder of the crew went on to Michipicoten harbour and safety.

The five men tried to follow on after a while, but got lost, and for two days wandered in the woods.

The owners and officers of the 'Golspie' must show clearly what efforts they made to rescue these men, cast away in a strange region, or stand condemned for the worst piece of criminal negligence in the recent history of shipping disasters on the great lakes.

It appears that on the 4th day of December the 'Golspie,' which is a wooden boat of 980 tons register, built in 1882, was on her voyage from Fort William to Owen Sound and meeting with stress of weather she went ashore in a storm on a reef southwest of Michipicoten harbour. The history of this boat, considering the time of year that she was permitted to be out, is not a very favourable one. The Toronto 'Globe' of December 10 says that she is a boat that 'has been wrecked and saved as often as any boat in the register.' She is a wooden boat, and I am informed that she was not considered to be a seaworthy boat. That is a matter that can only be ascertained by a rigid investigation such as I hope will result from these particulars being given to the House. She was an American steamer called the 'Osceola,' which was acquired by a firm of Hamilton ship-owners. After the wreck the men took refuge on the shore in a camp, and there are diverse accounts as between the captain and the mate on the one hand and the men themselves on the other as to the circumstances under which the five men

who suffered so terribly became separated from the rest of the crew. Be that as it may there remains the fact that these men were left out in the open for three days in a temperature 45 below zero with insufficient food and with practically no clothing, because, it is said, that they were not allowed clothing when leaving the ship and that they were ten days freezing within telegraphic call of government officers, and no aid was given to them in the shape of sending them to a hospital. The names of the men injured are Arthur Green, of London, Eng.; J. H. Keebing, of Huddersfield Yorkshire, Eng.; John Donnelly, of Belfast, Ireland, and James Thorburn and Wiliam Macdonald, of Glasgow. These are the men whose feet had to be amputated, and Macdonald was so badly frozen that both his feet and his hands had to be amputated. It appears that the captain and the mate of the boat arrived in Michipicoten which is in touch with Ottawa by telephone and telegraph on the day following the wreck, and telegraphic communication was at once got with the outside world so that the people of Sault Ste. Marie became aware of the particulars of the wreck on the 5th or at the latest the 6th of December that is two days following the wreck. The eastern papers copied the account of the wreck immediately, and on the 10th of December the Toronto 'Globe' refers to the sufferings of these men, and instead of any action being taken by the government or by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the men were allowed to stay there, although it is said that if prompt help had been rendered to them then the limbs that they lost might have been saved. In the Toronto 'Globe' of the 10th of December there is a telegram from Hamilton stating that five of the sailors in the wreck of the 'Golspie' were so badly frozen while crossing to Michipicoten that they would have to be sent to the hospital. As I said before, there are diverse accounts of the circumstances under which these lamentable results happened; but I would again quote from the Toronto 'Globe' of yesterday as follows

> There is another side, however, to this terrible tale. Vesselmen here are saying hard things of the Mackays, of Hamilton, owners of the 'Golspie.' Captain Sinclair, of Detroit, the underwriters' representative, says:
>
> It was a pitiful sight to see the five frozen men from the 'Golspie's' crew carried aboard the tug. It was ten days after the steamer was wrecked before the men reached the hospital. Two or three of them had no feeling at all in their feet, and the members were as black as your hat. It is reported that it was 45 degrees below zero when the steamer went ashore.
>
> The Detroit 'News-Tribune' prints copies of telegrams that passed between Captain Bault and the ship's owners. To the first telegram asking for a tug the owners replied that the tug was busy on the Soo River, and asked if the men could not come out overland. As this would have meant taking the injured sixty miles on a stage it was determined to wait for the underwriters' tug. The 'Smith' reached Michipicoten with Captain Sinclair ten days after the wreck, and the men were then hurried to the hospital at the Soo. It is believed that skilled attendance at an earlier stage might have saved their limbs.

Now for the men's story. The same article goes on to say, speaking of the men:—

> They allege that on their return they were refused admission and then again set out. Three days they wandered in the woods in an endeavour to reach Michipicoten. The axe they carried flew from the handle and was lost. They got their matches wet. The third night out the men lay down in the open, and it was then their feet and hands were frozen. Next day some Indians who had been sent out by the others who reached Michipicoten safely, found them, and rendered services which doubtless saved their lives.

Briefly, these are the details of a very lamentable accident, and they reveal a state of affairs which certainly demands the consideration of the government and particularly that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). The people of this country demand the strictest investigation into all the circumstances of this shocking business. That there has been neglect somewhere is very apparent. That the provisons of our own statute regarding the assistance which must be given by government officials in the case of wrecks, have not been carried out, must be very apparent, even to the hon. minister himself. The facts I have stated, I believe to be entirely in accord with the truth, and they prove clearly that the department or some of its officers are to blame. There is a receiver in the district of Algoma or some other officer who has to act under the Wrecks and Salvage Act, yet at least five or six days elapsed before any attempt was made to get these men out. And then the attempt made was not made by the government. I do not know if up to this day any interest whatever has been shown by the department in the matter. When a telegram was sent to Sault Ste. Marie from Michipicoten stating the position of the men and asking that a tug be sent to get them out, what was the reply? It was that the tug was busy on the 'Soo' river so that the department evidently considered it was much more important that the commerce of the country should not be interrupted in the slightest degree on that river than that five poor half frozen men should be given relief. Six days went by and still no help was rendered. Then at last a private tug was sent by the owners themselves at, I believe, their own cost, and the men were brought to the hospital. But alas! it was then too late because, black and frozen, their feet had to be cut off, and in the case of one man both hands as well. What was the bounden duty of the depart-

ment under the circumstances? Let me quote from the Wrecks and Salvage Act, chapter 81 of the Dominion Statutes:

Section 17. When any British or foreign vessel is wrecked, stranded or in distress at any place within the limits of Canada the receiver——

The receiver, I believe, is an officer of the department or under its control!—

The receiver shall, upon being made acquainted with the stranding or distress forthwith proceed to such place, and upon his arrival there he shall take command of all persons present, and shall assign such duties and issue such directions to each person as he thinks fit for the preservation of such vessel and of the lives of shipwrecked persons, and of the wreck.

2. Every person who disobeys such directions of the receiver shall incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

Section 19—empowers the receiver to——

Require such persons as he thinks necessary to assist him;

Require the master of any vessels near at hand to give such aid with his men or vessel as is in his power;

Demand the use of any wagon, cart, horses, tackle, ropes or appliances that are near at hand;

Every person who refuses without reasonable cause, to comply with any such requisition or demand, so made as aforesaid, shall for every day on which he refuses, incur a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars.

I ask the hon. minister to explain how it was that when the news of the pitiable condition of those poor men on that wreck which was published in an eastern paper, reached him, he did nothing but sat still and allowed the humane provisions of this statute to be disregarded by his own officer. I ask him to explain what, if anything, he or any official of his department did to render one tittle of assistance in that sad catastrophe, which has aroused such a feeling of public indignation throughout this province. Who was to blame? In the first place, I have no hesitation in saying that upon the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) lies the blame—not of the wreck or of the causes which contributed to it, for these will be matters for investigation—but for the neglect to do anything when the news came to him. The hon. minister cannot plead ignorance because he was bound to know. He must have known through the newspapers and through his own agents. But the hon. minister may ask how could he do anything. My reply is that there are telegraph wires right from his office in Ottawa to the place where those men were lying in Michipicoten. There was an officer in that locality whom he could by telegraph have directed to render all the assistance possible. Did he do that? It is for the hon. gentleman to explain.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who is the officer of my department there?

Mr. BOYCE. There is an officer of the government there. There is an officer of customs there who, I understand, is the designated receiver of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and who is bound to fulfil the functions provided by the statute I have quoted. This vessel was an old one. She was built in 1882, and, according to the Toronto 'Globe,' has been wrecked and repaired as often as any vessel in the register. When was she last inspected? Was her hull inspected during the past year? Who was the officer that inspected her and what was his report upon her hull? Those are questions of vital importance, not only in connection with this wreck but with the loss of two other boats, namely, the steamer 'Monarch' and the steamer 'Strathmore,' the former of which was lost at Isle Royale early in the month and the latter of which was lost in this graveyard of Lake Superior near Michipicoten. The question of inspection is one of the gravest importance, it is one concerning which we cannot afford to be lax in any particular and under any circumstances, especially in the case of these old wooden vessels, some of them waterlogged craft, which are allowed to navigate the lakes, after a perfunctory inspection made in the spring when the sun is shining and the birds are singing and the waters are quite calm and everything looks rosy.

Does not the hon. minister think that some further inspection than that should be given to a boat later on in the fall? Is not the suggested safeguard against such accidents, with which we are always met during this month and the month of November, the inspection twice a year of such hulls as are more than a certain number of years old? Take, for instance, the hull of this boat, the hull of the 'Monarch,' or of the 'Strathmore' all of which made very distressing wrecks, resulting in the case of the 'Monarch' a passenger boat, in loss of life. If there had been an inspection, in all probability, if we may trust common report, the inspector would have made known to the Marine Department that boat while she might have been fit to go out in summer weather, up to the first of September, had not a hull fitted to cope with the storms of Lake Superior in the fall, and therefore she should be laid up. There are boats to-day going up and down that lake during this present season, battling with the storms, boats which vesselmen themselves say are not fit to be out exposed to such danger. Then, let us see what the condition is up there, and why there have been so many distressing wrecks and such lamentable loss of life. We know that commencing with the year 1885, on the 7th of November I believe, when the steamer 'Algoma' went down off Isle Royale

with forty-six souls, there has been an annual record loss of life on the great lakes, making a source of very bitter trouble to us all. And what is the remedy ? The remedy is more rigid enforcement of the law, the giving of better aids to navigation and the establishment of life saving stations. May I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if there is a life-saving station on the north shore of Lake Superior, and if so, where it is, and how it is equipped ?

The hon. gentleman is silent. Year after year this record mounts up of disasters on the most dangerous inland sea of Canada, with terrible loss of life, or, if life is not actually lost, then human beings are exposed to the terrible suffering as narrated in the case of the 'Golspie' wreck, and yet there is no place established by this government or subsidized by this government to give aid to sufferers under these unfortunate circumstances. Millions of dollars of this country's money are spent for public works where public works are not necessary in the public interest. It has been pointed out, time after time, that post offices and other public works have been erected, where the expenditure simply meant the squandering of thousands of dollars of public money with no real object except to affect future elections. There are no votes to be had on the north shore of Lake Superior, and there are no life-saving stations on the north shore of Lake Superior, although it is the most dangerous ground for navigation, probably, in Canada. The storms of Lake Superior are known to be most severe ; and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, even by looking at the map, can see two points where it would be most pre-eminently desirable to maintain life-saving stations. One is near Thunder Cape, close to this angle of Isle Royale, the Canoe rocks which have been the graveyard of many a good ship and the other off Michipicoten where there are numerous reefs very dangerous to vessels. Had there been a life-saving station there, the captains of vessels would have been notified ; and, instead of the men of this steamer 'Golspie' going through the woods of an unknown country, over a trail of which they knew nothing, and without sufficient food to carry them through, they would have made their way to the life-saving station, or given signals which would have procured for them ready assistance.

There is another matter in this connection that I desire to comment on before I close. There are very dangerous shoals about where this wreck occurred. Possibly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the very shoal upon which this vessel went ashore and the reason it went ashore and whether there was any neglect of his department to maintain the proper light or buoy on that shoal contributing to that disaster. Will he allow me to draw his attention to the fact that his agent there, in October last, to save himself the inconvenience of going out later actually took a boat, when out on a shooting trip and brought in the buoy from Pancake shoal on the Michipicoten route—just at the time of the year when it was most vitally needed. Does the hon. gentleman remember that ? And does he remember that I drew it to his attention and that he wrote me a letter on the subject ? Here is the letter :

November 3, 1906.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 31st ultimo, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the removal of the bell buoy on Pancake shoal by the contractor, I have to inform you that telegrams were sent to the contractor and Mr. A. G. Duncan, fishery officer at Marksville, informing them that the buoy is most required at this season of navigation in its position.

No report has been received concerning the removal of the buoy with the exception of your letter.

Yours truly,
F. GOURDEAU.

A. C. Boyce, Esq., M.P.,
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

Now, let me tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that if he telegraphed to the agent in that referred letter to re-establish that buoy, it never was re-established. And there is only one sequel to that piece of neglect, and that is that which may be revealed by this investigation—and I wonder whether it will be. If that vessel went ashore on that shoal, then I can only say that I would not like to be in some one's shoes.

There is, then, the question as to what the Department of Marine and Fisheries propose to do in this all important matter. Is there, or is there not, to be an investigation ? There is a widespread feeling of indignation not only in the community which I have the honour to represent, but all through this province and Dominion, about the sufferings to which these men have been exposed through what I fear will be proved to have been cold-blooded studied neglect. At whose door is laid the duty of rendering prompt succour to these men ? To what purpose have we this written on the statute-book ? For what reason, and to what end, have we telegraph and telephone lines in that district to communicate with the sources of help ? Of what use is a Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if, having the means at his command of saving life he has not afforded prompt and sufficient relief, even at the cost of leaving unbuilt a public building in some place where no public building is needed. I lay to the charge of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that his duty in the premises is to investigate up to the hilt all the circumstances attending this disaster both before and after.

We desire to ascertain the circumstances under which the wreck took place, and

whether it was due to any removal of the aids to navigation which had been established there to suit the convenience of some contractor who wanted to get off on a shooting expedition wished to kill two birds with one stone. The department knew, or might have known by listening to the communication that was flashed all through this country and reproduced in the daily press, that that wreck had happened, and that these men were lying there frozen, and it did not do in twenty-four hours what it could have done at the cost of the country by sending out a special boat from Sault Ste. Marie to bring these men in. We await with interest the action that the minister will take. I must confess that we expected the hon. gentleman would be more active than he has been in this important matter. So far as we can tell to-day, not a wheel of the departmental machinery has been turned in this matter. Even the American papers are commenting strongly upon it, and saying that there has been great neglect somewhere, and the people of this country are asking to-day upon whose shoulders the burden of responsibility is to rest. We expect the minister will promise that the most rigid investigation will be made into the causes of this wreck; and the people of this country will exact from the minister the most strict inquiry to ascertain the part which each man charged with a public duty had to fulfil, and through whose neglect it was that these men suffered, one of them with only a trunk, arms and feet gone, and four others with feet gone. If we are men born with heavenly compassion in our hearts, surely we must burn with indignation at the neglect which has been shown, and demand to know where the responsibility should be placed.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). My hon. friend told me yesterday, I think, that he intended to ask, when the Orders of the Day were called, whether the department intended to make an investigation with regard to the wreck which he has just mentioned. I was ready to answer that all instructions had been given for the purpose of making as thorough an investigation as possible.

Mr. BOYCE. When were those instructions given ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Immediately after the return of Commander Spain who was conducting another investigation; and as soon as he returned I instructed him to go and make this investigation. I am sorry indeed that my hon. friend has thought fit to cast upon the department aspersions so grave as he has done, without waiting for that investigation. After listening to the remarks which have fallen from his lips I could not help asking myself whether I was fit to live.

Mr. FOSTER. What conclusion did you come to ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I concluded that the remarks which my hon. friend was making had rather a political end in view, and that I need not attach too much importance to them and that after all I was fit to live some time longer. My hon. friend may be sure that he will get all the information it is possible to give, and when he sees it I think he will have to retract many of the things which he has spoken against the department. We have been endeavouring to do the best we could, with the money at our disposal, to make the necessary improvements in aid of navigation, and for the purpose of saving life in cases of wreck. My hon. friend says we have not properly discharged out duties ; but he must know that we are limited in our efforts by the amount of money at our disposal. He has spoken of life-saving stations. We discussed this question a few days ago. Last year about $12,000 was voted to the department for this purpose, and this year the estimates I think will show an increase of about $9,000. The House therefore will see that we are alive to the necessities of the situation. Perhaps even this sum will not meet all the requirements: I do not know about that, I will not offer any opinion as to that. But we are doing our best to save the lives of people who are wrecked. Now with regard to this boat, my hon. friend suggests that there was no inspection, or that the inspection was defective. I do not even know if it was a Canadian boat. Is it a Canadian boat?

Mr. BOYCE. I understood so. It was an American boat, the 'Osceola,' which was brought over here, I understand.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why should my hon. friend criticise and blame the department as he has been doing with regard to the inspection, when he does not even know whether the boat is a Canadian boat ?

Mr. J. D. REID. She is a Canadian boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. If she is a Canadian boat, it is singular that I do not find her name in the list. I find the 'Goldspie.'

Mr. BOYCE. The boat was registered in Hamilton, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. If it is a Canadian boat, I do not find it in the list which I have before me.

Mr. BOYCE. I think the hon. gentleman will find it when he has time to examine the list more leisurely.

Mr. J. D. REID It was an American boat brought over here and duty paid on it, either at Owen Sound or Hamilton.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see the name on the list of Canadian registered steam

vessels. It is the last list published, on the 31st of December, 1905.

Mr. J. D. REID. She was brought over since, duty paid and inspected by a Canadian inspector at Hamilton.

Mr. BOYCE. Some time last spring.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was very late. But we will get all this information when the investigation has been made. I think there has been a lack of fairness on the part of the hon. gentleman in charging the department with all sorts of crimes in connection with this wreck, when the department has been doing its best to observe the laws that we have to administer.

CLOSING OF STATION AT CHARING CROSS.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). I desire for a moment to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a matter which affects a large section of the people in the riding I have the honour to represent. I regret that the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell), who had the honour of representing the riding of West Kent, has left his seat. I am sure he would be in sympathy with the remarks I am about to make to the House. It is a matter which I am not certain that the Railway Commissioners have control over. I had the honour of calling upon Judge Killam, but I have not been able to get a decision whether they have the power or not, and as the House is closing and as it is a very important matter to the section of the people there I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) to it, because if any action can be taken by his department I am sure that he will be glad to assist us. It is in connection with the Michigan Central Railway which, as nearly all hon. members of this House understands, extends from Windsor to Buffalo. This railway is now controlled by American capital and they are apparently neglecting their Canadian patrons between Windsor and Niagara Falls in order to provide a better service for American products. At the time the old Canada Southern, which is now the Michigan Central, was built there was established and there has since been maintained a station called Charing Cross. It has been kept up during all these years and an operator and freight agent has been maintained there. I might tell the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the House that this station is about seven miles from the city of Chatham and that the people there are so hemmed in that if this station is cut off that whole section within a radius of six or seven miles will be without railway facilities at all. The people there will be compelled to go seven miles to reach a railway station. The railway company saw fit a short time ago to cut this station off, removing the operator entirely, but since deputations have been waiting upon them they have placed a man in charge to receive freight only. I may say that the operator makes the statement that at the time this station was cut off eleven cars were ordered for service at that point. I would draw the attention of the minister to section 24 of the Railway Act of 1903, and from that, while I am not versed in law myself, I would judge that the minister has direct authority to act in conjunction with the Railway Commission. I understand that the Railway Commission have power to open stations, but where a station has been closed it is a question whether they have power or not to order that station to be reopened. I may state that this station is situated in the centre of a district which is one of the best farming sections of the country. Many of the farmers there grow sugar beets and those who understand the raising of sugar beets to any extent must know that these beets must be got to the factory at the least possible cost. But, as a result of closing this station, these farmers are compelled to draw their beets from six to eight miles, whereas they expected they would have this station and the necessary facilities to ship their product. For the information of the minister I may say that I have received dozens of letters from people in that locality. I have one in particular from a gentleman who resides right in the district in which Charing Cross station is located and who is a very reputable citizen, protesting against the action of the railway company. I would say personally that I have known this station to have been in existence for thirty years, and I see no reason why the station should now be cut off. It is a reasonably well paying station, and I can assure the hon. minister that other railway companies operating in that district within a radius of forty miles are keeping up stations that are not so important as the Charing Cross station is. While I approve of American capital being invested in railways in this country, I think they should serve the Canadian public when they have the privilege of operating railways in Canada. They should give the same advantages to the general public as any other line of railway does in the country. I also want to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to this matter. This gentleman who has written me this letter states that representations—I am not certain in regard to this, but no doubt the hon. minister will be able to tell me—have been made by the Michigan Central to the Postmaster General asking that the contract for the mail service at this station be annulled. If that be a fact, I would ask the hon. minister not to allow such a thing to take place in that district. It is a dis-

trict which deserves not only railway accommodation, but passenger and mail service. I would ask the hon. minister if such representations have been made not to allow such a change to take place. I would also appeal to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to take this matter up. I only brought it up because the House is closing to-day. I endeavoured to see both ministers this morning, but I was unable to do so. I saw the Railway Commission, and I am sure that every member of the commission sympathizes with the desire of the people of that district and is willing to do whatever is in his power, but I am not quite certain that the commission have power to act in the matter, that being the view expressed by Mr. Justice Killam to me this morning. If the hon. minister has power to render any assistance he would do the citizens of that part of the country a great service by giving instructions that the Michigan Central Railway Company shall not be allowed to cut this station off. I may also say in conclusion that this railway was subsidized by the Dominion parliament and that the citizens of Raleigh and Harwich contributed $400 to acquire the land upon which this station was erected. On this ground I am sure the minister will sympathize with the people there. It is a well settled section, and I trust that he will see that the people there are not put to the inconvenience of having this station closed resulting in their having to go seven or eight miles to secure the means of transportation. I would thank the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the hon. Postmaster General if they would give their attention to this matter.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am not at all familiar with the circumstances to which my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) has referred; in fact, I hear of the matter for the first time I received a note from him a few minutes ago saying that he would make reference to the Michigan Central Railway in some remarks that he proposed to address to the House, but he did not indicate in what direction I do not remember just exactly the provision of section 24, but it is the section which I had in my mind that where any grievance was brought to the notice of the Minister of Railways or the Railway Department the minister had the power to request the Board of Railway Commissioners to take action in the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It says that the board may of its own motion and shall upon request of the minister deal with any matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend having called attention to the matter, I shall certainly request the commissioners to inquire into it and see wherein the difficulty lies. I quite appreciate the inconvenience which arises to the people of that locality —I am somewhat familiar with it—by the closing of this station. There must be some good and sufficient reason for this action by the railroad company, because, as a rule, railway companies do not arbitrarily close railway stations especially where there is any business to be done. I perhaps might very well understand why they might close a station as an operating office, but they would not close it as a railway station for passengers to get on and off and for the receipt, transportation and sending out of freight. Whatever the facts are I shall endeavour to have them disclosed, and if the railway company is at fault it shall be called to an account to the extent that the Railway Commission has jurisdiction.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). When the hon. gentleman called at my office this morning I was in attendance at a special Committee of the House, or else I would have been pleased to be there to listen to his request. I may tell my hon. friend that as usual I will try to meet his wishes in the matter.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before we adjourn, I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to the slow rate at which the business of parliament has been progressing. The initial difficulty arises from the fact that although the government provided for a fall session, in reality a fall session has not been held. By calling the session a few days before the end of November appearances were saved and it can be technically said that parliament did meet in the fall, but practically the session was called in the early winter. There may have been good reasons to the government itself why they decided upon a fall session as part of their policy, but the delay has had the effect of interfering materially with the despatch of business for which a fall session was predicated entirely. It is of course absolutely necessary that the House should take vacation for the Christmas and New Year's holidays, but these holidays coming so soon after parliament was called has had the double effect of making members less attentive to their work, arising from the idea that the vacation would so soon come, and on the other hand it has had the effect of making it impossible to have brought down that information which the members of the House need to enable them to prepare for the work of the session when we meet again. We enter upon the vacation with the advantage of having a few questions answered; a few motions passed as to which no returns have yet been brought down, and without important public documents which the government should have had ready being placed in possession of the members.

It is absolutely impossible for anything of a financial kind to be done until we get the Auditor General's Report, but we have not had the Auditor General's Report yet, although we have the promise that during the present week it may be brought down so that when the House meets again we may be prepared to analyse the finances of the year. Not only have the government not had their reports ready, but they do not seem to have had their measures ready, and no important measure has been introduced to the House during all the time we have been here—at least no important measure which the government has been in a position to proceed with after it was brought down. The tariff has been submitted, but the government directly they had submitted it, found that it did not appear to be the tariff they proposed to press through the House and like grandfathers clock it stopped short; whether it is ever to go on again we do not know, but we live in hopes that it may tick again after the holidays. The delay in calling the session on the 22nd of November when it should have been called at least about the 1st of November ; the delay in presenting departmental reports; the delay in the government not being ready to go on with its important measures, has resulted in our being here from the 22nd of November without much work being done. It is not that the government has not plenty of opportunities to go on with the work if it were ready, and it is not that the government has been hampered by the opposition. A glance at the 'Hansard' or the Votes and Proceedings will show that the budget speech which generally takes a number of days to dissect and criticise was not unduly impeded by the opposition, because the whole debate was finished in ten or eleven hours of the sitting of the House—two speeches were made by members of the opposition which is certainly not an undue prolongation of that debate. The tariff was submitted and the House went speedily into committee upon the resolutions. We got into and through ways and means in a very few hours. Since then the government has simply been marking time ; there has been no attempt to push the business of the House and outside of the budget speech and the discussion on the resolution of ways and means, the House has adjourned either at six o'clock or before six o'clock, and there have been no evening sittings except on two or three occasions. The government, the House, and the country can profitably note that although we were ostensibly called for a fall session the government was not prepared with its business, the result being that from November 22nd up to the present time we have been in session only about 66 hours, or in other words we have done an amount of work which could have been fairly well done in six days. That is not treating the members of the House or the business of the country in a proper fashion. The Prime Minister started out with the plea that we should get through this session when the robins began to sing. I am afraid his poetic idea will not be realized, and if it is not realized it will not be the fault of the opposition so far as their action up to the present time is concerned. If it is not realized it will be because the important legislation has been delayed and delayed, and because we will be well into the winter and may be towards the spring before we really get to the real business of this session. I hope that better resolutions and better practice accordant with better resolutions will be the result of the cogitations of the holiday season, and that when we get back here we shall find the government prepared to go on with its work and the work of the country without this undue delay. Remember that when we do come back there are many things to be investigated, and there is a deal of information that we have asked for which we shall have to have and have time to digest before we can do this work. If we had had a little more of that before the holidays, we would have been prepared to take that up at an earlier period, and so facilitate the work of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has concluded his remarks with the expression of the hope that when we meet again the government will be prepared with better resolutions and better practice. The resolutions cannot be better than they are on the part of the government. The practice of course can always be improved even though it is very good ; there is always room for improvement in human affairs. On the whole, I think my hon. friend has indulged in rather hypercritical criticism this afternoon. Things have not been worse this session than others ; they have been very much as they are ordinarily. My hon. friend is an old parliamentary hand ; he has had a good deal of experience on both sides of the House, and he knows that it usually is three or four weeks before the work of the session really begins in earnest. The members, when they come here, whether it is because they have lost the habit of parliamentary business, do not seem inclined to rush at once into the discussion of public affairs. The order paper has this session been loaded with questions and notices of motion by hon. gentlemen opposite. Many of these have been disposed of. Others have been called day after day, and the members who put them on the paper were not ready to proceed, I do not know for what reason, but I surmise that it was because a good many members who were expected to take part in the discussion of these questions were not present. My hon. friend knows that on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, the days given to the business of private mem-

bers, the order paper has been gone over and exhausted, and more than one-half or three-quarters of the items in the hands of the private members have been postponed to another sitting. With regard to the business of the government, my hon. friend says that with the exception of two or three occasions the House has adjourned at six o'clock. Has my hon. friend calculated how many days the government have had ? We have not had more than seven or eight days since the beginning of the session. We have had Tuesdays and Fridays, and we are now in the fourth week of the session, and on those days we have been sitting until far in the evening except on two or three occasions, about half the time. The government have been more ready with their business than any previous government. My hon. friend should give us credit for that, though he does not do so. The budget speech was delivered within one week after parliament was opened. This is absolutely unprecedented ; it never took place before. According to my recollection, in my hon. friend's time the budget speech was never delivered until four or six weeks after the opening of the session, or later. This year parliament was called under the new rule which we have adopted for a fall session, and it was impossible the fall session coming for the first time, to get the business of the government as ready as in other years. The Minister of Finance last session repeatedly informed the House that when we met in November, the members were not to expect the Auditor General's Report and the reports of the different departments at the opening of the session, because it was physically impossible to get them ready by that time; so that the House was not taken by surprise. I think we have done very well in placing on the table of the House as many records as we have done already. The Auditor General's Report has not been placed on the table. This is the most important document the House has to deal with ; but for this my hon. friend knows that the government are not any more responsible than he is, as the Auditor General is an officer not of the government but of parliament ; we cannot give an order for his report, but have to wait such time as he is ready. The measures of the government have been reasonably ready. We have introduced some important legislation. We shall have, I hope, all our Bills ready when we meet again after the recess. We have brought down many returns which have been asked for. Every week we have brought several, and in this respect I think we are more advanced than we have been at any time before. I have another report which I wanted to bring to-morrow, but it is not ready ; it is a very important one, the report of the Interprovincial Conference. I will have advance copies sent to the members ; and when they meet again, they will find them in their boxes. On the whole, I think the criticisms of my hon. friend are not justified, for I venture to say with all deference that the business of the House is as far advanced after four weeks of the session as it has been in any year during confederation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, it does not say very much for the efforts of the government during the past sessions. Even with the usual dilatoriness of the government in the early part of the session, I think they have done better than this on some previous occasions. I do not want to add very much to what has been said by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) except to remark that the government have been somewhat disposed, particularly during the last two weeks, to make haste very slowly. In the early part of the session they did make a little progress, and we did sit sometimes until half-past nine or half-past ten in the evening and accomplish some work, particularly with regard to legislation brought in by the Minister of Agriculture. But latterly, very often, we have been adjourning on government days at six o'clock. I want to point out to the Prime Minister that there is a great deal of important legislation promised in the speech from the Throne which we have not yet before us. The representation Bill in regard to the Northwest we have not seen yet; the papers with regard to the Interprovincial Conference, referred to just now by the Prime Minister, we have not yet seen ; the amendments to the Dominion Elections Act, and I hope to the Controverted Elections Act have not yet been presented ; the Post Office Act, promised in the speech from the Throne, has not yet been brought down. The Dominion Lands Act it is true, has been brought down, but not in such a shape that we can know what it is ; it has not been printed ; it was brought down only two or three days ago. We were promised a Bill with respect to juvenile delinquents, and we have not seen that. One would suppose, as the House has been in session now for about four weeks, that some of those important measures, which must have been considered in advance or they would not have been mentioned in the speech from the Throne, might have been placed in the hands of the members in order that some attention might have been given to them during the vacation. So far as all these matters which I have mentioned are concerned, we shall meet on the 9th of January with no more idea as to what the government intend than we had on the first day of the session. By that time about seven weeks will have elapsed, and if it is of any use at all to have a session in the autumn, it seems to me that it is the bounden duty of the government to bring down its legislation, which has evidently been considered

and is mentioned in the speech from the Throne, within the first two or three weeks of the opening of the session at the outside.

I cannot understand how the administration could advise His Excellency to indicate to us the intention of the government to bring down important legislation and then not be able to give us that legislation until the middle of January although we began the session shortly after the middle of November. I do not think that is treating the House fairly. The right hon. gentleman knows what happens in such a case. We spend our time, not very profitably, in the first three or four weeks of the session and then in the last five or six weeks legislation is brought down of an important character which cannot then meet with the consideration its importance demands. It is absolutely impossible to get members to give to it during the closing weeks of the session the attention to which it is entitled. It is absolutely impossible to get members on either side to give to the estimates and the matters set forth in the Auditor General's Report that consideration and criticism which should be given them, when you only lay them before us in the closing weeks of the session. As a matter of public interest, from the standpoint of the government as well as the opposition, I think a serious effort should be made by the government in these autumn sessions to be ready with its business and to ensure in the future that every matter to be dealt with by this House should be dealt with under such conditions that it will be fully and fairly considered. I appreciate fully that we are beginning this session under difficulties which will not occur again. As the fiscal year ends only on the 30th June, the Auditor General's Report is of course not available as early as we hope it will be in future years. But that consideration does not apply to the bringing down of government legislation, unless the making of the tariff, to which the right hon. gentleman says he has given his undivided attention the last six months, has absolutely prevented his bestowing upon these matters the consideration that should be given them. I hope we shall have all that legislation referred to in the speech from the Throne at the earliest possible moment when we resume in January, so that before the House enters into the consideration of these measures it will have a fair opportunity of examining and understanding their purport and be thus able to properly discuss and criticise them.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I wish to enter my protest also against this delay. The right hon. the First Minister has said that we have done more work during this session than we have in the same time in previous sessions. Well, I have been here a good many sessions and do not agree with him. True the budget speech has been delivered, but it is not unreasonable that we should have proceeded with the discussion on the tariff. The right hon. gentleman has said that notices of motions have been passed every day alloted to private members. On that point I agree with him, but I fail to see any reason why we should not have taken up the tariff or some other public measures on government days. Besides I really think that the Auditor General's Report should have been down long before this. The First Minister says that is not the fault of the government, but of the Auditor General who is an officer of this House. As I understand it, however, he cannot complete his report until every department has sent him in its accounts, and I am afraid that the delay in the departments is what has prevented his getting out his report as early as possible. Last session we probably had more meetings of the Public Accounts Committee than in previous years, and I think the results show that that was absolutely necessary. And I have no hesitation in saying that if the government have as many meetings of the Public Accounts Committee this year judging by the information given by the government in answer to questions, the same reckless expenditure will be shown to have gone on during the last fiscal year, and even more so, than during the year previous. I believe that prices have been paid for goods on the same lines as they were in the year previous. Let me add that when I asked the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) for a statement as to what goods have been imported free of duty or in what cases rebates have been given, he handed me the departmental report. In that report I find it stated that Mr. B. Coghlin only imported 16 pounds, or $75 worth of goods, in that fiscal year. Yet by his evidence in the Public Accounts Committee last year it was shown that he had imported thousands of dollars worth free of duty. I find also by the report that Mr. Stubbe, never imported any goods free of duty or that the duties were not refunded him. Yet he himself swore in the Public Accounts Committee that he got in goods free of duty. I find further that Messrs. F. L. Brooks & Co. never imported anything free of duty or for the government at the town of Prescott. But if you will look up the sworn evidence in the Public Accounts Committee of Mr. Merwin, who was Brooks & Co., you will find that he swore that a pump was brought in free of duty. Mr. Buckley swore that he brought his coal in free of duty.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman has said that Mr. Buckley swore before the Public Accounts Committee that the coal

he sold the government he imported free of duty. The hon. gentleman should produce from the report that statement he attributes to Mr. Buckley.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not know what question the hon. gentleman is asking. All I can say is that in the reports of the evidence taken by the Public Accounts Committee, which I read to-day, Mr. Buckley said that coal was imported at Prescott for use of the government on which no duty was paid.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Mr. Buckley said that the coal had been imported in bond and he paid the duty on all the coal with the exception of what was used in the government boats. My hon. friend has said also that the duty was not paid on some goods imported by Mr. Coghlin. Mr. Coghlin stated, if I remember right, that he paid duty on the goods.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is not my recollection of the case so far as Mr. Coghlin is concerned. So far as Mr. Buckley is concerned, I read it in the evidence to-day. As to F. L. Brooks & Co., Mr. Merwin swore that the pump was brought in free of duty at Prescott, and I know it was. And Mr. Stubbe's name is down here as having brought his goods in and, I believe, no duty paid.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that Mr. Stubbe stated that on all the goods that he had imported he had paid duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is not my recollection of it. However, the Public Accounts Committee's evidence will show it. All I have to say is that, so far as these parties are concerned, it was shown to be necessary to have an investigation of their accounts. The names of these same gentlemen appear in the public accounts for the last fiscal year. We shall not get the Auditor Genearl's Report until we meet again on January 9th. That being the case, we cannot go thoroughly into these accounts. I think that every member of the House, whether on the government side or on the opposition side, should have the Auditor General's Report at the earliest possible moment, not only that he may examine the accounts, but so that he may have the information necessary to an intelligent discussion of the estimates of the coming year. For that reason, I enter my protest, and I say that I cannot agree with what has been stated that we have advanced as much this session as we really should have done.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Progress reported.

QUESTION.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL WATER-POWER.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government had any negotiations verbally or in writing, with any party or parties for the sale or rent or the disposing of in any other way of the Beauharnois canal for water, electric power, or any other purpose ?
2. If so, when and with whom ?
3. Has a delegation from the city of Montreal interviewed the Prime Minister or any member of the govenment on the subject ?
4. If so, what was the request of the delegation, and what was the answer of the Prime Minister or any other member of the government to such demand ?

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

1. The government had had negotiations with regard to disposing of the Beauharnois canal water-power.

2 and 3. A delegation from the city of Montreal interviewed the Prime Minister and some members of the government on this subject.

4. The request of the delegation was that the city of Montreal should be given water at reasonable rates. The government has taken the matter into consideration.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return giving a comparative statement of the standard passenger tariff in force on the Intercolonial Railway in 1904 and that in force at the present time, said statement to be so arranged as to show the former and present local passenger rates in convenient form for purposes of comparison, in each of the following cases :—1. From Truro (a) to Hopewell, to New Glasgow, to Pictou, to Antigonish, to Port Mulgrave, to Grand Narrows, to Sydney, to Glace Bay, to Louisburg ; (b) to Halifax ; (c) to Londonderry, to Amherst, to Sackville, to Shediac, to Moncton, to Cape Tormentine.

2. From Moncton (a) to Salisbury, to Sussex, to Norton, to St. John; (b) to Kent Junction, to Weldford, to Newcastle, to Dalhousie, to Campbellton.

3. From Lévis (a) to Berthier-en-bas, to St. Thomas de Montmagny, to St. Anne de la Pocatière, to River du Loup, to Rimouski, to Causapscal, to Métapedia ; (b) to Drummondville, to Ste. Rosalie, to Montreal.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertisements for tenders, tenders, specifications of every kind, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, agreements and other documents and papers of every kind, touching or relating to the construction of a section of the Transcontinental Railway, designated as 'district F,' from a point at or near the city of Winnipeg, to a point known as Peninsular Crossing, near the junction point of the Fort William branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, a distance of about 245 miles. —Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, instructions, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence and other papers of every kind relating

to the negotiations for the Songhees Indian reserve, and especially all such papers as aforesaid relating to the recent mission of Mr. Pedley, deputy superintendent general of Indian affairs, to the province of British Columbia.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, advertisements for tenders, tenders, specifications of every kind, plans, drawings, reports, letters, telegrams, correspondence, contracts, agreements and other documents and papers of every kind, touching or relating to the construction of a post office in the city of Winnipeg, since the year 1900.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence between the five companies and the one individual whose hydraulic mining leases were cancelled during the past year, and the government, or any department thereof.—Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended June 30, 1906, volume III.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Annual report of the Commissioner of the Dominion Police.—Hon. A. B. Aylesworth.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended June 30, 1906.—Hon. H. R. Emmerson.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended June 30, 1906; and Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the same year.—Hon. Frank Oliver.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway.—Mr. Derbyshire.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—Mr. Lavergne (Drummond and Arthabaska).

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Dominion Central Railway Company.—Mr. Hall.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. Schell (Oxford).

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Arthabaska Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona).

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dugas.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Schell (Glengarry).

EXTENSION OF INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TO MONTREAL.—AMENDING ACT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 50) to amend an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her late Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system to the city of Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The explanation is simply that by some means—probably impossible now to discover—in the transcribing of the schedule to this Act, which is a short Act validating the agreement between the two companies, a clerical error took place. The result is that the schedule containing a copy of the agreement does not accord with the written and executed agreement between the companies. The discrepancy was discovered in the course of the arbitration that is now proceeding between the companies, and it occasioned embarrassment to the arbitrators. They had before them not only the original authentic document as executed by the respective parties to it, but they had also the Act of parliament declaring a document, slightly differing in its language, to be binding upon each of the parties to the agreement, and in their embarrassment as to which they ought to follow it was thought the only means of relieving the situation was to amend the schedule to make it accord with the true agreement, which is the whole purpose of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION OF ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN IN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce

Bill (No. 51) to readjust the representation of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in the House of Commons, and to amend the Representation Act. He said: By the terms of the Acts creating the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, it was provided that after the quinquennial census which was to take place in 1906, the representation of the two provinces in this House should be readjusted according to the terms of the British North America Act. A census has been taken from which it appears that the population of Saskatchewan is 257,763 and the population of Alberta 184,349. According to this, Saskatchewan should have 10 members in this House and Alberta 7 members, so that it becomes necessary to make provision for the readjustment of the representation accordingly. I have left the schedules in blank; I propose when the Bill comes for second reading to move that it be referred to a committee of five members (unless a different number is suggested) which will be entrusted with the duty of making up the schedule for the purpose of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MAIL FROM TORONTO EAST.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked:

1. What railways carry the government mails from Toronto east each day?
2. What is the cost to the country, approximately, of such service?
3. What are the earliest mail trains leaving Toronto for the east each morning by these railways?
4. Is it not possible for the government to secure an earlier mail train service from Toronto east each day?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway carry the mails from Toronto east to Montreal and to Ottawa.
2. The amount paid by this department for the conveyance of mails between Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa, and between Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, is $117,696.54.
3. 7.45 a.m. Grand Trunk Railway. 9.15 a.m. Canadian Pacific Railway.
4. The Post Office Department despatches mails by the first trains that are available.

DENATURED ALCOHOL.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. In what year did the government first make denatured alcohol?
2. What quantity has been sold in each year, and at what prices?
3. For what purposes have these sales been made?
4. What is the present price of denatured alcohol?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. During the fiscal year 1888-9.
2.

	Gallons.	Price.
1888-89	42,054.88	$1.40
1888-89	16,598.64	1.60
1889-90	13,292.41	1.40
1889-90	17,254.68	1.30
1889-90	9,960.76	1.20
1889-90	3,230.04	1.28
1889-90	728.37	1.18
1889-90	21,871.05	1.60
1890-91	46,172.13	1.20
1890-91	6,647.90	1.18
1890-91	22,136.48	1.60
1891-92	46,139.55	1.20
1891-92	8,373.02	1.18
1891-92	22,474.72	1.60
1892-93	49,825.65	1.20
1892-93	8,800.22	1.18
1892-93	22,819.80	1.60
1893-94	44,835.27	1.10
1893-94	200.00	1.00
1893-94	7,373.15	1.08
1893-94	22,251.34	1.50
1894-95	42,348.80	1.10
1894-95	8,919.74	1.08
1894-95	21,861.54	1.50
1895-96	43,477.68	1.10
1895-96	7,725.48	1.08
1895-96	21,764.89	1.50
1896-97	40,488.21	1.10
1896-97	8,674.11	1.08
1896-97	21,699.28	1.50
1897-98	48,324.01	1.10
1897-98	10,135.29	1.08
1897-98	32,415.54	1.50
1898-99	42,718.93	1.10
1898-99	11,329.22	1.08
1898-99	15,850.21	1.50
1899-00	640,000.00	1.00
1899-00	8,171.31	1.08
1899-00	30,605.89	1.10
1899-00	10,622.72	1.50
1900-01	11,107.28	1.08
1900-01	36,269.81	1.10
1900-01	9,640.34	1.50
1901-02	12,284.43	1.08
1901-02	32,096.46	1.10
1901-02	7,197.65	1.50
1902-03	13,588.51	1.08
1902-03	35,814.09	1.10
1902-03	7,537.59	1.50
1903-04	12,193.25	1.08
1903-04	34,196.54	1.10
1903-04	6,557.89	1.50
1904-05	11,221.89	1.08
1904-05	35,327.19	1.10
1904-05	5,980.24	1.50
1905-06	9,822.14	1.08
1905-06	34,525.59	1.10
1905-06	5,924.48	1.50

3. For use in the manufacture of varnish, shellac, hats, wood stains, soaps, polishes, brushes, paints, photographic supplies, lacquers, picture frame moulding, shoe and leather dressings, inks, mucilage, liquid glue, cements, for scientific and hospital purposes, for anatomical preparations, for preserving museum specimens, for thawing gas and other pipes, &c., &c., &c.

4. Grade No. 1, 70 cents. Grade No. 2, 80 cents. Grade No. 2, coloured, 65 cents.

'FAVOURED NATION' TREATIES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. With what country does Canada at present enjoy the most favoured nation treatment ?
2. With what foreign countries has Canada lost such treatment since 1897 ?
3. Have any steps been taken, and what steps, to advance the conclusion of commercial arrangements with Italy by the government of Canada, since the return placed before parliament upon this subject, on the 23rd May, 1901 ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. His Majesty has treaties applicable to Canada, with the following countries, under which reciprocal favoured nation treatment in trade is guaranteed, viz.:—Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Corea, Denmark, France, Liberia, Morocco, Muscat, Persia, Salvador, Sweden, Congo, Venezuela. His Majesty has also a treaty or commercial arrangement with Spain, as to the effect of which there is some doubt. Canada has also favoured nation treatment in Japan, and has the benefit of the Preferential Tariff provided for the colonies who are parties to the South African Customs Union Convention. She also receives the benefit of the Preferential Tariff with New Zealand.

2. Canada does not receive favoured nation treatment from Germany, that country having withdrawn such consideration in consequence of the action of Canada in granting the British Preferential Tariff.

3. Pending the completion of the work of revising the Canadian tariff it has not been deemed expedient to press for the conclusion of new commercial arrangements with any country.

BONUSES ON IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Upon how many immigrants who arrived in Canada coming from the continent of Europe during the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, respectively, were bonuses paid to agents, how much per head and what was the total amount ?
2. How many of the above immigrants were from countries covered by the North Atlantic Trading Company contract, how much per head was received by this company for them, and what was the total amount ?
3. Upon how many immigrants from Great Britain and Ireland were bonuses paid for the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, how much per head and what was the total amount ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. For year 1904, 10,664 persons ; £1 per capita. Amount paid, £10,664. For year 1905, 10,662 persons ; £1 per capita. Amount paid, £10,662. For year 1906 (January to April), 2,475 persons ; £1 per capita. Amount paid, £2,475.

2. All were from countries covered by North Atlantic Trading Company contract. Total, £23,801.

3. On immigrants arriving in 1904, bonuses were paid on 14,047 adults and 1,365 children, amounting to £5,425, 4s.; on those arriving in 1905, £5,682, 10s.; on 13,322 adults and 1,851 children ; on those arriving in 1906, before October 1, £11,462, 16s., on 14,088 adults and 2,776 children.

Prior to April first, 1906, the rate was 7s. upon immigrants of the prescribed classes, 12 years of age and over, and 3s. 6d., upon children under twelve. The Salvation Army and certain societies bringing domestic servants were granted an additional 5s. on adults and 2s., 6d., on children. Since April first, 1906, the bonus has been uniform at £1 on immigrants 18 years of age and over and 10s. on persons under 18, the eligible classes being largely restricted.

EXPORT TRADE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What was our export trade with Germany during each of the following years :—1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Total exports to Germany from Canada during undermentioned fiscal years, were as follows :—

	Value.
1900	$1,715,903
1901	2,141,552
1902	2,692,578
1903	2,097,699
1904	1,819,223
1905	1,146,654
1906	1,872,557

GALT POST OFFICE.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Who were the parties who tendered for furnishing additional accommodation, alterations, fittings, &c., in the Galt post office ?
2. What were the figures at which the various parties tendered ?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what sum ?

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

1. In answer to public advertisement only one tender was received, that of Mr. Archibald McAuslan.
2. $6,550.
3. Contract awarded to Mr. Archibald McAuslan, for $6,550.

LACHUTE PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What has caused the delay in erecting the proposed public building at Lachute, Quebec ?
2. Have any plans been prepared for it ?
3. When does the government intend to start building it ?

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

1. The usual preliminary work in such cases had to be done, such as selection of

site, survey of lot, discussion of details of building with Post Office Department, &c., &c., and this had also to be done in connection with many other buildings for which appropriations were voted by parliament.

2. Yes.

3. Department hopes to call for tenders shortly.

POSTMASTER AT STONEFIELD.

Mr. PERLEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Who was the postmaster at Stonefield, Quebec, on January 1, 1906 ?
2. On what date did he vacate the office ?
3. Did he resign, or was he dismissed ?
4. If the latter, for what reason was he dismissed ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Mr. D. V. Cameron.

2. He tendered his resignation as postmaster on the 21st June, 1906. The office was transferred to his successor on the 10th July, 1906.

3 and 4. See answer to No. 2.

DUTIES ON WOOL.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. What duties, if any, were imposed by the Canadian tariff of 1897, or by any amendment thereto, on the following classes of wools: Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown, combing wools such as are grown in Canada?
2. What quantity in pounds of the said classes of wools, respectively, has been imported into Canada since the said tariff of 1897 came into force, and what amount of duties have been collected thereon under such tariff?
3. Were any duties of customs upon any such wools during any and what portion or portions of the said term of years, remitted? If so, for what reason, and upon what authority?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The tariff of 1897 provides for a duty of 3 cents per pound under the general tariff on the following classes of wools : 'Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown combing wools,' no change having been made to the end of the fiscal year 1906.

2.

—	Lbs.	Value.	Duty Collected.
		$	$ cts.
1898	201	18	6 03
1899	6	6	0 14
1900	..	..	
1901	..	..	
1902	..	..	
1903	..	..	
1904	..	..	
1905	69	43	1 58
1906	..	..	
Total	276	67	7 75

3. There was no remission of Customs duties on any such wools during the period mentioned.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. On the 1st January, 1906, how many rifles had the Ross Rifle Company delivered to the government of Canada ?
2. How much had the government paid for those rifles at that date, inclusively?
3. Was this done by contract? If so, what date, and for how many rifles was the contract?
4. How many Ross rifles did the government receive from January, 1906, to May, 1906, and how much was paid by the government to the Ross Rifle Company till then?
5. How much money was paid by the government for Ross rifles for (a) the Marine Department; (b) the Mounted Police; (c) the Militia Department, of Mark 1?
6. How much was paid by the government for Mark 2 of Ross rifles for: (a) Department of Militia; (b) Department of Militia; (c) Department of Justice?
7. What is the cost of the Ross rifle?
8. What is the cost of the Lee-Enfield?
9. Is it true that by an order of the Department of Militia of the 22nd August, 1906, it was forbiden to utilize the gallery ammunition for Ross rifles No. 1 and No. 2? If so, why?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. 6,500. 20,500 were delivered prior to November, 1906.

2. $162,500.

3. Yes. Contract dated March 27, 1902, for 12,000 rifles ; and in addition 'all rifles required for the use of the government during the continuance of this contract.'

4. (a) 4,000. (b) The total amount paid the Ross Rifle Co., including payments for rifles delivered and all advances on progress estimates under terms of the contract on rifles made to May, 1906, is $736,817.40.

5. (a) $12,500. (b) $25,000 (c) $150,000.

6. (a) $100,000. (b) Marine Department, nil. (c) Justice Department, $300.

7. $25.

8. The last British Army rifles (short Lee-Enfield) purchased from the War Office cost, approximately, $24 laid down in the department here, duty free. Ordnance factory cost does not include rent of land, interest on capital, or other trade charges and risks not incurred in government manufacture.

Rifles purchased from the trade would cost, according to an estimate of the British government, about 44 per cent more in England than those made in the Royal Small Arms factory. (About half the rifles for the War Department and India are purchased from the trade.)

The secretary of the Defence Department of Australia stated in an official report made in December last to his Minister that the Defence Department pays £5 9s. 3d. ($26.58½) for these rifles. It is not known whether or not this price includes the usual

War Department charges, boxing and freight. There is no further information on the subject in the department.

9. Yes.—It was necessary to forbid the use of gallery ammunition in Ross Rifle Mark II (not Mark I.) on account of a change in the chamber which permitted the escape of gas. A means to overcome this is engaging the attention of the Master General of the Ordnance at present, but it is too early to lay down what the remedy will be. Gallery ammunition is only used for practice at short distances and is never used in target practice at rifle ranges, nor on active service.

GOVERNMENT AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How many agents has the Canadian government in Great Britain and Ireland who receive a regular salary, what are their names and duties, where are they located, and what salary is paid to each ?

2. How many agents has the Canadian government in Great Britain and Ireland who are paid by commission for their services, what are their names and duties, where are they located, and what is the amount of commission paid in each case?

3. How much has been expended by the government on these agencies for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1906, and up to December 1st, 1906, under the following heads: (a) house and office rent; (b) travelling expenses; (c) advertising ; (d) incidental expenses of all kinds?

4. What has been the total cost of these agencies for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1906, and up to December, 1906.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In so far as the Department of Trade and Commerce is concerned:

1. Four Canadian commercial agents. P. B. Ball, Birmingham, England ; salary, $3,000 per annum. P. B. MacNamara, Manchester, England ; salary, $3,000 per annum. J. B. Jackson, Leeds and Hull, England ; salary, $3,000 per annum. W. A. MacKinnon, Bristol, England ; salary, $3,000 per annum.

2. None.

3.

Expenses.	Fiscal Year to June 30, 1906.	July 1 to December 1, 1906.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
(a) Office rent	1,336 43	517 65
(b) Travelling expenses	542 61	361 12
(c) Advertising		
(d) Incidentals	4,545 67	1,954 41
	6,424 71	2,833 18

4. Fiscal year to June 30, 1906, $18,424.71; 1st July to 1st December, 1906, $7,833.18.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I desire to answer the question so far as the immigration service is concerned.

1. In the immigration service, eight agents.

Names.	Where Located.	Salary Per Annum.
		$ cts.
J. Bruce Walker	London, Eng.	3,000 00
A. F. Jury	Liverpool, Eng.	2,000 00
G. H. Mitchell	Birmingham, Eng.	1,400 00
H. O. Chapman	Headqu'ers, London, Eng.	1,500 00
John Webster	Glasgow, Scot.	1,800 00
J. Edgar	Glasgow, Scot.	1,825 00
H. M. Murray	Cardiff, Wales	1,500 00
E. O'Kelly	Belfast, Ire.	2,000 00

Their duties are, in the case of Mr. Walker, to supervise the work of the other agents and attend generally to the immigration interests of Canada in Great Britain and on the continent ; in the case of the others to distribute literature, give lectures, to canvas and generally to promote the movement of desirable emigrants to Canada. In some cases also they act as trade agents for Canada.

2. The immigration service has no agents in Great Britain and Ireland who are paid by commission. The booking agents appointed and employed by the steamship companies on salary, or commission, or both, receive a commission from the Canadian government on their bookings to Canada of certain classes of immigrant passengers. The commission is £1 per head.

3.

—	Fiscal Year 1905-1906.	5 Months ended Nov. 30, 1906.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
a. Office rent	9,317 00	2,046 00
b. Travelling expenses	6,761 00	1,542 00
c. Advertising	5,754 00	2,309 00
d. Incidentals	32,955 00	11,845 00

4. Fiscal year 1905-6, $75,200. Five months ended November 30, 1906, $24,600.

FISCAL RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Since the imposition on Germany of the maximum tariff on goods coming from Canada in 1898 up to the 1st of March, 1906, have these duties been any higher than the duties charged on similar goods coming from the United States to Germany ?

2. What other countries, if any, are charged the same rates of duty as Canada on goods going into Germany ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. For a portion of the time included within the dates named, presumably 'yes, on certain articles specified in the Conventional Tariff between the United States and Germany.'

The tariff then in force, as well as that now in force, set forth that 'Germany is bound by conventions which enforce in the present tariff the special duties known as conventional duties. These duties.....are applicable to goods proceeding from treaty countries, i. e., those countries with which Germany has concluded special commercial treaties, as well as to those countries enjoying most favoured nation treatment. Among the various countries enjoying most favoured nation treatment in 1898, or in other words having conventions with Germany, were 'Great Britain, including colonies and trans-marine possessions.'

On the denunciation of the German treaty an ad interim arrangement was made which continued the benefits of most favoured nation treatment in terms as published : 'From July 1, 1899, the Bundesrath was authorized to grant until July 30, 1900, to subjects and products of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as to those of the British colonies and possessions abroad, all the advantages accorded by Germany to subjects and products of the most favoured nation.' From the 30th July, 1900, the Federal Council decided to continue to grant after that date and until further notice, to subjects and products of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, as also to British colonies and possessions abroad—Canada and Barbadoes excepted—all such advantages as are accorded by Germany to subjects or citizens and products of the most favoured nation.

On the 10th July, 1900, a commercial arrangement was concluded between Germany and the United States which provided inter alia. 'The reduced rate of duty which had been conceded by commercial treaties entered into during the years 1891 to 1894 between Germany of the one part and Belgium, Italy, Austria Hungary, Roumania, Russia, Switzerland and Servia of the other part.'

From this it would appear that irrespective of the surtax authorized by Germany to be imposed on imports from Canada, the duties were higher on imports from Canada than from the United States only on the articles specified in the convention, and only from July 30, 1900.

2. All countries except such as had conventional arrangements with Germany, a revised list of which was published under date the 26th May, 1898, and reads as follows :—

The list of countries enjoying the most favoured nation treatment is modified as follows :—

'Argentine Republic, Belgium, Chili, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France including colonies, transmarine possessions and the Principality of Monaco, Greece, Great Britain including colonies and transmarine possessions, Guatemala, Hawaiian Islands, Honduras, Italy including the Republic of Saint Marin, Colombia, Republic of Liberia, Madagascar, Morocco, Mexico, Nicaragua, Netherlands including colonies and transmarine possessions, Austria-Hungary including the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina belonging to the customs circumscription as well as the Principality of Lichtenstein, Orange Free State, Paraguay, Persia, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, South African Republic (Transvaal), Turkey (with Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia), Tunis, United States of America, Zanzibar, German territories excluded from the customs circumscription, German colonies and protectorates.'

RAILWAY BETWEEN MADOC AND ELDORADO.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked :

1. Was any portion of the subsidy paid by the Dominion government to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with the line between Madoc and Eldorado, in the county of Hastings, paid after the construction of the road?

2. If so, was such subsidy paid for the operation of the road? If not, for what purpose was it paid?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No.

2. Subsidy was paid for the construction of the road.

JOHN O'ROURKE.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has one John O'Rourke been arrested at the instance of the Department of Railways?
2. If so, with what offence was he charged?
3. What is the present state of the case?
4. Is the defendant still in custody?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No. John O'Rourke has not been arrested at the instance of the Department of Railways.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

N. T. R.—LANDS AT MONCTON.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

Have any lands been purchased or contracted for in or near Moncton on account of or for the use of the National Transcontinental Railway? If so, where are such lands situated, how many distinct and separate parcels are included, what was the area of each parcel, from whom and at what time was it purchased, and what was, in the case of each parcel, the price paid?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). No lands were purchased or contracted for at or near Moncton for the National Transcontinental Railway.

LANDS PURCHASED AT MONCTON FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. What lands have been purchased or contracted for under the Appropriation Act, 1906. Item, locomotive and car shops and land purchased at Moncton ?

2. Where are such lands situated, how many separate parcels are included, what was, approximately, the area of each parcel, from whom and at what time was each purchased, and what was, in the case of each parcel, the price paid ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Answered by number two.

2. Land purchased at Moncton for new shops and yard, situated about one mile from Moncton station on the north main line.

No.	Date, 1906.	Owner.	Acres.	Buildings.	Amount paid.
1	May 15	James E. Weldon	70·79	House and barn	$ 4,500 00
2	April 5	Margaret Dickie	10·57	"	1,528 50
3	May 5	Agnes McDougall	10·04		750 00
4	" 5	Isabella McDougall	10·00	House and barn	2,300 00
5	" 5	Howard Trites	10·26	"	1,213 00
6	" 5	Alex. McDougall	10·06	House	903 00
7	" 5	Hon. D. L. Hannington, Trustee for Estate Charles Jones.	61·22		4,897 60
8	" 19	Peter McKenna	13·43	House and barn	4,317 40
9	" 21	Theodore Dupuis	14·66	"	3,438 80
10	June 20	Hoohilan Estate	3·28	House	2,050 00
11	May 19	John McGuigan	1·66	House and barn	1,100 00
12	" 8	Jane Mary Jones	55·73		3,901 10
13	June 4	Moncton Land Co	2·22		444 00
14	August 13	Florence M. Somers	2·00		100 00
15	June 6	Delancey M. Wilbur	4·15		1,200 00
			280·07		$32,643 40

NOTE :

No. 14 and part of No. 10 ($140), paid in fiscal year 1906-7, and charged to locomotive and car shops and land purchased at Moncton.

The balance was paid in fiscal year 1905-6, and charged to increased accommodation at Moncton.

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR INDIANS.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Who has supplied the cattle for the Blood and Piegan agencies during the year 1906 ?

2. How many bulls were supplied, their ages and prices paid ?

3. How many heifers, their ages and prices paid ?

4. Were said cattle all purchased in Alberta and Saskatchewan ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Heifers from J. G. Christie, Stapleton Bros., and H. J. Mackie; and bulls from the Alberta Cattle Breeders' Association at the annual sale at Calgary.

2. 40 bulls, age from 2½ to 3½ years ; average price for Shorthorns, $95.26, for Herefords $126.41.

3. 263 heifers, yearlings and two-year olds. Price, yearlings, $19; two-year olds, $23.

4. Yes.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS AT STE. FLAVIE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What has been the nature and extent of the improvements carried on at Ste. Flavie, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, since July 1, 1906 ?

2. What further improvements does the government intend to carry out during the fiscal year 1907-8 ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Additional sidings for which the amount of $15,448.76 was expended.

2. Provision is made in main estimates for 1907-8 amounting to $21,500 for the following improvements, viz.:

Ash pit.

Coal handling plant.

Additional siding accommodation.

RAILWAY EXPENDITURE AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What has been the total cost from January 1, 1905, to date, of the engine-house, machine shop, &c., at Rivière du Loup, chargeable to capital account ?

2. What further expenditure will be necessary to complete the works at this point?
3. What further improvements has the government in view at Rivière du Loup during the fiscal year 1907-8?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $92,510.59.
2. Answered by No. 3.
3. Provision is made in main estimates for 1907-8 amounting to $99,500 for improvements at Rivière du Loup, as follows, viz.:
Coal handling plant.
Sand and ash conveyor.
Building for stores and offices.
Machine shop and boiler house.
Ash pit.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS AT CHAUDIERE JUNCTION.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What has been the total cost to date of the engine-house at Chaudière Junction, and what further expenditure will be necessary to finish this work?
2. What other improvements are being made or in contemplation at Chaudière Junction?
3. Has the engine-house been erected by contract? If so, who has the contract, and what was the contract price?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $59,609 total cost to date. A floor is required in engine-house estimated cost $3,800.
2. Provision is made in main estimates for 1907-8 for $66,800 for the following improvements, viz.:
Ash pit.
Water service.
Coal plant.
Floor in engine-house.
Buildings for store and office building.
Additional siding accommodation.
Addition to engine-house.
3. Yes. Contract was awarded to Joseph Gosselin for $44,200. Annex to engine-house also to Joseph Gosselin, $8,495.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS AT DRUMMONDVILLE.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What is the character and cost of the improvements on the Intercolonial Railway at Drummondville, made since the commencement of the fiscal year 1906-7?
2. What improvements has the government in contemplation for the year 1907-8?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Heating station, grading yard and laying platform, $2,937.35.
2. Provision is made in the main estimates of 1907-8 for $20,000 for the following improvements, viz.:
Improving water service.
Coal handling plant.
Sand house and ash conveyor.
Additional sidings and concrete platforms.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS AT STE. ROSALIE.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

What is the nature of the improvements at Ste. Rosalie, which it is the intention of the government to prosecute during the fiscal year 1907-8?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Provision is made in main estimates for the year 1907-8 for the expenditure of $13,000, for the following improvements at Ste. Rosalie, viz.:
Yard room for 200 cars.
Engine-house for four engines.
Additional land.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS ON POSTMASTERS.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked:

What amount of money has been received by the government from the postmasters of each of the provinces of Canada by special assessment, and what has been the losses sustained by the government from postmasters of each province, and what amount is now in the hands of the government from such special assessments of the postmasters, since the beginning; also what disposition does the government intend to make of the surplus, if any?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). It is not possible to answer the question in the way it is put, inasmuch as the accounts relating to the fund are kept for the whole Dominion and not for each province separately.

The total contributions from all postmasters since the creation of the fund amounts to $90,246.56, and the total amount of the losses sustained through postmasters is $4,346.16. The balance to the credit of this fund is $92,708.61. This balance is kept available for the purpose of making good losses which may arise not only through postmasters, city post office employees, and railway mail clerks, but also from the default of mail contractors to carry out their obligations.

POSTAGE ON BRITISH PERIODICALS.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked:

1. Has the government or any member thereof received from the British government, or from Mr. Sydney Buxton, Postmaster General

of Great Britain and Ireland, certain proposals in reference to placing British periodicals on a more satisfactory basis in Canada ?

2. If so, what is the nature of such proposals?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. As negotiations are now pending, it is not considered expedient to make public the nature of any proposals.

T. A. BRICK AND ALBERTA CENSUS.

Mr. AMES asked :

Was E. W. Brick, M.L.A., for Peace River, employed in connection with the taking of the provincial census for Alberta? If so, what district was assigned to him, have his returns been received and accepted by the department, what remuneration was given him for services rendered, what was the total amount of his expenses incurred and paid by the government?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. T. Allan Brick, not E. W. Brick, M.L.A., was employed in taking the census of the province of Alberta in 1906.

2. Subdistrict No. 1 in the census district of Alberta North was assigned to him.

3. His returns have been received and accepted by the department.

4. He has been paid for 52 days service at $3 per day.

5. His expenses incurred, and paid by the government, amounted to $479 ; which included the help of two assistants or guides, and a per diem allowance for cost of travelling and living as authorized by order in council.

GOLD COMMISSIONERS AND ASSISTANTS—YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What are the names of the Gold Commissioner and Assistant Gold Commissioner for Yukon Territory? What salary and allowance does each receive ?

2. What are the names of the members of the staff of the Gold Commissioner's Office at Dawson, Yukon Territory ? What duties are attached to each, and what salary and allowance does each receive ?

3. How many other persons are employed in Yukon Territory, outside of Dawson, in connection with the Gold Commissioner's office ? What are their names, duties, salaries and allowances, respectively, and where are their duties performed ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Living Allowance.
1.		$	$
E. C. Senkler	Gold Commissioner	5,000 00	1,500 00
F. X. Gosselin	Asst. Gold Commissioner	4,000 00	1,200 00
2.			
O. S. Finnie	Chief Clerk	2,000 00	1,500 00
C. V. Shannon	Clerk and Stenographer, Gold Court	1,300 00	1,200 00
T. M. McKay	Accountant	1,300 00	1,200 00
H. B. M. Brown	Stenographer	1,000 00	1,500 00
F. M. Warrington	"	2,100 00	.....
J. B. Bolduc	Clerk	900 00	1,200 00
F. A. H. Fysh	"	1,200 00	1,500 00
Aimé Dugas	"	1,200 00	1,500 00
V. G. Grant	"	1,200 00	1,200 00
W. C. Noble	"	1,000 00	1,200 00
G. Pepin	"	2,100 00	.....
G. D. Munro	"	1,920 00	.....
3.			
R. C. Millar	Asst. Gold Commissi'n'r, White horse District.	2,500 00	1,500 00
T. H. Hinton	Mining Inspector, Duncan District	1,500 00	1,500 00
M. A. Fiset	Mining Inspector, Glacier District	1,500 00	1,500 00
L. T. Burwash	Mining Recorder, White horse District	1,500 00	1,500 00
Percy Reid	Mining Recorder and Inspector, Conrad City	1,500 00	1,500 00
P. Holliday	Mining Recorder and Inspector, Kluahne	1,500 00	1,200 00

FREIGHT SHED AT SUMMERSIDE.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. Martin—asked :

1. Has any decision been arrived at re the rebuilding of a freight shed at Summerside to replace the one recently destroyed by fire, other than the temporary structure now being built ?

2. What location, if any, has been decided upon ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, the railway has rebuilt a portion of a freight shed at Summerside, on the old site, which is of a permanent character; and it is the intention of the government to add to it in the spring, as soon as the weather permits.

2. Answered by No. 1.

QUARTER-SECTION, TOWNSHIP 51, ALBERTA.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Is the southeastern quarter of section 2, township 51, range 2, west of the 4th, at the present open for homestead entry ?
2. If not, by whom is it held or for what purpose is it reserved ?
3. What applications, if any, have been made to the department in respect of the aforesaid quarter-section ?
4. What action has been or will be taken upon said application ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.

2. Entry for the quarter-section described was granted to Mr. William Joseph Knight on the 5th December, 1906.

3. The records of the department show that this quarter-section was originally entered for by William C. Watmore, who, on the 4th of December, 1904, formerly abandoned the same; that on the 22nd March, 1906, William Knight, who holds as a homestead the north east ¼ of the same section, applied for the southeast quarter-section on behalf of his son, William Joseph Knight, who was then some eight months short of the age requisite for making entry ; that Walter Frederick Forest afterwards applied; and that E. Nigh, of Eastview, Saskatchewan, claims to have sent an application with a fee to the sub-agent at Lloydminster, but that the local agent has no record of the same.

The department has called for reports which have not yet been received.

4. The department, having before it only the application of Knight, instructed, in accordance with its practice, the agent at Battleford, on the 11th April, 1906, to hold the southeast quarter-section, if he knew of no reason to the contrary, until the 1st of December, 1906, when the said William Joseph Knight would be of an age making him eligible to obtain entry. The quarter-section was reserved for, and afterwards allowed as a homestead to William Joseph Knight.

ROBBINS IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. AMES asked :

Have the plans of the proposed works contemplated by the Robbins Irrigation Company or their assigns, been as yet filed with the Commissioner of Irrigation? If so, are they available to members for examination, and where can they be seen?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). A return has been laid upon the table of the House containing the information asked for.

Mr. AMES. Does the hon. minister say that the full details asked for in questions 33, 34, 35 and 36 will be found in the return brought down?

Mr. OLIVER. All we have except those asked in question 34 to which I have the answer here.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Were the lands, or any portion thereof, sold to the Robbins Irrigation Company, on the 26th of June, 1906, at any time prior to that date applied for by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a part of their irrigation tract ? If so, when and to what extent?
2. Were any offers, written or verbal, made by or on behalf of the Alberta Irrigation Company, to the Minister of the Interior himself, or to any person connected with his department, for additional lands, to be by the said company irrigated in the neighbourhood of Forty-Mile Coulee ? If so, when, by whom, and to whom were said applications made ?
3. Have any offers at any time since 1898 been made to the government by any persons or corporations other than those referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 to acquire for irrigation purposes, the land in whole or in part, sold on the 26th June, 1906, to the Robbins Irrigation Company ? If so, by whom, when, and how were such offers made ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The lands lying to the north of the Bow River were included in a request made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the 14th March, 1902, for the withdrawal from entry of the even-numbered sections pending the settlement of the Bow River irrigation scheme. These lands were not included in the final application.

2. The Alberta Irrigation Company submitted a memorial dated 31st January, 1899, to divert water from St. Mary's River, and one dated the 13th March, 1900, to divert water from Spring or Pine Pound Coulee, Pot Hole Creek, Nine Mile Coulee, Little Coulee, and Etzikom or Kipps Coulee. A memorial was filed on the 23rd September, 1902, by the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company (formerly the Alberta Irrigation Company) supplemental, to the previous memorials asking for authority to divert water from Belly River, Milk River, Willow or Rolph Creek, various unnamed water courses running in an easterly direction carrying the water out of the eastern portion of Milk River Ridge and various reservoirs shown on the plans filed. The tract to be irrigated was described as follows: Bounded on the south by the north boundary of township one (1), on the east by the eastern boundary of Alberta, on the north by the northern boundary of township ten (10) and Belly River, and on the west by Belly River, together with the lands in township 1, ranges 21 to 28, inclusive, west of the 4th meridian.

By order in council of the 12th December, 1902, the Canadian North West Irrigation Company were granted, in accordance with an application made by them the right to purchase 500,000 acres of land for irrigation

purposes in township 8, ranges 17 and 18, township 7, ranges 13, 14, 15 16 and 17, township 6, ranges 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, township 5, ranges 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, township 4, ranges 13, 14, 15 and 16, township 3, ranges 14 and 15, west of the 4th meridian.

3. No.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. At the time that the lands were sold by the government to the Robbins Irrigation Company, what knowledge was in the possession of the government as to the constitution of the said company?

2. Was it an incorporated company? If so, when and where was it registered, where was its head office, and who were its officers?

3. If it was not an incorporated company, of what persons was it composed, and what are the names and addresses of such persons?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The information asked for will be found in the return laid on the table.

Mr. AMES asked:

On what date was the scheme of the Robbins Irrigation Company authorized by the government, under the provisions of the Northwest Irrigation Act of 1898?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The same answer as to the former question.

POULTRY BRANCH.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

Has the Department of Agriculture discontinued the poultry branch? If so, for what reason?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). No. But several stations established for demonstration purposes have been discontinued the object for which they were established having been accomplished. The principal work of the department in connection with poultry has always been carried on at the Central Experimental Farm. This work continues to be carried on there, and is being constantly extended.

SEEDS BRANCH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many officials of the Department of Agriculture are occupied in the seeds branch?

2. How many samples of grass seeds have been examined for seedsmen, and how many for farmers, during the past two years?

3. How many samples of grain have been examined for seedsmen, and how many for farmers, during the past two years?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. In addition to the seed commissioner there are twenty-one clerks in the seed branch. Of these six are engaged in outside work, and two are employed only temporarily during the busiest part of the year.

2. During the year 1905 there were 268 samples of grass seeds and 224 samples of clover seeds examined for farmers, and 70 samples of grass seeds and 593 samples of clover seeds examined for seed merchants.

During the year 1906 there were 397 samples of grass seeds and 490 samples of clover seeds examined for farmers, and 492 samples of grass seeds and 1,071 samples of clover seeds examined for seed merchants.

3. During the year 1905 there were 96 samples of grain examined for farmers and 55 samples of grain examined for seed merchants.

During the year 1906, there were 334 samples of grain examined for farmers, and 56 samples of grain examined for seed merchants.

COMPLAINTS BY FARMERS OF SEEDSMEN'S REPORTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

Has the government received any complaints from farmers relating to the injustice done them through reports sent to the seedsmen by the department? If so, what is the nature of the complaints?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

No. Information has been obtained that in the purchase of seeds the seedsmen discriminate in prices in favour of the cleaner article; also that in the sale of seeds to farmers the reports issued from the seed laboratory and the reference collections of weed seeds prepared in the seed laboratory for distribution to seed merchants are exposed by many of the seed merchants, together with the seeds offererd for sale to farmers.

MR. C. M. KITTSON—CANADIAN AGENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked:

1. Has Mr. C. M. Kittson, Canadian agent in South Africa, resigned?

2. If so, what are the reasons for his resignation, and what is the date thereof?

3. Has Mr. W. T. R. Preston been appointed to succeed Mr. Kittson? If not, who has?

4. If Mr. Preston is still trade commissioner to China, Japan and Corea, why did he go to South Africa?

5. Is Mr. Preston still in South Africa? If so, how long will he remain there?

6. Is it true that the government of China, Japan and Corea, or any of them, have protested against the appointment of Mr. Preston as Canadian trade commissioner in these countries?

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

1. Yes.

2. Kittson cabled his resignation November 26 and asked that it take effect December 1.

3. No. No one as yet.

4. To investigate and if found necessary take temporary charge pending the appointment of a successor to Mr. Kittson.

5. Yes. Until Mr. Kittson's successor is appointed.

6. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WINDSOR BRANCH.

Mr. BLACK asked :

1. Does the government receive a part of the gross receipts of the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, leased to and operated by the Dominion Atlantic Railway ?

2. If so, are the receipts falling off since the Dominion Atlantic Railway began operating a competing branch from Windsor on the Dominion Atlantic Railway to Truro, on the Intercolonial Railway ?

3. Is the owning and operating of a competing line by the Dominion Atlantic Railway a breach of the spirit of the government's lease of the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway ?

4. If so, should not steps be taken to terminate said lease ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes, slightly :

Gross earnings per year 1904-5..	$50,038 67
Gross earnings per year 1905-6..	49,452 50
A decrease of..	$ 586 17

3. The question has been submitted to the Justice Department for the determination of the government's rights under the circumstances.

4. Depends upon answer involved in No. 3.

RETIRED SERVANTS OF HUDSON BAY COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has the Prime Minister yet referred the claims of retired servants of the Hudson Bay Company to the Minister of Justice for examination and report ?

2. Is the government in possession of all records in the case necessary to the consideration of the claims put forward by the representatives of these retired servants ?

3. If not, where are these records held, and by whom ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.

2. So far as the Department of Justice is aware.

THE ENGLISH AND FRENCH RACES.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked:

1. Does the government of Canada intend to assist in drawing closer the bonds between the English and French races over the world, according to the principle of the entente cordiale ?

2. If so, does the government purpose to take advantage of the present position of the French Catholics to push on in France its propaganda in favour of emigration to Canada ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government is ready to assist, as occasion offers, in drawing closer the bonds between the English and French races, the world over.

2. The government is carrying on, and purposes continuing, a propaganda to secure immigrants from France.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS—EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Were any immigration agents appointed in the eastern townships, Quebec, this year ?

2. Were those appointments permanent or only of a temporary nature?

3. Has the Immigration Department any record of the number of immigrants placed in the various counties of the eastern townships during the year 1906 ? If so, what are the figures ?

4. Is it the intention of the department to continue these appointments?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes ; one.

2. Temporary.

3. Yes :

Sherbrooke..	131
Compton..	126
Stanstead..	78
Richmond and Wolfe	88
Missisquoi..	47
Brome..	53
Shefford..	43
Drummond..	16
St. John's..	26
Huntingdon..	11
Chateauguay..	5
Total..	624

4. The engagement of the agents was, as stated, temporary, and ceased on October 31, last.

RAINY RIVER NAVIGATION.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Is the government aware that navigation on the Rainy river was closed in the middle of the season, on account of obstruction of sand at the mouth of the river ?

2. Have not petitions been presented to, and delegations waited on, the government. during the past three years, asking that something be done to prevent such conditions ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to do anything in the matter ?

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

1. Yes. The department tried to secure a dredge to do the most urgent work, but without success.

2. Yes.

3. Matter under consideration.

QUAHAUG FISHING.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What is the regulation with regard to quahaug fishing in Prince Edward Island, when was it made, and where are the areas covered by this sort of fishing ?
2. What amount was shipped from Prince Edward Island this past season, and where shipped?
3. What prices paid the fishermen ?
4. What is the average price paid to the centres of consumption ?
5. Is the market restricted or unrestricted ?
6. What seizures were made by the inspector ?
7. What was done with the fish ?
8. What is the future policy of the department with regard to quahaug ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Fishing for clams and quahaugs in bays, harbours and other waters within the Dominion of Canada where oysters are taken, shall be permitted only on areas set apart and marked out by the local fishery officer for the respective districts in which such fishing is prosecuted. (O.C., October 29, 1901.)

At Grand River, Enmore, Sheep, Brae, Cascumpec, Richmond, Tryon, Hillsborough, Pownal and some other places throughout the island.

2. The returns are not yet complete; but as far as can be estimated, from 60,000 to 70,000 bushels have been shipped, principally to New York.

3. From 30 cents to $1.30 per bushel.

4. The wholesale price ranges from $1.50 to $4.50 per bag of 1½ bushels, depending on the quality and the season shipped.

5. The market depends on the supply and weather conditions.

6. One seizure of 39 bags, made by a local guardian at the request of the inspector.

7. They were shipped to New York and sold there.

8. Under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Minister of Justice now have the kindness to enlighten us as to what kind of a fish a 'quahaug' is?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am much indebted to my hon. friend for the information that it is a fish.

PRODUCTION OF CHEESE IN CANADA.

Mr. DESJARDINS asked :

1. What is the total product of cheese for exportation or consumption in Canada, for each year, from 1896, inclusively, to 1906, inclusively ?
2. What has been the total cost for each year ?
3. What was the amount exported and the total price for each year ?
4. What was the amount consumed in Canada and the total price for each year ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. There are no statistics showing the annual total production of cheese in Canada except for the year 1900, in which, according to the last census returns the total quantity of cheese manufactured was 220,833,269 pounds of a value of $22,221,430.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3.

Years ending June 30.	Lbs.	$
1896	164,689,123	13,956,571
1897	164,220,699	14,676,239
1898	196,703,323	17,572,763
1899	189,827,839	16,776,765
1900	185,984,430	19,856,324
1901	195,926,397	20 696,951
1902	200,946,401	19 686,281
1903	229,099,925	24,712,943
1904	233,980,716	24,184,566
1905	215,733,259	20,300,500
1906	215,916,157	24,441,664

4. There are no statistics showing the annual consumption of cheese in Canada or value of the same. It is estimated to be about 6 pounds per head of population.

COAL FOR PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Is the government aware that the coal in use on the trains in Prince Edward Island is of such an inferior quality as to greatly interfere with regular transits over the road ?
2. Who supplied the coal to said railway, and at what figure per ton ?
3. Is it the policy of the department to buy the cheapest or any coal without regard to quality and steam-producing properties?
4. Were tenders called, who were the tenderers, and the amount of each ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No, on the contrary the report shows that the coal is of good quality.

2. The Gowrie and Blackhouse Coal Company, and the Port Hood Coal Company, delivery at Charlottetown $3.19 per gross ton, Summerside $3.21 per gross ton, Georgetown $3.19 per gross ton, Souris $3.18 per gross ton, Murray River $3.35 per gross ton.

3. No, the department requires the best procurable coal.

4. ABSTRACT of tenders received for the supply of 10,000 tons of steam coal for the Prince Edward Island Railway.

No.	Name.	Residence.	Charlottetown, 4,250 Tons.		Summerside 3,600 Tons.		Georgetown, 850 Tons.		Souris, 650 Tons.		Murray River, 650 Tons.	
			Run of Mine price per ton.	Screened Coal price per ton.	Run of Mine price per ton.	Screened Coal price per ton.	Run of Mine price per ton.	Screened Coal price per ton.	Run of Mine price per ton.	Screened Coal price per ton.	Run of Mine price per ton.	Screened Coal price per ton.
			$ c.	$ c	$ c	$ c.	$ c	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
A	Mabou & Gulf Coal Co	Mabou, C.B.	.....	3 65	.....	3 65	.....	3 65	...	3 65	...	3 65
B	Inverness Railway & Coal Co	Inverness	3 40	3 60	3 40	3 60	3 40	3 60	3 40	3 60	3 40	3 60
C	International Coal Mining Co	Montreal	3 25	3 50	3 25	3 50	3 25	3 50	3 25	3 50	3 25	3 50
D	Gowrie & Blockhouse Collieries Co	Montreal	2 99	3 19	3 01	3 21	2 89	3 19	2 99	3 18	3 15	3 35
E	Acadia Coal Co., Ltd	Stellarton	3 50	3 75	3 50	3 75	3 50	3 75	3 50	3 75	3 50	3 75

BUTTER PRODUCTION.

Mr. DESJARDINS asked :

1. What has been the total amount of butter, for exportation or consumption in Canada, produced each year, from 1896, inclusively, to 1906 inclusively ?

2. What was the total cost each year ?

3. What was the amount exported and the total price for each year ?

4. What was the amount consumed in Canada and the total price for each year ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. There are no statistics showing the annual total production of butter in Canada, except for the year 1900, in which, according to the last census returns there were produced 36,066,739 pounds of creamery butter at a value of $7,240,972, also 105,343,076 pounds of home-made butter which at a value of twenty cents per pound would amount to $21,068,615.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3.

Years ending June 30.	Lbs.	$
1896	5,889,241	1,052,089
1897	11,453,351	2,089,173
1898	11,253,787	2,046,686
1899	20,139,195	3,700,873
1900	25,259,737	5,122,156
1901	16,335,528	3,295,663
1902	27,855,978	5,660,541
1903	34,128,944	6,954,618
1904	24,568,001	4,724,155
1905	31,764,303	5,930,379
1906	34,081,142	7,086,019

4. There are no statistics showing the annual consumption of butter in Canada or value of the same.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—INVESTIGATIONS.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Martin—asked:

1. What investigations of officials took place on the Prince Edward Island Railway in the current year ?

2. What were the charges ?

3. Who were the investigators ?

4. What are the reports made, and will they be laid on the table of this House ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, charges were made against W. S. Poole, mechanical superintendent and Darius Garnett.

2. That coal had been misappropriated, that the named officers had been guilty of favouritism and drinking on duty.

3. G. A. Sharp, superintendent.

4. No objection to bringing down the evidence, which effectually disposed of the charges, but in the opinion of the minister no good purpose can be served thereby.

LOSS OF THE 'G. A. McKEEN'.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Martin—asked:

1. Did the Cascumpec bar shift during the great November gales ?

2. Had this anything to do with the loss of the 'G. A. McKeen' ? If so, are changes of bars telegraphed to points where shipping originates, so that disasters may be avoided ?

3. What was done in the Cascumpec case, and has any report been received by the government ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.

2. In the opinion of the department it had nothing to do with the loss of the 'G. A. McKeen'. Changes of bars are not telegraphed to points where shipping originates, such information is made public through the issue of notices to mariners by the department.

3. The agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Charlottetown had the channel sounded immediately he learned that the bar had changed, and had the range lights moved to give best water possible, but change made was so little that the course in from sea was not materially affected and could not endanger any vessel entering the harbour if the range lights were properly used.

ASSISTANT POSTMASTER AT BETHANY.

Mr. WARD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is the assistant postmaster at Bethany ?
2. What is the date of his appointment ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). In post offices of this grade the assistants are not appointed by the department. The postmasters secure such assistance as may be required in the performance of their duties. The department has no information as to whom the postmaster of Bethany employs as his assistant.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. D. ROSS—by Mr. Alex. Johnston—asked :

1. How many homestead entries were made by persons from continental countries under contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company ?
2. For seven years prior to 1899, when emigration work was done through local booking agents ?
3. For the past seven years under the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 29,312 homestead entries.
2. 3,808 homestead entries.
3. 25,504 homestead entries.

Mr. D. ROSS—by Mr. Alex. Johnston—asked :

How many people arrived in Canada from continental countries under contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company for seven years prior to 1899, when the work of advertising was carried on through booking agents, and the number from the same countries for the past seven years under the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). For the seven years ending December 31, 1899, there arrived from countries covered by the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract 34,305 immigrants.

For six years and ten months ending October 30, 1906, under the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, there arrived from the same countries 157,389 immigrants.

Mr. D. ROSS—by Mr. Alex. Johnston—asked :

What means of advertising, if any, did the Department of the Interior take to advertise Canada in European countries, since an arrangement was first made with said company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). None other than that provided for by the agreement with the company.

Mr. D. ROSS—by Mr. Alex. Johnston—asked :

Does the department know of any other work of propaganda in Canada's interest, carried on in said countries, excepting by the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). During the continuance of the contract with the company the Department of Immigration propaganda in the countries covered thereby was carried on exclusively by the company.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence in connection with registered letters lost between Bethany and Millbrook, and other points in the county of Durham; more especially concerning a letter posted by one Joseph Hadden, of Bethany, to the Bank of Toronto at Millbrook.—Mr. Ward.

For a return showing : 1. How many cheese curing buildings in all have been erected or provided by the government.

2. Where they are located.

3. The cost of each one, including care, and any other expense or expenses in connection therewith.

4. The charge, if any, made to the users of them.

5. What amount the government paid for transporting cheese from the factory to the curing rooms. The cost in connection with each factory, and the aggregate of all such costs up to date ?

6. Who paid the charge for transportation from curing room when shipping? And if paid by the government, the aggregate of such costs to date ?

7. The number of cheese manufacturers who have taken advantage of these curing rooms, and how many cheese have been stored by each, year by year, and the length of time each consignment has remained in the curing room.

8. The intention of the government to continue the use of these curing rooms for the future, or to extend them.

9. What disposition to be made of these now owned by the government.—Mr. Sproule.

For a copy of all reports, instructions, plans, agreements or documents, of every description, in the possession of the government, concerning, relating to, or touching upon the location, the erection, or the equipment of new locomotive and car shops at Moncton, or the purchase of new machinery for the same.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing, in respect of all contracts since January 1, 1904, between the government and the Galena Oil Company, of Toronto, for supplies to any of the railways of the government :

1. The tenders upon which contracts were based, and all tenders made by other parties for such contracts.

2. All correspondence and communications of the department and officers thereof, with the several tenderers or contractors, relating to such contracts, or tenders or supplies; also all correspondence and communications between such officers, relating to such tenders, contracts or supplies.

3. All advertisements, notices, statements, accounts, papers and vouchers, relating to such contracts or supplies, or payments thereof.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all orders in council, leases, agreements, valuations, reports, memoranda, letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents of every description, relating to or treating of (a) the granting of a closed grazing lease to Brown, Bedingfield, et al ; (b) the enjoyment of and the payment for the privileges granted under said lease.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing all timber lands in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia, sold or leased by the government, or any department thereof, since the 1st July, 1896, the description and area of such lots, the applications made therefor, the notice of advertisement for sale or tender, the tenders received, the amount of each tender, the tenders accepted, the name and address of the person or company to whom each lot was sold or leased.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

For a return showing : The imports by provinces into Canada for home consumption, from the United States, and the exports of the same from Canada to the United States, and the duty on the same, giving the present Canadian duty and the United States duty, for the past twelve months ending 1st October, 1906, on the following agricultural articles : Live pork, cattle, horses, beef and pork dressed, beans, corn, barley, buckwheat, peas, wheat, sugar, beets, eggs, hay, butter, cheese, apples, evaporated and otherwise, vegetables, green peas, tomatoes, peaches, plums, pears, including all canned vegetable and lard and tobacco, raw.—Mr. Clements.

GERMAN AND CANADIAN TARIFFS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved:

For a copy of all correspondence since 1896 between the government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the German or British governments, or any person or persons officially or otherwise representing those governments; and a copy of all documents and papers in possession of the government, respecting the tariffs of Germany and Canada, in relation to each.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I do not think there is any additional correspondence on the subject, but if there is it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR DISPUTES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) moved :

That in the opinion of this House more effective legislative provision should be made for the prevention and settlement of disputes between employers and workmen, to the end that strikes and lockouts, sometimes resulting in loss of life, and always entailing privation and suffering, may be prevented. That a select committee of nine be appointed to inquire into the matters aforesaid and to consider and report what further enactments are desirable or necessary. That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath. That three be a quorum of the committee.

He said : I desire to call the attention of the House for a short time to the matter which is the subject of this resolution. It is clearly of the utmost importance to industrial growth that disputes between employers and workmen should be minimized as far as possible. I shall not go into statistics to any great extent, but it may be of importance that we should bear in mind the great frequency and importance of the strikes and lockouts which have taken place in this country during the last four or five years. I have here a statement compiled for the years 1901 to the present. It has been compiled largely from official returns. I find the following strikes and lockouts occurred during the years I have mentioned :

In 1901..	104
1902..	123
1903..	160
1904..	103
1905..	87

I have not the figures for 1906. Going back to 1901, as far as I can ascertain, the 104 strikes which took place in that year concerned no less than 23,581 employees. There was in that year a strike of the Canadian Pacific Railway trackmen, involving about 5,000 persons. There was a strike of the Fraser river fishermen. There were strikes of the carpenters in Ottawa. Winnipeg and Sydney. There was a strike at the Rossland mines involving 1,000 men. Also at the Alexandria mines, B.C., involving 260 men. There was a strike of the piano workers in Toronto involving 480 men. Also at the Laurentide pulp mills in which 800 men took part. Also at the Valleyfield cotton mills. During 1901 the militia were called out in connection with the Fraser river strike and the strike of the Valleyfield cotton mills. In 1902 the 123 strikes involved 12,142 employees. There was a strike of the longshoremen at Halifax involving 1,200 men. There was also a strike of the employees of the Toronto Street Railway involving 1,000 men, in connection with which the militia were called out. In that year there were also many

other strikes. In the year 1903, among the 160 strikes which took place was one of the employees of the Montreal street railway. In fact there were two strikes of the Montreal street railway employees during that year. One of these which began the 5th February, 1903, involved about 1,200 men, and that which took place on the 22nd May of that year involved about the same number. There was a strike also among the employees of the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company, involving 450 men. Another strike amongst the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia involved 1,000 men. There were strikes among the longshoremen of Montreal, among the men engaged in certain building trades in Toronto, and also among other employees in Montreal, Halifax, Calgary and Vancouver. The militia were called out in connection with the strike of longshoremen in Montreal. In 1904 there were 103 strikes, involving 15,605 men. The time lost in consequence of these strikes was computed to amount to 278,956 working days. Among the strikes which took place that year may be specially mentioned the following: Strike among the employees of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company at Sydney, involving 1,500 men; strike among the employees of certain building trades in Montreal, involving some 1,250 men; strike among certain employees of the building trades in Toronto, involving 1,500 men. The militia were called out in connection with the strike of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company's employees of that year.

Looking at the question from the point of view of the invocation of the military power to aid the civil power in putting down violence, we find that this aid has been invoked nearly every year. The recent return brought down to the House shows that the Steveston strike in British Columbia in 1900-1 cost the government of this country $2,021.32 for the military force supplied; and the whole of that sum has been paid to the government. The Valleyfield mills strike in 1901-2, cost $4,602.-71 for military aid invoked. The municipality paid $2,040.21 in full settlement. The military aid was also called out in connection with the strike of street railway employees in Toronto in June, 1902. The amount paid in this connection was $3,892 and that has been refunded to the government by the city of Toronto. The military aid for the civil power invoked in the case of the Montreal longshoremen's strike in 1903-4 cost no less than $19,886.12. The city of Montreal repaid to this country the whole amount, together with interest and costs, of judgment amounting, in all, to $21,298.07. The strike at Sault Ste. Marie in 1903-4 involved a cost for military aid of $7,343.08. It appears that legal proceedings have been taken for the recovery by the government of this amount, but it has not yet been repaid. The military were also called out in connection with a strike at Niagara Falls in 1903-4. It appears that nothing has yet been paid by the government in connection with the aid so called out.

Mr. FOSTER. To the government or by the government?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. By the government. I suppose the men have not been paid. The strike at Sydney Mines in 1904-5, cost this country $7,809.09 for military aid to the civil power. Of this the municipality has paid $2,500, and, according to the return, legal proceedings have been taken for the recovery of the balance. The Buckingham mills strike in 1906-7 also involved the calling out of military aid to the civil power. It appears from the return referred to that no claims have yet been rendered. The militia were called out to aid the civil power in the strike of street railway employees at Hamilton in 1906-7. No claims have yet been rendered according to this return. The strike among Italian navvies in Kingston, in 1906 involved the calling out of the militia. It appears that no claims have yet been made and nothing paid on that account. Another strike in which the military were called out was that of street railway employees, in Winnipeg, in 1906. No claim has yet been made against the public in connection with that strike. It is perfectly clear, that, although, in some of these cases, no claims have yet been made, claims will come forward in due course. They will be, in the first instance, paid by the government, and the government will be obliged to have recourse against the several municipalities affected.

Now, it is perfectly clear to all, I suppose—and, indeed this point was made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) not long ago, and by other members of this House—that these strikes are especially dangerous to the public convenience when they interfere with the operation of great public utilities such as street railways and steam railways, and when they interfere with the supply to the public of commodities which, in this country, are absolutely necessary for the public comfort. For an illustration of this, we have only to recall the occurrence of a few weeks ago when the people of the Northwest were threatened with a fuel famine, which, to some extent at least, was attributed to a coal strike which took place in Lethbridge. I may say in connection with that coal strike and the discussion which took place in this House with regard to it, that the attention of the government and of parliament and of the country at large, might, perhaps, be advantageously directed to the New Zealand State Coal Mines Act of 1901, by which, it is provided, among other things, that the state may set apart for the purposes of the Act any unalienated Crown lands containing coal. By the same Act power is con-

ferred upon the government of New Zealand to open and work coal mines in such lands, to appoint all necessary managers and engineers and to sell, supply and deliver coal and other products of coal mining operations. I am not aware whether or not the powers thus conferred upon the government of New Zealand have, as yet, been exercised. But the fact that powers of that kind have been conferred upon the government and that certain coal lands are set apart for the purpose of operation by the state is in itself a safeguard to the public and a possible protection against the evil effects of strikes such as that we witnessed in our own Northwest.

Now, dealing more particularly with the subject to which I desire to direct the attention of the House, it might be worth while to consider the legislation we have on the statute-book at the present. In the first place, those who sat in the House in 1900 will remember the Conciliation Act introduced by Sir William Mulock, then Minister of Labour. I think Sir William Mulock himself said, that he was desirous of going further at that time than some other members of the House, that he was desirous of going a little beyond the provisions of the Act which he then placed before parliament. The Conciliation Act of 1900 provided in effect, in the first place, for the establishment of conciliation boards, which however, could only act upon an agreement in writing between the employers and the workingmen; it provided in the second place for inquiry into the causes and circumstances of any dispute, and for taking the necessary steps to bring the parties together; it provided, in the third place, for the appointment of persons to act as a conciliation board upon the application of the employers and the workingmen; and it provided for the appointment of an arbitrator who should have power to deal with disputes upon the application of both parties. The best proof that this statute is not adequate to meet the grave conditions which have prevailed in this country during the years from 1900 up to the present time, is the very occurrence and existence of the strikes which I have enumerated to-day; and no more signal evidence of the inadequacy of that statute can be found than the circumstance that within thirty miles of the city of Ottawa, and within the last four or five months, there has been a strike accompanied with violence and bloodshed and death, and that this Act now upon the statute-book was absolutely useless simply for the reason that it necessitated the consent of both parties before anything could be done under it. It might be observed further that the Act is designed, as Sir William Mulock explained, when he introduced it into this House, simply to bring the parties together, to use the powers of the government by way of conciliation, and it does not contain the provisions which have been adopted in some other countries by means of which, in the opinion of some people at least, very good results have been brought about.

The next advance in legislation in this country was the enactment of the Railway Disputes Act of 1903, chapter 55 of the Acts of that year. That Act provides that upon difference arising between railway employers and employees, the minister might, on the application of either party, or of any municipality affected, cause inquiry to be made, and for that purpose establish a committee of conciliation, mediation and investigation. It further provides that such conciliation committee should endeavour, by conciliation and mediation, to bring about an amicable settlement. It was further provided that in case the differences should continue, the minister might refer these differences to arbitrators, that a board of arbitrators should inquire and report to the minister its findings and recommendations, which should be published in the 'Labour Gazette.' There was no power to enforce the findings or recommendations of the arbitrators, and there was no penalty for refusing to abide thereby. I understand this statute was invoked in connection with the dispute between the telegraph operators of the Grand Trunk Railway and that company, that the arbitrators made their findings and recommendations, and that these were not observed or carried out by the company. It is true that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour stated the reverse of that. I desire to say to him that, I have made pretty careful inquiry from the representatives of the labour organizations involved, and they assure me that the settlement which was eventually made between the telegraph operators and the Grand Trunk Railway Company was not made upon the basis of that award, and that the company held itself in no sense bound by the findings and recommendations of the arbitrators in that case. I have no personal knowledge whether this is correct or not, and if the statement which I give him upon the authority to which I have referred, is not correct, I shall be very glad if the Minister of Labour would state the exact facts. I only point out to him that the information comes to me in that way; and as he has a much better opportunity than I have of knowing what the exact facts are in that regard, I should be very glad to hear from him what those facts were. At all events, this statute is designed, so far as I can understand it, solely for the purpose of conciliation and for investigation, if necessary, and it goes beyond that only to this extent, that the results of that investigation are to be made public through the 'Labour Gazette.' It is obvious that it does not go very far to meet some of the difficulties that have prevailed in this country during the last four or five years.

Now the policy of state regulation of contracts between employers and employees, and the regulation of labour conditions in general by the State, has been carried very much further in the Australasian dominions of His Majesty than in any other country in the world, so far as I am aware, and among these of course the legislation in New Zealand has been especially distinguished. The key note of the New Zealand legislation is the organization of the employers on the one hand and of the employees upon the other, and the interference of the State to bring these organzations together and to endeavour to settle their differences by conciliation. If that conciliation fails, the statute establishes the right of either party to have the matters determined by a court of arbitration appointed by the State. The New Zealand Act, as a necessary part of its constitution, goes this much further, that when that conciliation has been invoked, and when the power of the State board of arbitrators has been afterwarls invoked, it is impossible for either the one party or the other, without contravening the provisions of the law, to create either a strike or a lockout until the determination of the arbitrators, and then, under certain penalties provided by statute, each party is obliged to observe the provisions of the award. I shall come a little later to describe more in detail the New Zealand Act, not for the reason that I am advocating the passing of a statute like that of New Zealand, but for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the House and the country the provisions of that statute. It is obvious, as I stated a little while ago, that we must have some legislation in this country especially with regard to public utilities, with regard to supplies which are necessary for the comfort and convenience of the public, and that we cannot permit employers on the one hand and employees on the other hand, to hold up the whole country while they are settling disputes between themselves by a costly and unreasonable method, while those disputes might be terminated, it seems to me, by some method of arbitration to which the parties ought to consent and to which the state should oblige them to consent in the cases to which I have just now referred.

Before, however, coming to the New Zealand legislation, it is worth while to consider briefly how far employers and employed are organized in this country. I believe that there are in Canada a great many associations known as employers' associations: I do not know whether they are incorporated by statute or not. The only Act which I observe upon the statute-book of Canada relates to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association incorporated by 2 Edward VII., 1903, chap. 48. The objects of that association are as follows: To promote Canadian industries, to further the interests of Canadian manufacturers and exporters, and to render services and assistance to members of the association. It is contended by the labour organizations, I believe, that the Manufacturers' Association, in addition to its other objects, has the object of mutual protection among the manufacturers of this country, and in that way it might be regarded, I suppose, as an employers' organization. We have had, however, for many years upon our statute-book in this country an Act respecting trade unions. Trade unions in Canada may be constituted under the Trade Unions Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 131. I have not been able to procure a copy of this Act as it is to be found in the newly revised statutes of Canada, but I have looked carefully over all the statutes from 1886 to the present time, and I cannot find that this Act has been amended in any way, so I assume it will appear in the new revision of the statutes very much in the same shape in which it appears in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886. Section 2 provides that:

> In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'Trade Union' means such combination, whether temporary or permanent, for regulating the relations between workmen and masters, or for imposing restrictive conditions on the conduct of any trade or business, as would, but for this Act, have been deemed to be an unlawful combination by reason of some one or more of its purposes being in restraint of trade.

Section 4, subsection 1, provides that:

> Any agreement between members of a trade union as such, concerning the conditions on which any members for the time being of the trade union shall, or shall not, sell their goods, transact business, employ or be employed;

Shall not enable:

> (Sec. 4) any court to entertain any legal proceeding instituted with the object of directly enforcing or recovering damages for the breach of the agreement.

Section 5 provides that

> No Act in force in Canada providing for the constitution and incorporation of charitable, benevolent or provident institutions, shall include or apply to trade unions, and this Act shall not apply to any trade union not registered under this Act.

Section 22 provides that

> The purposes of any trade union shall not, by reason merely that they are in restraint of trade, be deemed to be unlawful, so as to render any member of such trade union liable to criminal prosecution for conspiracy or otherwise, so as to render void or voidable any agreement or trust.

That Act provides, therefore, in effect, that trade unions registered under it shall have certain privileges conferred upon them by that Act, and especially the privilege that agreements made by them in restraint

of trade shall not operate to subject them either to criminal or civil liability. It would appear from the terms of this Act that it might embrace employers as well as employees. The organization under it is of a very simple character; any seven or more members of a trade union may, by complying with very simple conditions, register such trade union under the Act.

Now, before touching the New Zealand Act, on which I desire to say a few words later on, it might be worth while to consider the organization of labour in Canada, and, while I do not profess to have any personal knowledge of the way in which labour is oragnized in this country, I have made careful inquiry and I have under my hand a memorandum furnished to me by a gentleman who is very familiar with this subject. I would like to submit to the House certain portions of this memorandum which are, it seems to me, material, in order that members of the House, in so far as they have not the information at hand, may be enabled to know in what way labour is organized in Canada. The unions to which this memorandum refers in the first instance are unions which are organized in the Trade and Labour Congress of Canada. The memorandum reads :

The local union is the unit. The bakers, say in Toronto, Montreal, Victoria and Halifax, organize themselves into local unions in their respective cities for the purpose of bettering their conditions generally.

The same procedure is adopted by bakers in the various cities of the United States.

On the principle that unites them in the cities into local unions, the various local unions throughout the country (Canada and the United States), unite for the further protection of their interests. This union of all the units constitutes the International Union which attends to trade matters alone. Provision is made in nearly every case also for sick and death benefits.

The local union has complete autonomy in the matter of strikes. It may strike without the approval of the International, but in doing so it forfeits its rights to benefits or 'strike pay' under the constitution of the International. If a strike takes place with the approval of the International, 'strike pay' is allowed. The fund for this purpose, as well as for the purposes of the International generally, is made up of a per capita tax from all the local unions constituting the International. The International cannot order a strike. Its function consists in refusing to sanction a strike already passed upon by a local union or in approving of the strike.

At its annual or biennial convention the International elects its officers.

In almost every case a Canadian is placed upon the International executive out of courtesy to the Canadian locals and that Canadian representative attends to Canadian matters.

The International has an organizer whose duty it is to visit various cities for the purpose of organizing the workmen into local unions. Canadian organizers look after the Canadian field and cover part of the United States territory as well.

The best report an International officer can make to the annual convention is that the year has been one without strikes. That report means that the funds of the International have been conserved for sick and death benefits and out-of-work pay. The whole interest of the International is to settle and to avoid strikes.

In many cases employers of labour prefer to have International officers to deal with in the settlement of grievances, because of the latter's greater experience and judgment. This has occurred, for instance, in Toronto, where the employing bookbinders refused to deal with representatives of the local union, and insisted upon the International officer being introduced into the matter.

That memorandum came to me after I had had some conversation on the subject of the operation of the international union with some employers of labour in this country, and I must confess that I was rather surprised when some employers of labour, not all of them, but some of them, told me that they have, over and over again, declined to deal with the local union or with the men constituting the local union, for the reason that they desire to have a bargain or agreement sanctioned and approved by the international officer and to have the guarantee of an agreement by that officer that there would be, as they term it, industrial peace upon the basis of the agreement so entered into. I think that aspect of the matter has not presented itself very fully to some of us in considering the operation of the International Union with respect to labour conditions in this country. It is apparently the interest of the international union to prevent a strike if possible and therefore the international officer coming to Toronto from the United States or going from Canada to one of the New England states, has as the basis and motive of all his acts a strong desire to bring about if possible conciliation and agreement between the employer and the employed.

The memorandum goes on further in justification of the right to international action :

Labour has as much right to unite internationally as capital has. You will no doubt be able to call to mind a number of large corporations with international affiliations; for example, the International Harvester Company, the National Metal Trades Association, which is simply an International union of employers and others.

Then he continues further on :

The international union of workmen is needed to cope with the international union of employers.

I give that as the aspect of international organization from the standpoint of the labour organizations themselves. The organization to which I have just now referred is with regard to trade, and includes co-operation for sick and death benefits and so on. In addition to these, the trades unions

in Canada are organized not on international lines but upon Canadian lines for legislative and advisory purposes. The Dominion Trades and Labour Congress has no jurisdiction whatever, so far as I understand, with regard to strikes or in regard to any of the matters with which I have just been dealing. But, in each city the various trades unions send delegates to the central body in the city which is generally known as a trades council. This council superintends in a general way the labour situation in a city or town; its functions are largely legislative. Then, for legislative purposes, the local unions and trades councils all over Canada send delegates to what is known as the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada which congress holds annual conventions, the last one being held in Victoria, B.C., in September, 1906. Officers are elected at these annual councils and these officers constitute the Dominion executive. Their duty is to supervise labour matters generally and to pay particular attention to the transactions of the Dominion parliament. It is this executive which maintains a parliamentary representative at Ottawa and which otherwise keeps a watch upon legislation here. At this annual convention provincial executives are elected and these provincial executives duplicate provincially what the Dominion executive does for Canada, so that each of the provincial executives has the duty of examining and considering and if necessary protesting against or approving provincial legislation. The Dominion congress is supreme in Canada in labour matters, just as the American Federation of Labour is supreme in the United States and the British Trades Congress in England. but of course there is a great bond of sympathy between the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and the American Federation of Labour. In addition to these, one should mention the great railway organizations of this country. The greater number of the railway organizations are not affiliated at present with the Trades and Labour Congress but maintain their own representatives at Ottawa. However, some of these railway organizations, such for instance as the maintenance of way men, are affiliated with the congress and there is understood to be complete harmony existing between the railway bodies and the Trades and Labour Congress.

Now, I have been referring so far to the trades unions and the Trade and Labour Congress, but we should not forget to mention the Provincial Workingmen's Association of the maritime provinces, which so far as I am aware is not affiliated with any other labour organization. It has a very large membership in the maritime provinces especially in Nova Scotia, and it exercises a very great influence over labour matters in that province. There is also, more especially in the province of Quebec the National Congress of Labour which I believe has not a very large membership, and there is also the Knights of Labour organization whose membership is chiefly in the province of Quebec. There may be other labour organizations which have not been brought to my attention.

Now, coming to the New Zealand legislation, which I select because it is legislation of the most advanced character I know of; the statute now in force in New Zealand is an extension and modification of an Act which I think was passed about 1894. The statute now in force in New Zealand is called the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1900, and it consolidated and amended several previous Acts. Shortly stated, the objects and provisions of that statute are as follows: As a condition precedent it contemplates and indeed requires the organization of employers and employees. This organization is carried out by the establishment of industrial unions of employers or of workmen as the case may be, which upon registration become bodies corporate for the purposes of the Act. Each union is required to frame certain rules which inter alia must provide for the execution of industrial agreements and for a correct list of actual members in good standing; two employers or seven workmen may constitute a union; each union is required to have a head office and to make annual returns of its officers and members; New Zealand is divided into industrial districts and a board of conciliation is established for each industrial district; each board of conciliation consists of an unequal number of persons, not more than five; the employers' industrial unions and the workmen's industrial unions within each district elect respectively an equal number; the persons so elected choose an additional member as chairman. There are elaborate provisions as to elections and vacancies caused by death. In cases of industrial dispute—that expression in the New Zealand Act has a very wide and comprehensive meaning—either party may refer the dispute to the board.

The board of conciliation in New Zealand has no compulsory powers whatever. The duty of the board is to inquire, and to endeavour to effect a settlement which if arrived at is embodied in an industrial agreement. This industrial agreement is to continue for not less than six months and not more than three years, but it remains in force after the expiration of that period until a new agreement is arrived at or a new award is made. Therefore, when you get the employers and the employed in any particular trade under the jurisdiction of the board of conciliation; when you arrive at an agreement by means of their efforts, you have a condition brought about under which there can be no strike because the agreement continues until a new agreement is arrived at or a new award is made. It is provided also by the New Zealand Act that the parties may agree in advance to accept

the recommendation of the board—because the board can only recommend—or they may do so after its recommendation has been made and such recommendations may be embodied either with or without, modification in the industrial agreement.

If no settlement is reached by means of this board of conciliation, then either party to the dispute may, by notice, refer the dispute to the court of arbitration for settlement. The court of arbitration for New Zealand is constituted for the whole colony —each board of conciliation has jurisdiction over only a particular district. This Court of Arbitration is appointed by the Crown and it consists of three members. One of these is appointed upon the recommendation of the employers' unions who vote if necessary for that purpose ; another is appointed upon the recommendation of the Workmens' unions throughout the colony, and the third is a judge of the supreme court of the colony and he acts as its president. The court has jurisdiction for the settlement and determination of any industrial dispute referred to it—and you may remember that either party to a proceeding before the board of conciliation has the right, in case no settlement is arrived at before that board, to refer the dispute to the board of arbitration simply by the giving of a notice. The parties may not be represented by counsel or solicitors before the board of conciliation, but they may be so represented if they desire before the court of arbitration. Unfortunately for the legal profession in that country, there is a provision in the statute that no costs are to be allowed by the board for counsel or solicitors and the parties must employ them entirely at their own expense. Two members of the board constitute a quorum ; the decision of the majority is binding and in case of an epual division (that is where only two members sit) the president's decision is the decision of the court.

The award of the court shall operate for not more than three years.

The award may affect the interests of other industries than those represented; but those so interested may move to vary the award, and the court has power to vary it.

The award binds not only the organized employers who are actually parties thereto, but all other employers in the same industry who carry on business within the industrial district. It also binds not only the members of the union, but also all workmen in the employ of an employer on whom the award is binding. Therefore an award once made has a very wide and comprehensive scope.

Under the amendment of 1901 trades unions within the district are also bound by the award although they may not have registered as an industrial union under the Act.

It may be worth while to read two sections of the Act in order that members of the House who are interested in the subject may see how very comprehensive is the scope of the New Zealand statute; I refer to sections 86 and 87 of the Act of 1900 as amended by the Act of 1901. Section 86 is as follows:

1. The award shall be framed in such manner as shall best express the decision of the court, avoiding all technicality where possible, and shall specify :

(a) Each original party on whom the award is binding, being in every case each industrial union, industrial association, or employer who is party to the proceedings at the time when the award is made ;

(b) The industry to which the award applies;

(c) The industrial district to which the award relates, being in every case the industrial district in which the proceedings were commenced ;

(d) The currency of the award, being any specified period not exceeding three years from the date of the award ;

Provided that, notwithstanding the expiration of the currency of the award, the award shall continue in force until a new award has been duly made, except where, subject to the provisions of subsection 2 of section twenty, the registration of an industrial union of workers bound by such award has been cancelled.

2. The award shall also state in clear terms what is or is not to be done by each party on whom the award is binding, or by the workers affected by the award, and may provide for an alternative course to be taken by any party :

Provided that in no case shall the court have power to fix any age for the commencement or termination of apprenticeship.

3. The award, by force of this Act, shall extend to and bind as subsequent party thereto every industrial union, industrial association, or employer who, not being original party thereto, is at any time whilst the award is in force connected with or engaged in the industry to which the award applies within the industrial district to which the award relates.

The Act of 1901 added to that section the following paragraphs:

4. The court may, in any award made by it, limit the operation of such award to any city, town, or district being within or part of any industrial district.

5. The court shall in such case have power on the application of any employer, industrial union, or industrial association, in any industrial district within which the award shall have effect, to extend the provisions of such award (if such award shall have been limited in its operation as aforesaid) to any person, employer, industrial union, or industrial association within such industrial district.

6. The court may, if it thinks fit, limit the operation of any award heretofore made under the principal Act to any particular town, city, or locality in any industrial district in which such award now has effect.

7. The limitation or extension referred to in the preceding paragraphs five and six shall be made upon such notice to and application of such parties as the court may in its discretion direct.

Section 87 of the Act of 1900, as amended by the Act of 1901, is as follows :

With respect to every award, whether made before or after the commencement of this Act, the following special powers shall be exercisable by the court by order at any time during the currency of the award, that is to say :

1. Power to amend the provisions of the award for the purpose of remedying any defect therein or of giving fuller effect thereto.

2. Power to extend the award so as to join and bind as party thereto any specified trade union, industrial union, industrial association, or employer in the colony not then bound thereby nor party thereto, but connected with or engaged in the same industry, as that to which the award applies.

And so on—I need not read the remainder of that subsection, which is very technical. The third subsection is as follows :

3. The award, by force of this Act, shall also extend to and bind every worker who, not being a member of any industrial union on which the award is binding, is at any time whilst it is in force employed by any employer on whom the award is binding; and if any such worker commits any breach of the award he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds, to be recovered in like manner as if he were a party to the award.

So much for the provisions of the New Zealand Act as to the relations between employers and employees. I should add that the award of the board of arbitration is enforced by substantial penalties; the board itself has jurisdiction for that purpose. It may either enforce the award or decline to enforce the award. If it decides to enforce the award, it has very large discretion as to the manner in which it shall enforce it.

The provisions of the New Zealand Act may be summarized as follows:

It applies only to industries in which employers and workmen are organized into unions.

It does not prevent private conciliation or arbitration.

Conciliation is exhausted by the state before it resorts to arbitration.

If conciliation is unsuccessful, the disputants must resort to arbitration.

Disobedience of the award may be punished or not at the discretion of the court. Strikes and lockouts are of course prohibited by other provisions of the Act during the proceedings of the court, and any violation of the award once made is punishable by fine and in some cases by imprisonment.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose neither party applies for arbitration after the award of the board of conciliation is made ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the board of conciliation makes a recommendation that recommendation is sometimes approved of and accepted by one party and not by the other. The successful party before the board of conciliation is the party who in the ordinary course give the notice, because he desires to obtain an award based on the recommendation in his favour ; and it has been found in actual practice that one of the parties always does give the necessary notice.

Various objections have been raised in regard to the New Zealand Act. In the first place, its successful operation is declared to be experimental until it shall be tested by hard times and declining prices. It is said that ever since the Conciliation Act has been in force employment has been good and prices have been high, and therefore up to the present time we have not had any real test of what the Act may accomplish. In the meantime, however, it has settled hundreds of disputes. If you go into our library, you will find there volume after volume of the rceords of the proceedings of the board of conciliation and the board of arbitration in New Zealand, and the results of their determinations, which have been accepted by both employers and employees.

It has been contended also that men cannot be made to work, and therefore no award will be effective or binding on labour. On the other hand, I understand that the labouring men say that no award can be made binding on capital because an employer will certainly cease to carry on business if the terms on which he is obliged to continue it are not satisfactory. It seems to me that that objection overlooks one fundamental ground and principle and that is that the employer desires to carry on his business and that the workmen are equally desirous to obtain employment. It is not the case of men unwilling to employ labour and of labouring men unwilling to work, but of men in the one case desiring to employ others and of men in the other case anxious to work. What does a strike mean to the workingmen in the long run? It means great loss and suffering to them and their families. The workingman desires to work but thinks he is not getting fair play. One hears of strikes between employers and labouring men discussed as if the men who furnish the capital and those who furnish the labour were not human beings of exactly the same type. Take a thousand workingmen and put them in the position of a thousand employers of labour, and they will look on the labour problem exactly as do the capitalists ; and on the other hand, if you were to take a thousand employers of labour and put them in the place of a thousand workingmen, you would find them, to a great extent, imbued by the same ideas respecting trades unions as those which actuate the workingmen to-day. They are all human beings, having the virtues and defects of humanity, and each is very much inclined to look at the situation from his own standpoint. It is very likely that employers are occasionally selfish, and it is not altogether beyond the bounds of probability that some workingmen may occasionally be found who are unreasonable. It was said by some one in

this House the other day that the only way in which you can bring about a reconciliation between the two is to let them engage in a strike for six or eight months and then, when both sides are absolutely exhausted, will come the psychological moment when you can bring about a reconciliation between them. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this parliament of Canada is capable of devising any means whatever of bringing about a reconciliation, it must be on the basis of getting the parties together in the first instance and of avoiding, by means of negotiations or compulsory arbitration, all the evils of a strike or lock-out, and by endeavouring if possible, at the very outset, to avoid that ultimate resort to strikes and lock-outs which, in many cases, is absolutely unnecessary. What has been the result of these disturbances? We have found employers standing on their strictest rights, determined to yield nothing, and workingmen equally determined to insist on their demands. We have found them thus at strife during weary months, we have found violence and even bloodshed resulting and coupled with serious loss to industrial life development and attended with a lack of that industrial peace which employers say is absolutely essential to industrial advancement. We have had all this and in the end we have found, in most cases, both employers and employees giving away something, but with the settlement leaving rancour and malice still existing in the hearts of both parties. Would it not be infinitely better to devise if possible some means of preventing such conditions? It is also said that no system as that which exists in New Zealand can have any effective operation unless both capital and labour organize. Well, I can see no objection to both capital and labour organizing for their protection, and in my opinion the tendency in that direction is bound to increase. The labouring men will become more and more organized and so will the employers, and it does not seem to me that there is any grave objection to such organization. Let labour be organized to the utmost possible extent and equally let capital be organized, but let us have some legislation by which the disputes between these great bodies, having to some extent conflicting interests and to some extent the same interests, may be reconciled. The subject is one of grave concern to Canada, and I have no apology to offer for inviting the attention of the House to it. Let me say one word in conclusion. It seems to me that the condition is one which calls for some legislative remedy, and that one means would be to have it considered by a small committee of representative members of parliament—men who have possibly given to the subject serious study. That is the way in which legislation of this character designed to break new ground is dealt with in the old country. I do not believe that any Act—not even that which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has introduced, but which I have not had the opportunity of studying very much, as I only had a copy of the measure last night—ought to be enforced on employers and workingmen without giving both every possible opportunity of stating their objections to it and making known their suggestions. For that reason, I think it is desirable we should have a committee composed, if possible, of men who have made a study of this subject, and that that committee should give both the employers and the labouring men the fullest opportunity of stating any objection they may have to that measure or any part of it and of offering any suggestions they may think advisable for the betterment of present conditions. I venture to believe, Sir, from what I have heard of the sentiments of the labouring men, that they themselves realize that it ought not to be possible in the future that the public utilities of this country should be paralyzed by strikes; that they themselves realize—at least some of them do—that the supplies of public commodities, such as coal and other similar articles, should not be allowed to be cut off while disputes prevail between labour and capital. I believe that they, as well as the representatives of capital, will be inclined to approach this subject in a reasonable way; and if they do, I venture to think the committee I have suggested will be able to obtain a great deal of information of great value from the suggestions that will be offered them from both sides. I therefore beg to move the resolution, Mr. Speaker, which I have placed in your hands.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I did not expect that the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) would bring up his motion to-day. However, I am quite ready to answer at once the main arguments made by him. The hon. gentleman says that a committee is necessary to gather information concerning the strikes and lockouts that occur from time to time in the Dominion. In my opinion, the best means for obtaining that information is through the Department of Labour created by my predecessor in office, Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) reads, as I know he does, the 'Labour Gazette' every month, he knows that the department has a complete organization of correspondents in the industrial centres of the country, and that these correspondents send in, month by month, detailed information concerning the strikes and lockouts that occur throughout the Dominion. In the second place if he reads, as I know he does, the annual report of the Department of Labour, he knows that that report gives tabulated statements of all the strikes and lockouts that occur in Canada throughout the year. Let us take the report of the department for last year which was laid upon the table during the opening days of the present session. At page 79, he will find the be-

ginning of a chapter devoted to strikes and lockouts in Canada during the year ended June 30, 1906, with comparative statistics for the calendar years 1901 to 1905 inclusive. The information collected is most complete. The first table is one showing the magnitude of trade disputes during the fiscal year. Then we have a chart showing the number of trade disputes in Canada for each month during the fiscal year. Another table shows the total number of firms or establishments affected by trade disputes which began during the year. Then we have total number of work people involved in these trade disputes. Another tabulated statement shows the loss of working days occasioned by these strikes. This table shows that during the last fiscal year the loss of time due to trade disputes amounted, approximately, to 343,801 working days. A chart immediately following shows this loss month by month. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there are, on this continent, reports prepared more accurately or presented more minutely than those prepared by our officials of the Department of Labour. We have a table showing by provinces the trade disputes during the year, and another table showing these disputes by industries. Then there is a table showing the causes of trade disputes during the year. I find from this table that demands for higher wages were involved in 56 cases, in 44 of which it was the only cause. The next principal cause was objection to the employment of particular persons, and 17 strikes took place on this account. Of this number, 11 had reference to persons objected to as not being members of the union. Another table shows the methods of settlement of 116 disputes which were terminated during the year. Of these 55 were settled by negotiation between the parties concerned; 27 by the employment of other work people in the places of the strikers, and 19 by the resumption of work without negotiation. Five disputes were settled by conciliation, four being terminated by the friendly intervention of the Department of Labour. Then we have a table showing the results of trade disputes in Canada which terminated during the year; a table showing by industries and trades the number of industrial disputes that took place in the year; a table showing the causes of trade disputes in Canada from 1901 to 1905 inclusive; and a table showing the methods by which trade disputes during that time were settled. So that we have a most complete and elaborate statement prepared for us by our own officers, who are the most competent officers that can be found for such work. These statements give us the facts concerning the origin, the maintenance and the settlement of trade disputes in Canada.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will remember also that in the year 1902 a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the industrial disputes in the province of British Columbia. This commission was composed of His Honour Chief Justice Gordon Hunter, of British Columbia, chairman, Rev. Elliott S. Rowe, and Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, deputy minister of labour, secretary. This commission made a report which should be read by every member of this House. Not only did the commission inquire as to the troubles existing at the time in the coal mines in British Columbia, but it prepared a report with conclusions concerning the origin of strikes and industrial troubles existing in Canada, and especially in western Canada. Let me give a few of the headings of this report which was published in 1903:

1. Duties of employers and employees in regard to strikes.
2. Rights of employers and employees in regard to strikes.
3. Rights of union and non-union men.
4. Sympathetic strikes.
5. The strike for recognition.
6. Definition of rights and duties of unions needed.
7. International organizations.
8. Certain labour organizations not legitimate trade unions.
9. The Western Federation of Miners, the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees and the American Labour Union.
10. Incendiary and scurrilous literature.
11. The incorporation of unions.
12. The union label and the 'unfair' and the 'scab' list.
13. The boycott, intimidation and picketing.
14. Preventive measures by parties.
15. Preventive measures by the state.
16. Greater publicity.
17. Boards of conciliation.
18. Compulsory investigation.
19. Compulsory arbitration.
20. Labour leaders.
21. Interference of foreign officials.
22. Violation of contracts.
23. Blacklisting.
24. Hours of labour.

So we have in that report of the Royal Commission appointed by Sir William Mulock concerning the industrial disputes in the province of British Columbia, a complete and elaborate statement of the industrial troubles, especially in western Canada. My hon. friend spoke of the Conciliation Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, we must admit that the Conciliation Act answered the purposes of that time, it was the first step in the right direction. My hon. friend said, speaking of the Buckingham strike, that the Conciliation Act had proved useless in that case. Well, if he refers to the forty or fifty strikes which took place and which were settled under the Conciliation Act, he will revise his statement. He must remember that if it was found useless in the Buckingham strike it was because one of the parties to that dispute refused the intervention of the Labour Department and the intervention of the Conciliation Act. But the Conciliation Act proved very efficient in the Valleyfield strike, it proved

very efficient in the longshoremen's strike in Halifax.

Mr. BERGERON. In what way did it prove efficient ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Up till the last moment the parties would not accept conciliation, troops had to be called out, and after the troops were called out then the mediation of the department was requested, and a settlement was brought about in a very short time.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the settlement, does my hon. friend know?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not the details, but I know the strike was settled through the intervention of the Department of Labour. A similar result followed at the time of the Ste. Croix trouble in the county of Charlotte, N.B. I say again that if the Conciliation Act was ineffective in the case of the Buckingham strike, it was for the reason that one of the parties refused to accept the intervention of the Labour Department and the operation of the Conciliation Act. Now in regard to the telegraphers' strike and the operation of the Railway Labour Disputes Act, my hon. friend wanted to know if I was right in stating the other day that the strike of the telegraphers had been settled according to the award made. If I remember the facts aright, the question arose as to a minimum salary and three members were appointed to settle the difficulty under the Railway Labour Disputes Act. An investigation took place, an investigation which was compulsory and the award was made public; but although the settlement did not take place immediately after the award was published, and although the settlement was not effected in the very terms of the award, yet a settlement was effected because the award was made public, and because the company was forced by public opinion to make a settlement with the telegraphers' union. As I say, the settlement was not according to the terms of the award, but it was reached as a result of the award.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Conciliation Act introduced by Sir William Mulock was one step in the right direction; the Railway Labour Disputes Act was another step in the right direction, and I contend that the Bill which I presented to this House the other day is the next step to be adopted in the interest of both capital and labour in this country. I believe that it will answer all present purposes, it will satisfy public opinion; I am confident from the letters which I have received, and the encouragement which has been offered to me by both the press and the labour organizations in this country, that this Bill will satisfy public opinion.

My hon. friend spoke of the legislation in New Zealand, and I desire to thank him for the very elaborate study he made of the Acts in force in that colony. But he must not forget that in New Zealand as well as in Australia they have adopted radical legislation on many important topics, and that while such legislation may suit New Zealand or Australia, it might not suit Canada. As regards compulsory arbitration, which was advocated the other day by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the labour organizations, if I may speak on their behalf, are opposed to it in Canada. Since I introduced this Bill the other day I have met several labour leaders, among the gentlemen who are members of this House, and I may say that if they know whereof they speak, and I think they do, they are opposed to compulsory arbitration. I believe the labour congress which took place in Victoria in the month of September or October passed a resolution against compulsory arbitration. The Department of Labour is full of protests from labour organizations throughout Canada against compulsory arbitration.

Now, Sir, what are the chief features of the legislation which I have introduced? This may not be the proper time for me to enter into the explanations which should be given on the second reading, but after the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend, I am compelled now, it seems to me, to give the general features of that Bill. First of all, it will establish boards of conciliation, and pending the investigation which such boards will conduct, no strikes and no lockouts can be carried on. A penalty will be imposed on the parties if, during the investigation, they do not continue their operations as before.

Mr. BERGERON. Continue work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, continue work. First of all this Bill will apply to persons owning or operating any mining property, agency of transportation, or communication or public service utility, including railways whether operated by steam, electricity, or other motive power, steamships, telegraph and telephone lines, gas, electric light, water and power works.

Now by a section of the Bill—

It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lock-out, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation, or during the pendency of any proceedings in relation to such dispute before a board under the provisions of this Act.

In every case where a dispute has been referred to a board, until the dispute has been finally dealt with by the board, neither of the parties nor the employees affected shall, on account of the dispute, do or be concerned in doing, directly or indirectly, anything in the nature of a lock-out or strike, or a suspension or discontinuance of employment or work, but the relationship of employer and employee shall continue uninterrupted by the dispute or anything arising out of the dispute, but if in the opinion of the board either party shall

use this or any other provision of this Act for the purpose of unjustly maintaining a given condition of affairs through delay, and the board so report to the minister, such party shall be guilty of an offence, and liable to the same penalties as are imposed for a violation of the preceding section.

Mr. BOURASSA. That will not apply to all industries ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. To all industries declared to be public utilities, and there is a clause of the Bill which will permit the Governor in Council to specify certain industries as coming within the provisions of this Act. I shall read the clause, it is section 67 :

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, by notice in the 'Gazette' declare any specified industry to be an agency of transportation or communication or a public service utility, and such industry shall thereafter be deemed to be included in the provisions of this Act.

This is not the proper time for me to give an explanation to the House of the provisions of this Bill. All I meant to say was that we have proceeded wisely, I believe, in this country as regards industrial disputes, first of all by the creation of the Department of Labour, which was a wise creation, then by the establishment of the 'Labour Gazette,' giving the labour organizations, employers, and the public all the information required, then by the passing of the Conciliation Act, then by the passing of the Railway Labour Disputes Act, and now, this year, coming before parliament with a principle a little more radical than these, but yet conservative enough to be accepted by all wise men in this country. I therefore believe that, at the present time, with the information we have before us, with the reports of the Royal Commission of 1903, with the monthly reports which we receive from our correspondents from all parts of Canada and with the ample reports that are presented to this House by the Labour Department, it is quite unnecessary to appoint a committee of this House to take evidence in connection with this Bill. Such a committee would receive the views probably of some manufacturers who will be able to spare the time to come here and give information before that committee, but it might not receive information from the labour organizations who at this time of the year would perhaps not be ready to come before us and give us the information required by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden). I believe that the information contained in our reports and in the 'Labour Gazette' is quite sufficient to guide this House in the legislation which we contemplate presenting during the present session.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Mr. Speaker, I have followed closely the discussion upon the resolution now before the House calling for the appointment of a select committee of a certain number of members to study the different matters affecting labour troubles throughout the country. Much has been said about the information that we have in the 'Labour Gazette'. As one representing labour or any other element of citizens I claim that it is my right and the right of every member of the House to make a perfect study of the conditions of labour or any other conditions in my own riding. Any member doing that would then be in a position, without calling for a committee, to come before this House and ask to have legislation passed, and should be in a position to assist in framing legislation to meet the views of all concerned. In the 'Labour Gazette' and in the report of the Royal Commission which I read a year or so ago, most of the information necessary for any member of this House upon this subject is to be found. I have often stated publicly and I state here that the members of this House do not seem to care anything about the 'Labour Gazette' ; it is thrown under their desks here and I suppose when they are at home it is thrown on the street. I claim that it is now one of the most important documents issued by the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE. The 'Labour Gazette' is not studied. Everything is in it, labour troubles, strikes, labour conditions, &c., and if there are enough representative correspondents throughout the country they are in a position to give us exactly the information required. If there is labour trouble in my own riding for instance, I will not go to my next door neighbour and ask him to make an investigation, I will do it myself and I think that is what I am paid for. I am paid to represent all the elements, in my constituency and to make as close a study as possible of all troubles that may occur in my riding, and I claim we are all in duty bound to do exactly the same thing; not to wait until such time as the troops are called out in a case of labour trouble.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has plainly stated that he is going to bring a measure before the House this year, which will prevent strikes, and I am strongly in favour of that, because I have always advocated a closer connection between capital and labour, that is the only way in which we can avoid strikes. But, on the other hand, I know that the word strike is in the constitution of labour organizations and it will remain there as long as they are organized, because it may be some time the only plank of salvation to them, their only means of bettering their condition. If the members of this House will take the trouble to study the history of the strikes which have occurred in their own constituencies; if they study both sides of the question and not only one side, then they will be able to inform themselves on this question. It now seems as if this was going to be a regular labour session and I am proud of

it, and I know that the labouring people of this country are entirely satisfied that labour problems are to be discussed before this parliament. I am in a position to know something of the measure which the Minister of Labour proposes to introduce, but there is no use in discussing it until the Bill is placed in the hands of the members. I am strongly in favour of it, and I believe that when it is submitted we will see that there will be no necessity for a committee such as that proposed by the leader of the opposition. It may be said that we care nothing about expense in this parliament, but nevertheless I would like to know what would be the cost of such a committee as that proposed, and whether the labouring men who might appear before that committee as witnesses are to be paid their expenses and compensated for their loss of time in coming here. If not, then the large manufacturers and the mine-owners will come to Ottawa and place their case before such a committee, but the workingmen from distant parts of the Dominion can neither afford the time nor the money to come here. What I want is legislation. Give me bad legislation if you will, but give me legislation, for I would rather have bad legislation than no legislation at all; bad legislation we can amend, but if we have no legislation we cannot improve it. I prefer legislation to inquiry by committee. When the Bill of the Minister of Labour is submitted, I think that every member should be in a position to discuss its principles from his own knowledge of the labour condition in his constituency. I intend to discuss that Bill as fully as possible and I hope to do so in the interest of labour, in the interest of capital, and in the interest of the whole country at large. I trust the members of this House will get information from their constituents, and that they will come prepared to approve or disapprove of the principles embodied in the Bill when it comes up for a second reading. A reference has been made to compulsory arbitration. I may be personally in favour of compulsory arbitration, but I know that the labour people of this country are not in a position to accept that principle at the present time, and I think I am safe in saying that the manufacturers who hold seats in this House are not ready for it either. The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada is not ready now to accept compulsory arbitration although they are willing to accept something in that direction. I believe that the law to be presented by the Minister of Labour, will, under existing conditions, be better than compulsory arbitration, and if this government can succeed by legislation to bring about a closer union between employers and employees, then the government will have done a great deal towards stopping strikes throughout the country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to know whether the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Verville) is in favour of including industrial establishments in this Bill as well as public utilities; it would appear to me that the Bill does not extend quite far enough.

Mr. VERVILLE. We have only been discussing the resolution presented by the leader of the opposition, but when the Bill of the Minister of Labour comes before the House I shall express my opinion upon it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). The motion of the leader of the opposition, and especially his speech, is based on two very unreasonable assumptions. One of these is, that the present law affecting industrial conditions is useless, and the other is, that the Department of Labour created by this government for the purpose of collecting information which may lead to legislation has also been useful. As a matter of fact the legislation passed by this government for the settlement of labour disputes has been exceptionally successful. It has not only been successful in every instance where its interference has been called for, but through its influence it has had a beneficial effect in moulding the general disposition of the people of the country in favour of conciliation. What the Labour Department has been doing for seven years most successfully, the leader of the opposition proposes to do in a few days by a select committee of this House, which would neither have the time nor the opportunity to become seized of that information which the Labour Department has been for years collecting and publishing in its annual reports. If one takes the trouble to follow the results of the Conciliation Act, and if he be impartial, he will have to admit that that law has worked very successfully in Canada. Let me point out what it has done. In 1900-1901 there were five strikes in Canada involving 4,855 employees and these were all settled by the Labour Department. In 1901-2 there were eleven strikes in Canada involving 4,080 employees and these were all successfully settled under the administration of the Conciliation Act. In 1902-3 there were 13 strikes in Canada involving 7,555 employees, and these were all settled by the intervention of the Labour Department. In 1903-4 there were 4 strikes in Canada involving 964 employees and these all were settled by the Labour Department. In 1905 there was one strike involving 1,500 men in my own city of Nanaimo. and after four months of the strike it was settled by the application of this Act. In 1905-6 there were five strikes involving 974 men, and the application of this Act, which my hon. friend assumed was absolutely useless, resulted in the settlement of those strikes. In 1906-7 there has been one strike involving 600 men, which has been settled by the intervention of the department. In the six years the total number of strikes has been forty, involving 20,466 employees, and all

of these have been settled by the intervention of this department, and by the operation of this useless law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman answer two questions? One is: What proportion of the strikes in each year were settled by the intervention of the department, and the other is whether or not the efforts of Mr. Mackenzie King rather than any provision of the law were not the main cause of the settlement in every case? In other words, would not the same results have occurred if he had been authorized as deputy Minister of Labour to offer his services?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am simply stating the cases in which the services of the deputy minister were called for and given, showing that in every case he made a settlement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What percentage of the strikes in each year were settled?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Every one of the strikes I have mentioned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But what percentage of the total strikes that occurred?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman just now. I was looking up the favourable side of the question. Contrary to the disposition of my hon. friend, I was seeing what good things the department had done, while he was shutting his eyes to its practical benefits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not criticise the department, I criticised the legislation. Will the hon. gentleman point out one word of mine criticising Mr. Mackenzie King's efforts?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is difficult for me to discriminate between the right efforts of the department and the wrong administration of the law. Mr. King was successful in the administration of the law because he had a good law to administer, and because the proper machinery for the settlement of labour disputes was put into his hands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there should not be need of new legislation.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Certainly he could not have made these settlements if he had not the Conciliation Act behind him. In reference to the hon. gentleman's motion I wish to make a few remarks. I am opposed to that motion because I think its only tendency would be to postpone necessary legislation on this question. Already the Minister of Labour has given notice of a Bill, which is the outcome of investigation made by the deputy minister of the department, to introduce the principle of the compulsory investigation of trade disputes, which in my opinion is the next logical step to be taken in legislation of this character. This House must understand that there can be no method introduced in this country of compelling two parties to a dispute to resort to arbitration. Neither capital nor labour is disposed to be forced absolutely to abide by the decision of a board outside of any jurisdiction or control on the part of the business concerned. But the Bill which is before the House proposes to make compulsory an investigation into the facts of an industrial conflict. To this there can be no reasonable objection on the part of either the workmen or the employer. After such an investigation, both parties will be at perfect liberty to reject any agreement or decision that may be arrived at. There is nothing compulsory except the investigation into the facts. I am convinced that nothing could be more foolish than to attempt to introduce the principle of compulsory arbitration into this country at the present time. It is better to perfect the legislation which has thus far worked so well. The resolution of the hon. gentleman will tend to postpone legislation of this kind for another reason. My hon. friend's party has a history in dealing with matters of this kind. He will remember, if he has followed that history, that his own party appointed select committees years ago. In 1887 a royal commission was appointed by the Conservative party to consider the question of industrial strikes, and an Act was afterwards passed providing for the establishment of a bureau of information to use influences to bring about a settlement of such disputes. The appointment of that commission did good work for the election that immediately followed, because the fact was disseminated all over the country. The commission sat between that election and the election of 1891, and the report of the commission, which had been sitting for four or five years inquiring into the industrial question, did good work again in the election of 1891. Afterwards an Act was passed, which by the way was set aside in the revision of the statutes, as never having been applied and as being absolutely useless. That is the history of that royal commission, except that $80,000 of the people's money was spent upon it, and I am not aware that there is a detailed record in the departments of the expenditure of that money. When hon. gentlemen who have a history like that with regard to this question make a proposal to the House to again hand over to a select committee of this House the whole consideration of this question, in the very face of legislation being introduced on the subject, I cannot convince myself of the sincerity of the proposal. I have an impression that there is in this resolution a disposition to help out an organization of men in this country who have very unfavourable feelings towards organized labour. My hon. friend made reference to the Manufacturers' Association. Now, the Manufacturers'

Association has opposed every piece of industrial legislation that has been presented in this House for the amelioration of the industrial classes of this country, as well as every piece of legislation of the same kind that has been proposed in the provincial legislatures. If any one will read the record of the resolutions of this association, he will find that in every case it has had a committee appointed to investigate all legislation affecting the labouring interests in every province of this country. And if any one will look over the records of the Labour Department, he will find protests by such committees against every action by this government in seeking to bring about a better condition of things for the organized workingmen of this country. I am glad to know that, in spite of any influence exerted by that association, this government has enacted legislation which has been so far very successful and which I believe will be more successful in the future.

My next reason against the resolution is the last one I have to offer and in my mind the strongest. It is this, that the Labour Bureau which we established so many years ago has been actually accomplishing what my hon. friend proposed by his resolution. It is not possible for any seven men in this House to obtain in a short period the evidence which this department has already in its possession; and the legislation which my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) proposes is based upon the data and the evidence that has been collected by the Labour Bureau during many years. That is why I consider the resolution of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, altogether unnecessary and useless. Its only effect would be to postpone our consideration of this question. It could not give us any possible assistance in the way of obtaining data or information for the accomplishment of the purpose we all desire to see accomplished and which the Bill of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour is intended to secure. I have therefore drafted an amendment which, I think, the House would do well to carry, and which I believe the people of this country would be willing to support. I beg leave to move the following amendment:

That all the words after 'that' in the fifth line of the proposed resolution be struck out and the following substituted:

That whereas the Conciliation Act passed by parliament in 1900 and the Railway Labour Disputes Act passed in 1903 have aided in the prevention and settlement of disputes, it is desirable that the principle and application of these measures should be extended, with such additional provision, as experience has shown to be necessary, and that legislation for this purpose be introduced at the present session of parliament.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). I think, Mr. Speaker, that the last reason given by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), in opposition to the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, is probably the strongest that can appeal to this House against the motion proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. We may differ in opinion as to the practical results which have been achieved every year since the establishment of the Labour Department, but I hope that this question shall not be dealt with in a party spirit. Therefore I do not think it would be proper either to attack the government regarding what they have done so far, nor would I follow my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) in his retort regarding the failure of the Conservative party to do anything. For my part I wish to approach the question in a spirit entirely devoid of party feeling. I quite agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) that, at least as a means of gathering information, the Labour Bureau has proved much more successful than any committee of this House possibly could be. My own impression is that it would be practically impossible for a committee of this House to gather complete information as to the conditions of labour and capital in every part of the country. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) was not far astray when he said it would be impossible for the labouring people at large to give information to that committee because the labour organizations in distant parts of the country are not in a position to come to Ottawa and give evidence; whereas on the other hand the Manufacturers' Association and other large bodies of employers could much more easily reach that committee, and therefore the information received by it would not be complete and cover all sides of the question.

As regards the principle of arbitration, my views are quite radical. I am in favour of compulsory arbitration by legislative enactment as soon as public opinion will warrant it: It would be imprudent, I agree with my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith), to enforce by legislation the principle of compulsory arbitration so long as public opinion is not in favour of it. But it should be the duty of my hon. friends from Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) and of Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) to enlighten the labouring classes in favour of that principle, just as it should be the duty of the representatives in this House of the so-called more conservative classes to show these classes that in the principle of compulsory arbitration there is not such an amendment of radicalism and revolution as is supposed. The principle is after all nothing more nor less than the principle of arbitration enforced by our ordinary tribunals every day between private individuals. Whenever any citizen thinks his property or life is endangered by the action of another citizen, he has recourse to the courts. He takes a writ, either in the shape of a demand for money or of arrest to bring the offender before a criminal court. What else does that mean but that

he calls upon the courts to arbitrate compulsorily between the two. I quite admit that compulsory arbitration must go hand in hand with the legalization of labour unions, so that when we have a conflict between any railway company or other industrial corporation and any labour union, you will have a tribunal which will take cognizance of the dispute and enforce its judgment just as do the ordinary tribunals in cases of dispute between individual citizens. What is our criminal law but an interference with individual liberty, intended to enforce the principle that the liberty of any man ceases the moment his exercise of it injures his neighbour. We must come to the point when both employers and employees will understand that a stop must be put to the liberty of either to interfere unduly with the other to the detriment of either and the welfare of the community at large. It should be the duty of every one interested, not only in the welfare of the labouring community but in the prosperity of the employers, to enlighten public opinion on that question.

I must admit that it is not many years since the idea of compulsory arbitration had in it an appearance of socialism which frightened me. But the more I have studied it the more I have come to the conclusion that there is no more socialism in the principle of compulsory arbitration than there is in the organization, universal in civilized countries, of the civil and criminal law. And there is no doubt that the tendency of the age—and it will be more so for some years to come—is toward the abandonment by individuals of some of their individual liberties in order to be stronger as classes or associations. It may be for the good or for the detriment of nations, but whichever it may prove in the end, we must acknowledge that it is the tendency of the age. Capital unites ; it unites not only within the limits of each country, but it goes outside of the national limits to seek the aid of other masses of capital,, in order to be stronger, more effective, and, I may say, more domineering. As long as it is impossible to prevent capital going outside of the country to get help, it would be unjust for us to say to labour : You shall not go outside the country to seek assistance for the struggle. The moment the principle is adopted of forcing capital to remain within the country and not seek help outside, I am quite prepared to favour the idea of compelling labour unions to keep their organizations within the country.

I agree with the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) that what we need is not so much information as legislation. In principle, I am not in favour of too much legislation, I am deeply imbued with the old British tradition that there is always a danger in having too many laws. But while we now have information more than the proposal of the leader of the opposition would give, on the other hand we have not the legislation which is warranted by the information that is already before us as returned by the Labour Department. Therefore, in my opinion, our first step should be to enact some legislation to give effect to what we have already learned. I do not wish to discuss at all fully to-day the principles of the Bill which will be moved by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux). When it is before us for discussion, I shall be glad to give my opinion upon it. I think as the hon. minister does that it is a step in the right direction. I may say, even here, that, in my opinion, it does not go far enough. But I certainly prefer a short step in the right direction to no step at all ; and I am sure that the motion of the leader of the opposition, though moved in a good spirit, would not enable us to take any further step in the way of legislation than does the information that we already have. It may be that the present Bill does not go far enough, that it will not satisfy public opinion. But, as the hon. member for Maisonneuve pointed out, the main point is that the Bill is in the right direction. If, when enacted, it does not prove effective, it will come up for amendment as circumstances may require, just like the Conciliation Act, the amendment of which is not proposed. Being a very moderate man, I shall, perhaps, on this occasion as on so many others, be found half way between the two extremes, not agreeing either with the leader of the opposition who says that the Conciliation Act has done no good, or with the hon. member from Nanaimo who says it has done a great deal of good. Even though that Act may not have done the good expected of it, no doubt, the minister, in proposing legislation this year, desires to secure for his department power that will enable it to give the Act greater effectiveness. Reference was made by the leader of the opposition—at a time, when unfortunately, for me, I was absent—to the regrettable strike which took place at Buckingham, in the constituency which I represent. I shall take the liberty of bringing before the House, before very long, the circumstances of that strike, because of the not merely unworthy, but stupid and foolish attacks that some organs supporting the government have made against me. I will give the details of that unfortunate affair, because I think it is one illustration of what is lacking in our present law as rightly stated by the leader of the opposition. But I cannot agree with the leader of the opposition that because the present law did not work out in Buckingham, therefore it is bad. I am not in a position to state that public opinion in this country would warrant legislation which would have prevented such an unfortunate affair as the strike at Buckingham. Nothing short of compulsory arbitration pure and simple, with the means of

forcing both parties to appear before a tribunal and to submit to the award of that tribunal, could have prevented that unfortunate affair. The Labour Department made every effort it could in the direction of conciliation. I tried the same in my own private, humble capacity, even though I may not have done it in such a way as to win the applause of the newspapers—though I must say I do not care for the applause of the newspapers whether Liberal or Conservative. I used the best and most practicable means in my power for conciliation. Steps in the same direction were taken by others—the work was not confined to the efforts put forth by the Department of Labour or by myself. I may say, without undue vanity, that my efforts were of some weight under the circumstances, and with the people who were concerned on either side; for it happened—and I am happy to state it—that I was then, as I am now, in good relations with both the firm that employed the men and with the men who were at the head of the labour organization. And I think that, if by conciliation, it had been possible to settle that strike, either the Department of Labour or myself woud have succeeded. But I repeat that such an unfortunate event as that which occurred in Buckingham could not have been prevented unless we had had on the statute-book a complete and radical compulsory arbitration law.

Is the leader of the opposition prepared to state that public opinion is ready for such a law? I am in favour of a compulsory arbitration law and am ready to vote for it this session. And, not only that, but, when it is adopted, I am ready to do my best, as a public man, to make it acceptable to the people of Canada. But, in a British community it is not safe, it is not in the interest of the public at large, to go in advance of public opinion in the enactment even of the best of laws. When we see that those who are directly interested in compulsory arbitration, the large employers of our country, as well as most of the labour men who would reap the greatest benefits from it, are opposed to such a law, can we expect that the general public sentiment of this country would warrant the enactment of the law? I say they are opposed because, unfortunately, the great organs of public opinion, newspapers as well as public men, in this country, have unduly scared public opinion in reference to compulsory arbitration. But whatever the cause may be, public opinion is not prepared for such a law; and it would be wrong, even if the whole body of parliament were convinced of the goodness of it, to adopt such a law before public opinion is prepared for it. If on both sides of this House there are men of good will who wish to bring about an understanding between capital and labour in this country, men who wish to really form public opinion, an appeal must be made to that large class that must settle all disputes and put force behind all law. It is to that class we must appeal, it is that class we must educate. Once that class has well understood the principle, I am convinced that the time will then be ripe for adopting compulsory arbitration; but until it has, I am afraid it will not only be a wrong step to do so, but will defeat the very object we have in view.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). There seems to be no difference of opinion between hon. members that it is most important to public interests in this country that something should be done by legislation to make more effective our present legislation for the prevention and settlement of disputes between employees and employers. Both sides of the House seem to be unanimous on that subject. The whole matter is a question of common sense and procedure. My hon. friend from Nanaimo thinks the Conservative party is insincere to-day, because the Conservative party of 1886 did something that does not meet with his approval. I suppose there are some people who think that the Liberal party, who have lately made considerable changes in their tariff policy are perhaps not so sincere to-day as some of them would like to be thought. But that sort of argument leads to nothing. Public men must deal with public questions as they arise. It is the right of every public man and of every great party to take from time to time a different view, possibly, from what they took on some other occasion in reference to a public matter. There is, however, no radical difference of opinion between the members of this House as to the necessity of further legislation. That certainly is a very important point for us to consider. Now, another objection raised by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) was that this committee might delay matters. I can assure the hon. member that if I thought the appointment of a committee would in any way delay the passing of legislation this session, I would vote against this resolution. But I have no such opinion. The other suggestion made by the hon. gentleman is that he has all the information necessary, or can get it from his constituents, or can get it from the Labour Bureau. Well, there are gentlemen in this House who are not representatives of labour, nor representatives of manufacturers, nor representatives of capital, but who represent other great interests to be affected by any legislation that may be passed. For instance, suppose a question arises in the west where coal mines are shut down. It is not in a particular instance the owner of a mine or the workingman who is suffering most, but it is the large mass of the population who are left to freeze while these gentlemen fight out their disputes. There is therefore an enormous class of people outside the labour and manufacturing classes who are inter-

ested in this legislation, a legislation which is exceedingly important in the interest of the whole country rather than of any particular class. Now, I would be opposed to this committee if I thought the manufacturers were going to be the only ones who would be able to present their case, or present their case fairly. So far as I may have anything to do with this matter, I want to see every interest, every side fairly presented and considered by fair-minded men. Now, the government have the appointment of the nine men on this committee, and there can be no reason for delay. You can get information from British Columbia in five days. The question is whether the matter is of sufficient public importance to have a committee appointed, or whether we have now sufficient knowledge without this committee. We have heard a great deal of laudation of the Labour Bureau, and I hope everything that has been said of it is true. But even if it be true, it does not follow that because certain correspondents appointed by the government have sent information to the Labour Bureau, that bureau has all the information desirable. But if nine men are appointed by this House to deal with this matter, and the bureau has all the information, then that committee can at once obtain the information and report it to the House. But it is the opinion of the leader of the opposition and other gentlemen that the Labour Bureau has not all the information required, and that it would be proper and right for further information to be obtained and considered in connection with this pending legislation. For that reason, I for one, would be glad to get light from all quarters where it can be obtained in regard to a public question of so great importance, and I will therefore favour the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. An amendment has been made to this original motion. I intended to say something on the original motion, but as it is now five minutes to six, it is perhaps as well to adjourn the debate until we can have another opportunity to take it up.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Six o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will the government take up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up the tariff resolutions to-morrow, which is government day under the new rules.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOL.

WAYS AND MEANS—DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before the House goes into committee, I call the attention of the government to the fact that the following reports, so far as I am able to ascertain, have not yet been brought down, namely the Civil Service List; report of the Department of Trade and Commerce; report of the Auditor General (volumes 1 and 2); report of the Minister of Justice; report of the Minister of Public Works; report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; report of the Militia Council; report on the Adulteration of Food; Insurance Abstract; Chartered Banks and List of Shareholders; report on the Royal Northwest Mounted Police; report of Unclaimed Balances in Banks; re port of the Department of Printing and Stationery; report of the Secretary of State. These reports have been overdue for some time and among the most important of them is the report of the Auditor General (volumes 1 and 2). When are these reports likely to be laid on the table.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The information I have received is, that the report of the Department of Justice is complete and will be out early next week; the Civil Service List will be out early next week; the Trade and Commerce report is complete except the index which is in proof; the Geological Survey Report is nearly complete but the quantity ordered is large and it will take some time; the Printing Bureau is working on the report of the Minister of Marine but there is none of it yet in page form; reading of the proofs of the report of the Department of Public Works will be finished this week, a copy of the index will be probably received to-morrow and the report proceeded with without delay; as to the Auditor General's Report which is most important, the next part of it to be issued is volume 1 the copy for which is not all completed yet, the preliminary portion of parts (a) and (b) have not yet come in; the Mounted Police Report is a report for the calendar year ending 31st December and the proofs of that report are going out rapidly and its publication will have all possible despatch. That is all the information I have at this moment.

HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I inquire whether the Prime Minister has anything to announce to the House with regard to the position of Mr. Hyman as a member of the House or as a member of the cabinet. It is nearly two months since we had the announcement made by Mr. Speaker that

there had been an informal resignation, and the announcement by the Prime Minister that Mr. Hyman had tendered his resignation as a member of the cabinet, but that it had not been officially communicated to His Excellency the Governor General. After that we learned through the Prime Minister of the somewhat serious illness of Mr. Hyman. As to Mr. Hyman's resignation as a member of the House it is of course a very simple matter. If his intention is to resign it simply requires a declaration of intention executed in the presence of two witnesses. As to Mr. Hyman's position as a member of the cabinet we should know at the earliest possible moment what the intention of the Prime Minister is with regard to that. The present condition is very unsatisfactory and while it may be unadvoidable yet it is incumbent on us to make inquiry and to receive an answer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform my hon. friend and the House that since we separated some three weeks ago I have received no communication whatever from Mr. Hyman himself. I have received a communication from a person very near to him and I am sorry to have to say that the report as to his condition is very unfavourable indeed. The condition of Mr. Hyman is serious ; it is not without hope, however, and under such circumstances the House will certainly allow some further delay.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). I desire to call the attention of the government to the position of Bill (No. 5), a public Bill which passed its second reading thirteen days before we adjourned for the holidays, and which, at the instance of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), was sent to a special committee of this House. I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his place, as I wish to bring to his attention the fact that that committee has not yet met, and that if there is any further delay it will be interfered with by the standing committees which will very shortly begin their work. If the committee on this Bill were to meet at once, it might possibly get through with its work in a few days and thus not be interfered with by the other committees. I hope that the hon. First Minister will see that the committee is called at once as it is very important that this Bill should be dealt with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall call the attention of my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), on the first opportunity, to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. These resolutions when last before the committee were dealt with clause by clause and disposed of, with the qualification, however, that several suggestions which had been offered as to the wording might properly receive consideration. I have here several verbal amendments to the resolutions, not affecting their purpose, but carrying out their intentions. I am not now speaking of amendments to the tariff items, but to the resolutions. In resolution 1 the question was raised whether the language of the section applying the dumping clause to free goods as well as dutiabe goods, was quite sufficient for the purpose. To make assurance doubly sure, I propose to add at the end of section 5, on page 66 of the 'Votes and Proceedings,' where it provides that a special duty shall be imposed—I propose to add after the word 'consumption' the following words:

> And such special or dumping duty shall be levied and collected and paid on such articles although it is not otherwise dutiable.

That is the end of subsection 5 of resolution 1.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have always understood that all or nearly all the goods which are admitted free are supposed to be entered for the benefit either of the consumer or the manufacturer. In the latter case they compose to a large extent the raw material of the manufacturer. I do not see, therefore, what objection there can be to our importing them even at prices below the usual rates. What advantage can it be to the consumer or the manufacturer to apply the dumping clause when these goods, under special circumstances, come in at lower prices than usual.

Mr. FIELDING. Unless the article that is imported free of duty is of a class or kind which comes into competition with something made in Canada, the dumping clause would not apply. A number of things were put on the free list in days gone by, but which are nevertheless also manufactured in Canada. To transfer these to the dutiable list would cause some hardship and be resented as objectionable policy by many people. I suppose that those hon. gentlemen who take strong views in favour of a high tariff would not object, but even some of them might not be willing to have these non-dutiable articles transferred to the dutiable list. Take, for instance, the item of cream separators, very important to our farmers. That item has been on the free list some years, but nevertheless cream separators are manufactured in Canada and the Canadian manufacturer has to compete with the whole world. But a case was brought to our notice in which it was quite clear that a foreign manufacturer had cut his prices down to such a point that the evident intention was to close up the Canadian industry. Such a case should come under the dumping clause. Of course it may be argued that the proper remedy would be to impose a stiff duty. Well, that would no doubt excite a good deal of hostile criti-

cism, and in our judgment we do not think it advisable to transfer these articles to the dutiable list. But it will be admitted that if the Canadian manufacturer has to face the competition of the world, he ought not to be compelled to suffer the illegitimate competition I have indicated. I have given that instance as an illustration but other cases might arise. The object of the dumping duty has been accepted on both sides though of course there are differences of opinion as to the manner of its application. But the principle has been accepted that when foreign articles are sold below a fair reasonable price, with the sole object of crushing out some home industry, then the dumping duty should be applied. If that principle be a sound one as applied to articles on the dutiable list it is still more applicable to articles on the free list, because in the former case the home manufacturer has some protection while in the other he has none at all. Once we accept the principle of the dumping duty, it must be admitted that it ought to apply to free goods in cases where similar goods are made in Canada and the prices of the foreign articles are cut down for the express purpose of crushing out some Canadian industry.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not quite agree with the minister that the dumping clause would apply with more reason to articles on the free list than to dutiable articles. Duties are imposed such as the parliament of Canada thinks are necessary for the protection of certain manufacturers. Articles on the free list are of two classes; either they are imported free for the sole benefit of the consumers, or they are imported free as raw materials for the manufacturer. If it is a case of raw material imported by the manufacturer, there is no advantage either to him or to the consumer in charging that article with the dumping clause in case it comes in at a very low price. Both the manufacturer and the consumer will be the gainers if the material comes in at a very cheap price. If on the contrary it is some article, either of natural produce or manufactured, which has been placed on the free list because this parliament thinks that the interest of the consumer in getting that article free of duty is greater than the interest of the manufacturer who may take the risk of manufacturing such a product in Canada, then I say we should not take into account the protection to the manufacturer. The Minister of Finance says that when the dumping clause applies to dutiable goods the manufacturer has some protection; and therefore that the same principle should apply to the case of the manufacturer. To that, I cannot agree; because, in the first instance, we have, by an artificial means, given some sort of a guarantee to that manufacturer that he should be protected upon that special article. Therefore we must follow up our principle. If we mean, under ordinary circumstances, to protect the manufacturer by a duty of 25 per cent, then we must make up the deficiency in case of a combine of outside manufacturers trying to overcome that duty, and I understand the dumping clause is introduced for that purpose. But in the instance which the minister has cited, and that would apply to other cases, namely, that of cream separators, it has been judged by the parliament of Canada that the interest of the farmer is greater than the interest of the manufacturer. That article has been put upon the free list in order that the farmer might get it free of all charges levied by this government, and the manufacturer has not been given any protection upon it. If we put the manufacturer under free competition, he must be prepared to accept free competition all along the line, whether under ordinary prices or not. I do not think it is fair, I do not think the manufacturer is entitled in that case to any special protection, still less to any accidental protection, since his industry has not been placed under the ordinary scale of duties adopted by parliament for the general protection of manufacturers who might benefit by it. Therefore I cannot entirely agree with that part of the resolution, and to my mind it would have been more consistent with the policy of the government and of parliament to keep the dumping duty as it was under the old tariff, and to apply it only upon goods upon which the manufacturers have all along expected a certain protection. As to the farmers of this country, I may say that I am not speaking here as a free trader, everybody knows what my views are upon tariff matters. I was a moderate protectionist even before this government were converted to protection. But I do not want to go too far in that line, I want to remain what I have been, a moderate protectionist, that is, I want to keep some degree of protection for those industries which we think are entitled to protection, or are in need of it. But I do not wish to see introduced into our tariff the idea that because some of those manufacturers, who I do not think are entitled to protection, are now operating under a free tariff, they are therefore entitled to some protection at certain periods; because that would lead them to expect permanent protection later on. I am afraid that, leaving the principle of free trade, even this government might go further to the practice of high protection, where I am not ready to follow them.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the minister one question to make this clear. I suppose that under section 5 this dumping duty would not apply to any free goods of a class or kind raised in Canada provided they were raw material; that is, it would not apply to natural products?

Mr. FIELDING. Raw material is an expression not easily defined, I do not think any case could arise as respects raw materials

in the true sense of the word, but anything which is made in Canada would come under the operation.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it apply to articles or produce of any kind that we call natural ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have no case of the kind. It is possibly open to debate, and I should be inclined to think that if the object is sound in one line it is equally sound in the other. If it should become a question of legal interpretation, everything would turn upon the meaning of the phrase 'made in Canada.' While the dumping is likely to arise chiefly in the line of manufactured goods, I would almost think that if it should be found to arise in some other line, that line could be brought within the four corners of this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. That, I think, ought to be made sufficiently clear. I admit that the word 'made' is too inclusive. You could hardly say that we make wheat, or make wool, or make barley, or make the natural produce of this country. These are natural products, we grow them, or we produce them, but we do not make them. The idea of making implies handiwork or machine work of some kind, and I would take it that under this clause you would not be able to apply the dumping arrangement at all to natural products. For instance, if people ship grain at greatly reduced prices below the price in the country from which they export it, and this came into competition with the grain of this country, you would not be able to apply the dumping clause to that. The same remark applies to any other raw material which is in actual product.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to the point. I would certainly understand that the principle of the dumping clause, if a sound one, would include the one class of articles as well as the other. Since my hon. friend has mentioned it, one of the officials has pointed out to me that these words were in the original dumping clause. I shall see that the new clause corresponds in that respect with the old one. I think the point is well taken. 'Made or produced in Canada' would be the proper phrase, put into the first line. That would make it correspond with the tariff as it has been.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the minister say what are the means of finding out the selling price of an article in a foreign country ; what machinery is at the disposal of the Minister of Customs to find out whether a price is a proper one or not ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has asked me a question which would apply not merely to these transactions, but to the whole customs tariff ever since we have had a customs tariff.

Mr. BERGERON. But I refer more particularly to this dumping clause.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no greater difficulty in this than in any other case, in which the fair market value is made the basis of the duty. Dumping clause or no dumping clause, the officials have to be very vigilant. And they have to adopt many methods to find out what the fair market value is. We have the benefit, of course, in the principal ports of experts who are able, from personal knowledge and experience in trade to ascertain the fair market value of goods. The commercial journals give us some help. Sometimes we have to send agents abroad in order to ascertain the facts. But, as I say, that is not new, it has been a feature of the tariff for many years ; and I cannot imagine any tariff law which would not require these words.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the effect of this clause upon one particular class of goods in which my hon. friend from East Peterborough (Mr. Findlay) may, perhaps, be interested. Item 502 of the tariff reads as follows :

> Felloes of hickory or oak not further manufactured than rough sawn or bent to shape.

These goods are on the free list to-day, or are imported free for the purposes of wheel manufacturers who do not bend their own goods. But there are several factories in Canada bending these goods. How will these concerns be affected by this clause? As I say, these goods are manufactured in Canada, some out of our own timber—but we have very little timber in the country now to make them from—and some direct from imported timber, or partially manufactured by being bent.

Mr. FIELDING. These goods would certainly be subject to the dumping duty. If these goods are brought in from abroad under the conditions contemplated by the dumping clause, they would have to pay that duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred to cream separators as an example of the subject now before the committee. I have been wondering whether the minister had any information to show that cream separators were being dumped in this country under their real value. This is a subject that I have had some occasion to make inquiry about, and the result of that inquiry has been to leave me under the impression that the Canadian manufacturer was meeting the demands of the pepole at as low a price as that asked for the imported machine. In fact, to my mind, this is a case like those of barbed wire, binder twine and other articles, the facts going to prove that putting the article on the free list does not practically give the consumer the article at a lower price. I have had occasion to compare the price charged by the cream separator at Guelph and possibly some other factories in this country with that charged

on the cream separator for New Jersey, and I am told, that, practically, value for value, the price in the one case is as low as in the other. I have no doubt that the cream separator manufacturers in Canada have been obliged to work at a disadvantage by reason of the competition of other countries. This is one of the anomalies in our very anomalous tariff. I never could understand why cream separators were put on the free list any more than the plough or the farm wagon which also the farmer must use. I have always supposed that the real object was to give the Minister of Agriculture an opportunity, when he happens to be at a farmers meeting and has to listen to complaints about the tariff, to shout that cream separators are on the free list; and he would shout it so loud that he would drown and silence the demand of the farmers for cheaper agricultural implements. Certainly, it is a peculiar thing that one article should be singled out from the others for this kind of treatment. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing if the Canadian industry were crushed out. It employs a good many men, and is just as much entitled to the paternal care of the government as any other. I am not going to raise the question whether it should receive the benefit of a protective duty or not. Under the former government the bowl used in the separator was put on the free list, because it was not manufactured in this country; but when this government came into power they put the whole machine on the free list. It appears that now the government are beginning to reap the reward of their mistake. They do not like to admit that they were wrong in putting these cream separators on the free list and to ask directly that they be put on the list of dutiable articles, but they go at it by a roundabout way by bringing them under the dumping clause, which will subject them to a high tax, perhaps higher than would be levied upon them if they were added to the dutiable list. Perhaps the Minister of Finance can tell me whether there is any danger of dumping in this particular case or whether cream separators have actually been dumped into Canada. I have no doubt that the Canadian manufacturer has been meeting the demands of the people, though at a disadvantage. And my own opinion is that if the article were made dutiable, the people of this country would get a cheaper cream separator. It is quite evident that if the Canadian manufacturer has to send an agent through the country to sell cream separators he must pay that agent enough to cover his salary and expenses. If the agent, instead of selling two or three cream separators a day, can sell only one a day, the expense of distribution in this respect is greater. If the agent could increase his sales, it would be quite possible to sell the machine at $5 or $10 less with equal profit to the manufacturer. I think that a very decided mistake has been made in this case; but I am not going to ask the minister to go back on his anomalous tariff, for if we were to attempt to correct the anomalies in this tariff, we should stay here until June and do nothing else but work at the rectification of these anomalies.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I should not be justified in regarding this item as one upon which I could enter upon a protracted discussion of the effect of putting articles on the free list. I know that the hon. gentleman thinks that you do not make an article cheaper to the consumer by putting it on the free list. But I would like to remind him that, of all the delegations of farmers that have come before the tariff commission, not one of them has asked to have cream separators, binder twine or barbed wire made dutiable. Therefore, whether the hon. gentleman is or is not right in his belief that putting an article on the dutiable list cheapens it to the consumers, it is his misfortune not to agree with the farmers on that question. As to the other point referred to by the hon. gentleman—the question whether there is real danger of dumping in this class of goods—I do not know how the matter stands at this moment, but not long ago, we had information which made it absolutely clear that a combination had been formed on the other side of the border by people largely interested in the manufacture of this article and that they were dumping—to use the word which has been coined and which we have put into the tariff—at prices much below the actual cost. Undoubtedly if they could continue to do that for a long time, they would close up all our factories making these goods. Of course, the argument might fairly be used that in that case our people would get the article at a cheaper price. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) will probably agree with me in what I am about to say—that the people who carry on this system of dumping do not do it with the benevolent attention of helping the Canadian farmer. They have a selfish end in view and so soon as they had closed up the factories in Canada making these articles undoubtedly the price would immediately go up and so the farmer would not be benefited by such competition.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a good protection principle.

Mr. FIELDING. It is good protection principle. There are some kinds of protection which are very good. I am quite prepared to recognize a good thing when I see it under any name. The case of cream separators is a good illustration of the difficulty which has been brought to our notice in this regard and we have an illustration of same thing which might happen in any other line.

Mr. HENDERSON. What the hon. minister said may be satisfactory to himself,

but I do not think it will be satisfactory to the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Finance remembers that his colleague the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) attempted to cast all kinds of ridicule upon the principles which he has just now been enunciating, and that he did this in speeches made in the House in 1902, 1903 and 1904. I would like very much to have the opinion of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce upon the argument which his colleagues has presented to the House, because when it was put forward from this side of the House at that time it was ridiculed in the most caustic manner not only by the Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, but by the chief government organ in Ontario, the Toronto 'Globe.' Both the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and this organ of the government referred to the fact that there were some Canadians so absolutely unpatriotic and lost to all sense of public duty that they would insist upon buying goods at unreasonably low prices when brought into this country. However, it is extremely satisfactory to know that certain views put forward from this side of the House seem to have obtained very much more approval on the part of the hon. Minister of Finance than they did at that time.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a sign of conversion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Beauharnois has referred to the conversion of the government, but I do not propose to allude to it. It is too sacred a matter to be trifled with. Let me ask the minister, however, as to the ground upon which free goods are brought within the scope of this resolution. The minister has referred to cream separators. He is giving that as one illustration. I would like to know whether the government are satisfied that dumping did take place with regard to that article, and whether there are any other articles which the government have in mind in making this change. I think we are entitled to know whether any information came before the commission at the hearings when, I think, the Minister of Finance was a member. We have not had very much opportunity of ascertaining what information was really obtained by that commission except in so far as we were able to gather it in the public press from day to day, and the minister will realize, of course, that that is sometimes not very satisfactory. I have no doubt that the information which was obtained by means of the commission which spent some months in the investigation has been tabulated and that the government in making this revision of the tariff have, to some extent, at least acted upon that information. Would the Minister of Finance be good enough to tell us what was disclosed by the evidence received by the commission in regard to this particular matter and especially whether there are any other articles than that to which he has alluded in respect to which there might be dumping?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the pleasure of remembering the speeches of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. BERGERON. You will find them in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but I do not think it would be very profitable if we were to inquire too closely into what we have all said on both sides of the House in the past on the tariff question.

An hon. MEMBER. You had better forget it.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, there are others; we are not the only pebbles on the beach. In regard to the other question, I have no particular recollection of the dumping clause being the subject of special reference in the hearings before the commission. I cannot recollect any particular case. The matters came up most prominently some time ago in connection with the cream separator business, but there is a principle involved and if it might arise in the case of cream separators it might arise in regard to other classes of goods. If the principle is sound in one case it ought to be sound in the other. I cannot recall any particular representation that was made to us at the moment, but there is a principle running through the whole thing which I think would naturally suggest itself to anybody called upon to deal with the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say to the hon. minister that I think it would be convenient when we get to the items of the tariff, that he should be able to give us —in respect to the principal items at least,— any that would be likely to invite discussion —the results of the investigation. I have no doubt the government have tabulated the evidence. We have had no opportunity of doing so. The evidence has not been printed. I merely mention it in advance to ascertain if the minister has any tabulation of the evidence.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am afraid there is no such tabulation. Of course, the information has been laid before the House, but I quite realize that hon. gentlemen may not find it very valuable. It is open to them if they wish to avail themselves of it. We can only give our general judgment drawn from it but we cannot give the House information on every item of tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought there would be a tabulation made of the result of the inquiry in regard to the leading items at least. I presume the revision of the tariff was based to some extent at least on the information acquired by the commission

on that investigation. Of course, if I am mistaken in that, if the government have not paid sufficient attention to the evidence in the obtaining of which so many months were occupied or tabulated it, I suppose it is our misfortune and we will have to trust to this general impression. I had supposed that it was otherwise.

Mr. FIELDING. We cannot on every item of the tariff produce a statement of the information that was received on that particular item. That would be utterly impossible. We can only in a general way state our judgment upon it.

Mr. BARR. Under these circumstances I would like to ask the hon. minister if there was any demand from the deputations which came down here for this legislation? I think the whole tenor of the representations of the delegates that came down here was in an opposite direction, and it seems to me, that, in so far as those representing the farming community are aware, this is the direct opposite of what they require. Take this one item under discussion which has been brought up as an illustration. The cream separator is an article of the greatest possible importance to the farming community. They have regarded the fact that cream separators were on the free list favorably and the result is that we have had competition from the other side of the border by reason of cream separators having been brought over here and they have been sold cheaper than they otherwise would have been if there had been a heavy duty.

The result of extending this resolution to farm implements and in fact to all those articles particularly required by the farmers would be that the agents of these firms could not come over here and sell these at a price because they would not know whether the government might not step in and apply the dumping clause and raise the price. Therefore I think the farmers of this country will rather look upon this with alarm. I think they will find it is driving in the thin end of the wedge to bring about protection on what the farmers require, and while there is no doubt the farming community is favourable to adequate protection, they are not favourable to protection upon those things which they have always had free and which they have always maintained it was to the best interest of the farming community to have free. Take for instance not only separators but many other things to which this might apply, even agricultural products, coming into this country at certain times. The dumping clause could apply to that at times when potatoes or corn were being imported when there was a deficiency, and there is no reason why it should be applied to these articles and therefore I think we are mixing and muddling this tariff to an extent that it never was before. So far as the dumping clause is concerned, it is like all others, it is an uncertain quantity and its effect we cannot exactly foresee and those doing business in the country find that they are unable to know just what the duty on importations will be and what they will have to pay or the result of this legislation.

Mr. MILLER. In reference to the matter of cream separators I am sorry I cannot give the name of the particular American manufacturing company, but I remember a few months ago that a company manufacturing cream separators in western Ontario complained very bitterly that a certain firm of American manufacturers were flooding the Canadian market with machines at very much lower prices than they were selling at on the American side. The government appear to have arrived at the conclusion that our manufacturers of cream separators could compete against the legitimate competition of American manufacturers. I do not know that the manufacturers of cream separators in Canada have made any very strong request for the placing of a duty on cream separators, under ordinary circumstances, and I am sure that the farmers of this country will prefer that there be no duty imposed, but it seems to me in reference to what the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has said that it may be a very proper thing to leave the manufacturers to compete as best they can, believing that they can profitably manufacture in competition with Americans giving them a fair competition; but to protect our manufacturers against an unfair competition where Americain makers are slaughtering prices is quite another and a different matter. The firm of western Ontario manufacturers of cream separators to which I have referred have a representative in this city, and if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) desire any information as to whether it had been true or not that our manufacturers have been subjected to any slaughtering of their goods by American manufacturers in our markets, the figures and the facts can very readily and easily be obtained.

Mr. ALCORN. Would the minister inform the House whether cream separators enter the United States from Canada free and if not what the American duty is ?

Mr. FIELDING. They are dutiable but the officers cannot find the item. I think it comes under unenumerated, and bears a heavy duty in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that he have a clerk take this tariff as it is and note against it, for the minister's own purposes, the United States duty. That question will be asked on almost every item and it is not difficult in most of these to place the equivalent United States duty. Then

the minister will have it at hand and can answer questions at once.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot agree with that suggestion. I am very happy to get the information in any given case, but I cannot see it has very much to with this. No matter what the duty in the United States it has no effect as far as the merits of this tariff are concerned, and therefore I would not like to furnish the information in the manner described, but I shall be happy at any moment to get the information desired on any item.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister can please himself in reference to that. My suggestion is simply that it will facilitate business. When any member wants to get the United States tariff on any item, I fancy the item will not go through until the information has been furnished.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not desire to be discourteous, but every member has the same facilities to get that information as we have.

Mr. FOSTER. The government is there to get information.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is appropriate, but if my hon. friend wants information that I think is not appropriate, we will not be able to give it to him.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will permit me to have some judgment as to what is pertinent.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly; I did not say 'pertinent.'

Mr. FOSTER. It is the government and not the members of the House who recommend this tariff ; the tariff is submitted for the approval of the House and the humblest member of this House has a perfect right on any item to ask for the United States duty on a similar item, and all I suggest is that it will be a convenience to the minister to be prepared with that information and not to have to wait as he has had to do in this instance. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) must not run away with the idea that he is going to put this tariff through without answering proper questions or that he is the sole judge of what questions are proper. He must allow each member to be the judge himself of what he thinks is a pertinent question.

Mr. FIELDING. And I strongly advise my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) not to run away with any opinion that he has authority to speak for the House. My hon. friend says that the House wants this and the House wants that and the House has a right to demand all that. I admit the right of the House but I do not admit the right of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to speak for the House. There is no more reason why I should have information in regard to the tariff of the United States than in regard to the tariff of Brazil or any of the republics.

Mr. FOSTER. If we want them—

Mr. FIELDING. And if my hon. friend wants any information on any item as to what the tariffs of the world are on that item I would regret to have to decline to give him the information, but I rather think I would have to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) will just remember this that though I cannot speak for the House I can for myself. I put it in the least personal way because I suppose every member of the House will have the same rights as I have myself and all independent members, I am sure, will go as far as I go in asking that those rights for information be respected. I had no thought at all except the convenience of the minister. If the minister wishes to take the thorniest road and the most inconvenient path, that is for himself.

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) I do not want the thorniest path. I want the most convenient, but not to accede to any unreasonable demands for information that has no proper bearing on the question, in my judgment. I cannot agree that it is the duty of the government to bring forward opposite every item a statement of the tariff in every country in the world, on that subject. If information is asked for on any subject we will do the best we can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) seems to be a little nervous.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I am.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly, whether I desire information with regard to Brazil or not, we should be entitled to it in regard to countries with which we do a large trade, and the whole basis of the minister's proposals with regard to the intermediate tariff was the tariff of other countries as applied to us. We are not to be allowed to ask what the tariffs of other countries against Canada are, although the whole basis of the tariff policy of the government, as far as that aspect is concerned, is in that connection. I venture to think that on reconsideration the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will come to the conclusion that having regard to his own statement of policy these questions would be relevant in so far at least as concerns countries with which we have large trade relations, and it was no more than that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see what more I can do in that connection than place on the table of the House copies of the tariffs of various countries—I presume they are

available in the Customs Department—and place in the possession of the hon. members the tariffs they ask for. I think that is all we can reasonably be expected to do. I do not think it is reasonable to ask that a detailed statement should be prepared from the tariff of the United States with regard to every one of these items.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not suggest that, I merely suggested what I thought would be a convenience to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Customs. For instance, a question was asked and the Minister attempted to reply to it, thus showing it was a reasonable question.

Mr. FIELDING. I sometimes reply to unreasonable questions.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister was asked what the United States duty on cream separators was and he sought the information from his clerk, and I thought it would facilitate business if there was a statement to which he or the Minister of Customs could refer at once and give the information. I do not agree with the idea that all the minister has to do to pass this tariff is to put the tariffs of the different countries on the table of the House and tell the members to rummage through them if they want information. The minister will find before he gets through with this tariff that if we think any information is pertinent to the question before the House, it will be his duty to give that information.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I may truthfully say that it is not my inclination to refuse information, but the information which my hon. friend now asks for it is not possible to supply, and I do not think it is as important as he thinks it is. We have the United States tariff in our hands and the duty on any article can be ascertained when he asks for it, but if we are asked to compare every item in this tariff with every item in the United States tariff and give the imports and exports as to each item and all that kind of thing, it is not possible to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. We will get the information.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Finance seems at last to understand what information it is which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) seeks, and he tells us that he has the United States tariff at hand from which he can give that information.

Mr. FIELDING. It is here now.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is right in his statement about the conversion of the government to protection, I would remind the hon. gentleman that the American tariff had a great deal to do with the introduction of protection into this country. It is therefore only natural that in framing our tariff we should want to know what is the corresponding duty on similar articles in the United States. It was only after both the Liberals and the Conservatives of Canada had failed to get a reciprocity treaty with the United States that protection was introduced here, the people of Canada having come to the conclusion that if we could not get reciprocity we would adopt the policy of protection in force in the United States. We are told to-day that the government has adopted the policy of protection; a policy which they strenuously fought against for eighteen years, and it is important for us to know the relevancy of our system of protection to the system in force in the United States.

Mr. PATERSON. It may be taken as a general rule that the American tariff is very much higher than the Canadian tariff.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And a very good idea it is too.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Minister of Customs sure of that ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. In the United States tariff you will not find each article particularized as under our tariff. For instance when you ask what is the duty on cream separators in the United States, all that the officers can answer is that they believe cream separators would come under a certain section which would make the duty 45 per cent. It comes to a question of interpreting the United States tariff and there is some difficulty as to that. There is no doubt that as to many of the questions we will be able, from the American tariff, to give an answer which we believe will be correct, although it is quite possible we may be mistaken in the interpretation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are we to understand that the Minister of Customs wants us to pass tariff legislation here without our knowing what the American tariff is? The Minister of Customs says that he can give us information as to the American tariff but he cannot guarantee that that information will be correct. If the Minister of Customs with all his officials at his command cannot understand what the United States tariff is on a particular item how can he suppose that the ordinary members of this House can have knowledge on the subject? The United States enters more largely into competition with our manufactures than does any other country, and speaking for my constituents, before this tariff is passed I shall want more information than the Minister of Customs seems to have.

Mr. PATERSON. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman's judgment as to the wisdom of this Canadian tariff is to be guided in every particular item by the amount of duty the Americans levy?

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly not. It is not conclusive evidence, but it is admissible

evidence, and it is evidence that every hon. gentleman should consider in framing our tariff. I do not want the Minister of Customs to put words in my mouth which I did not use; I did not say it is conclusive but I do say it is most important that we should know what tariff the American manufacturers have against Canadian goods. It might not be wise to retaliate, but the reason why we do not retaliate ought to be considered, and we should know what duty is levied by the American Republic against us. I do not think we should pass this legislation on such meagre information as the Minister of Customs seems to have.

Mr. PATERSON. The legislators of the United States in their wisdom declare a certain duty upon certain articles conceiving that duty to be in the interests of their people. Suppose that on these same articles the parliament of Canada should declare it to be in the interest of Canada to place them on the free list, is our judgment to be formed on the example of the United States? If the hon. gentleman wants the American tariff, why not the English tariff and the German tariff?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And you put the surtax on because of Germany's high tariff against us.

Mr. FIELDING. What has that to do with it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the whole case.

Mr. FIELDING. The surtax has been on for a number of years, and the hon. gentleman is late in attempting to discover now why it was put on.

Mr. PATERSON. The surtax was not put on for the purpose of protection but to assert Canada's right to have fair treatment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And that is the basis of protection.

Mr. PATERSON. And it is to assert our right to fair treatment that the surtax is kept on.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask the Minister of Customs if Canada has yet received that fair treatment, and if it is not going to receive that fair treatment why not withdraw the surtax?

Mr. PATERSON. Canada has not received fair treatment yet and the surtax is in force.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. member for Halton want to take it off?

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not say so; it is good protection.

Mr. FOSTER. We will stand by you as long as you stand by protection.

Mr. LOGGIE. I want to say a word in favour of the dumping duty placed on free goods. As I understand it there are two principles at stake when goods are admitted free into this country. First of all the raw material is brought into Canada and then distributed to our people in the shape of manufactured articles. Then there is the principle that articles which enter into general use, particularly those which are used by our agricultural population, should be admitted free, the interests of the farming community being predominant as compared with those of the manufacturers. But in that connection we have the dumping clause specially intended to protect Canadian manufacturers against any illegitimate competition by American manufacturers who, having a market of 80,000,000 people, are in a position to slaughter the market of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 people. Suppose for instance a manufactured article on the free list is sold at $10 to the American consumer, and suppose the price of that is reduced to $8 to the Canadian consumer, that evidently is a reduction that would help to crush out a Canadian industry, and the government comes to the relief of that industry by making the American manufacturer pay, under the dumping clause, the other $2 into the Dominion Treasury.

Mr. BERGERON. Who pays the $2?

Mr. LOGGIE. The Canadian farmer pays directly into the treasury of Canada the $2, but indirectly the American manufacturer has to stand the loss of the $2, as already explained, and that without any benefit to his Canadian customer, and on future sales will most assuredly sell to Canadian trade at not less than home trade prices. As a result the Canadian manufacturer escapes the competition of dumping prices. The Canadian farmer is not paying, including dumping duty any more for the article in question than is the American farmer who buys from makers who manufacture for an 80,000,000 home market. Let me give an illustration in the case of fishing nets. We know that millions of dollars worth of fishing nets come into this country free of duty. Why are they placed on the free list? It is in order that to benefit the fishing industry which stands on the same footing as the farming industry. We would all like to see those nets made in Canada. Then why does not some capitalist, with half a million dollars at his disposal, start a knitting plant? The only reason must be that he would have to compete with manufacturers on the other side of the line who have from $10,000,000 to $30,000,000 invested in similar plants and who have a market of 80,000,000 people at their disposal. Not only have they those advantages but they have a sea-board open winter and summer. But should a Canadian manufacturer see his way clear to face such competition, then, in order to prevent his stronger rivals from crushing him out by slaughtering prices, the Finance

Minister (Mr. Fielding) comes to his relief and applies the dumping clause. Should the American manufacturers reduce their rates to the Canadian consumers lower than the rates at which they sell to the American consumers, we impose a duty of 15 per cent. If I had my way, I would make it more than 15 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Would you vote for it?

Mr. LOGGIE. I would vote for it but would not vote for what my hon. friend wants. He no doubt would want a duty of 25 per cent imposed. I would vote against that because the moment you put on a duty of 25 per cent, the fishermen pays it. But as the dumping clause is applied, it is not the Canadian consumer who pays, but the American manufacturer who is simply compelled to keep his prices to the Canadian consumer the same as those he charges his American customers. To that extent the Canadian manufacturer who manufactures fishing nets is protected, and who will say he should not be?

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGGIE. That is the policy of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. BARKER. Does he know it?

Mr. BERGERON. What is his policy? Is it protection?

Mr. LOGGIE. My hon. friend talks about protection. Our average duty is 17 per cent or 18 per cent. It is protection to that extent, and when you apply this dumping clause to free goods that is protection to that extent, provided you manufacture the goods in this country. And if you do not, the 15 per cent does not apply. That is a reasonable proposition, and there is much in what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) says, that if the dumping clause is good when applied to dutiable articles it is doubly good when applied to the free list.

Mr. BERGERON. After the very clear explanation of my hon. friend, I come to a question which I wish to put to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). How can the Customs Department find out what is the market price and what is the selling price of an article in the United States? Or is it the intention of the government to delude the farmers by persuading them that they are getting in their cream separators free of duty, while at the same time the government have invented a device to give protection to the Canadian manufacturers? How can the government be consistent in their pledge to the farmers when they compel them to pay $10 in Canada for a thing which they can buy for $8 in the United States? Is not that giving $2 to the Canadian manufacturers at the expense of the Canadian farmers? That, I say, is a dishonest way of giving protection. It would be far more creditable for the government to come out in the open and let the people understand what their policy really is. And by means of this dumping clause, the government can easily let the manufacturers know what they may expect if they have the hardihood to be independent and not support the present cabinet. What criterion has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for finding out the selling price in the States or the market value of any article? I had a case in my own office concerning some agricultural implements imported from the States, and with which the dumping clause had a great deal to do. There was no end of trouble and no end of agents and inspectors. In fact the whole customs office in Montreal was upset in the attempt to find out whether the article had been paid for at a lower price than it should have been paid for in the United States. And as a matter of fact the upshot was that they could not get at the truth. Suppose a manufacturer is a friend of the government, it will be very easily found out by the department that the article was sold in the States to the Canadian consumer at a slaughter price. The government are not at all scrupulous in such matters. If the manufacturer should not be one of the friends of the party in power, it would soon be found out that the article was sold in the States at the market value and that the dumping clause should not be applied. Hon. gentlemen opposite know how to deal with the manufacturers and they know how every manufacturer stands in political matters. They have handled the manufacturers with a good deal of skill during the past ten years. At the last St. Ann's election some men, whose names were mentioned in the newspapers as attending a public meeting, were called to Ottawa and asked whether the report was true. Another manufacturer, whose name was mentioned as having been at a committee meeting, was called to Ottawa in order that the government might find out whether he had been at that meeting or not. We should take every precaution to find out really what is the policy of the government and to see that everybody will be protected in the same way. We ought to know what standard is taken for ascertaining what is the market value of an article in the American market as compared with the price to the Canadian consumer.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I am afraid my hon. friend has not sufficiently measured the gravity of his words and the charge they convey. He says that the Customs Department, in its administration, discriminates between one manufacturer and another and exercises favouritism. I am sure he does not want to accuse the Customs Department of such a charge, but that is what his words convey. I think that would be the most serious charge that could be levied against any department. I might also say that the Cus-

toms Department have the same duty cast upon them, regardless of the dumping clause of ascertaining the value of goods in foreign countries. We have to take the same precaution in reference to invoicing to which the dumping duty does not apply as to those in which it does apply. But it is true that the application of the dumping clause has led to a more thorough ascertainment of values by the Customs Department than before, through the expenditure of the larger sums of money which this House was kind enough, in the public interest, to place at our disposal, to enable us to engage a larger staff than before and to maintain men at different points, chiefly in the United States, whose duty it is to inquire as to proper values and whose time is devoted to that inquiry. It led, further, to the requirement by the Customs Department of additional information from the exporter. Under our present forms, the person exporting goods from another country to Canada is required to state at what price he sells them in his own country, and, in another column, at what price he has sold them to the Canadian purchaser. This places the facts before the customs officer at a glance. The exporter must state the facts under a solemn declaration. They may show, for instance, that he sells goods for $20 in Canada, the price of which in the United States is $25. In that case, the customs duty is levied upon the United States price. This is the form required in the case of shipments to Canada irrespective of the views of importers, their previous nationality or anything else. Of course, all cases are dealt with in a businesslike way and on their merits.

Mr. GERALD V. WHITE (North Renfrew). Some four or five years ago a company set up a plant in Pembroke for the manufacture of cream separators. This concern has been considerably handicapped by the fact—as has already been stated in this committee—that these separators have been entering Canada free of duty. Now, it is well known to members of the committee that the machinery for the manufacture of beet root sugar and pig iron for certain purposes have been allowed to come into Canada free. But this privilege is denied the manufacturers of cream separators. Why should not these people be given the same advantages as the others, especially in view of the fact that this machinery is not manufactured in Canada, but, as I understand, is produced in the United States only? Also, why should not the raw material used by the manufacturers of cream separators be admitted free, as that privilege is allowed to manufacturers in so many other lines? The Pembroke concern to which I have referred has had many advances made to it to induce it to establish a plant in the United States where it could manufacture both for the United States and for Canada. I think the government should give the matters to which I have referred their serious consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. I may say that the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. White) has already been provided for. It is only reasonable, seeing that the cream separators are themselves on the free list, that the materials necessary for the production of these machines should be admitted free also, and we have endeavoured to meet the wishes of the manufacturers of cream separators in that respect. I do not think that we were ever approached on the subject of the machinery. Certainly, I have no recollection of the point now raised by the hon. gentleman having been raised before. But, if he will consult the tariff schedules, he will see that, so far as materials are concerned, we have tried to do all that was fair and reasonable.

Mr. WHITE. I would ask the hon. minister how far the item to which he refers goes?

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will turn to item 472 of the tariff he will see to what I refer. It reads as follows :—

> Materials which enter into the construction and form part of cream separators, when imported by manufacturers of cream separators to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of cream separators.

These materials come in free. To that extent we have met the views of the representatives of this industry, and I have been under the impression that this provision was fairly satisfactory.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the minister will be able to see his way clear to providing that the machinery is also allowed to come in free, because as I understand it, this machinery is not manufactured in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Sometimes the granting of free machinery, as suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. White) is not desired by existing manufacturers, and, for a reason which can be explained in a moment. The factories already established have paid duty on their machinery, and they do not look too kindly upon a proposal under which a rival factory could be established and bring in its machinery free. We have found that view taken in other branches of the tariff question where we were disposed to grant free machinery—the value of the concession to the manufacturer has been debated. However, I think we have not had it brought before us previously in relation to cream separators.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that the words omitted in the copying, as called attention to by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) be inserted—that is, after the word 'made' insert the words 'or produced,' making it read 'made or produced in Canada.'

Mr. OSLER. That would include lumber?

Mr. FIELDING. If it is made or produced in Canada,—I do not see where you could draw the line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. At the end of that page you will find certain goods excepted from the operation of the dumping clause. I propose to insert an additional subsection as follows:—

(d) Binder twine or twine for harvest binding.

At first glance that may seem to be something that should not be exempt. But I would invite a moment's consideration of one point involved. Binder twine is one of the articles, which, to some extent, we are now exporting to the United States. Binder twine of certain classes is now admitted into the United States free and our manufacturers are exporting to that country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To any considerable amount?

Mr. FIELDING. I believe, as respects one or two factories, to a very considerable extent. The factory at Peterborough is one whose representatives have given us to understand that they are exporting in considerable quantities. There is a provision in the United States tariff that the classes of binder twine referred to are free only when imported from a country which does not charge a duty on binder twine. The fear is expressed that this dumping duty would bring us under the effect of that section of the American tariff, and that, in that case, we should be denying our manufacturers the privilege they have of exporting that class of binder twine free to the American market, and that in that case we would deny our own manufacturers the privilege which they now have of exporting that class of binder twine to the American market. As the manufacturers of binder twine do not wish for the benefit of the dumping clause in this respect, and feel that they have more to fear from being shut out from the advantage which they already have in the American market, we are meeting their wishes and serving, as we think, a very good purpose, by exempting that item from the operation of the dumping clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the Minister of Finance will admit now that the American tariff has something to do with these matters ?

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say the American tariff has nothing to do with it, but I tell my hon, friend that information concerning that provision in the American tariff is just as good given to him in that form as if I were to give it to him in any other form. I do not deny that here and there information on the American tariff may be valuable, and this is a case; but I do not think a full consideration of the whole American tariff in all its details is going to be very valuable or helpful to any of us.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the argument of the Minister of Finance is this, that the farmers will get binder twine dumped into this country and the minister will meet it with a manufacturer's reason.

Mr. PATERSON. There is this special reason, that there is an export trade from the United States of $363,000. The provision in the American tariff which makes this article free has another provision attached to it, that the articles mentioned in the paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on raw articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to a duty of one half of one per cent per pound. Now we admit it free, but if the twine was coming in under the price at which it is sold there and were made subject to the special exemption, it would come under this provision. A special exception would make it subject to the dumping duty, which the United States authorities would rule was the imposition of a duty, and therefore their duty would apply against Canadian manufacturers. It is one of the cases in which consideration has to be had to American legislation.

Mr. BRISTOL. Would the Minister of Finance say what considerations or facts were before him which made him fix the special duty at not more than 15 per cent in respect to dumping?

Mr. FIELDING. One must draw the line somewhere. Some duties are as high as 35 per cent, but take 30 per cent, and when you increase it by a special duty to 45 per cent, you have about as high a tariff, as. I suppose, hon. gentlemen opposite would be willing to allow.

Mr. BRISTOL. I was not asking with any view of getting a benefit from the tariff. As I read the dumping clause, I thought the idea was to prevent dumping under given circumstances, even if you had to put on a duty of 100 per cent. But if the view is that we will allow dumping, and if that difference is only 45 per cent, then I understand the minister's view.

Mr. FIELDING. That is right, with this explanation, that if we should find by experience that this is insufficient to afford the reasonable degree of protection which it is designed to give under certain circumstances, it could be reconsidered. But hitherto the provision was that the dumping duty should be the difference in value, but not exceeding one-half of the ordinary duty, which was aobut 15 per cent. The duty being say, 30 per cent, one-half would be 15 per cent. But instead of leaving it in that indefinite way, we put in a limit of 15 per cent. A case might be shown where 15 per cent would not prove to be enough. But

so far, we think, in our experience, that 15 per cent will serve the purpose which the government and the House have in view.

Mr. BRISTOL. There was a case of sewer pipes imported into Canada which was brought to my attention, and I thought if the clause was desirable at all it would be desirable in that case where it would prevent dumping against the Canadian manufacturer.

Mr. FIELDING. I think such a case would be quite exceptional.

Mr. LOGGIE. What would be about the extent of the duty in the case of free goods?

Mr. FIELDING. 15 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be that such a version could be given to this clause, but after all it would seem to me that any special ruling like that would be rather out of the ordinary course. This is not a case where a duty is being imposed, it is a penalty for unfair trading.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman knows how strict American rulings are.

Mr. FOSTER. But I should think they ought to be just, and the Minister of Customs will hardly say that the United States authorities would make an unjust ruling. Now we have no duty against binder twine, binder twine is free, and consequently they could not rule against our binder twine going in free because our tariff says binder twine comes into this country free. But you say there may be an unfair ruling, and men on the other side sell below the American price with the idea of destroying our trade, and in that case you really impose a fine and a penalty. They could not go any further than to put a clause in their tariff by which, if manufacturers on this side dumped goods on to the other side, they could put on an artificial duty. It does not seem to me that anything but a forced duty could rule our binder twine off the free list in the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. We call it a duty.

Mr. FOSTER. We call it a duty in a way. You try to put a penalty upon dumping, and a penalty must be something.

Mr. PATERSON. It is levied by way of duty.

Mr. FOSTER. It can be levied in any other way. You say before these goods come into our country there must be a fine upon them. In one case you say it is $2, in another case it is 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The net consequence of the provision is that it is possible that almost every article brought into this country might be subject to the duty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is difficult to understand the import of the hon. gentleman's words until we have them in writing. We have two factories in the city of Brantford, and I do not think either export to the United States. I understand the Minister of Finance is making a difference on this account because some two out of a dozen factories in Canada do export twine to a small extent to the United States, whereas a much larger amount of twine is imported from the United States into Canada. How is the leaving out of this dumping clause going to affect the ten factories that do not export to the United States for the sake of the two, in one of which the hon. member for Peterborough, sitting behind the hon. minister, is interested? It appears to me that the binder twine factories have made very strong representations to the hon. minister to help that industry. I do not see that help is going to be given by this legislation. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman it rather appears that he is going to sacrifice the interests of ten factories for the sake of two which do a small exporting trade with the United States. I do not understand the principle upon which he is proceeding. I think it is a very unfair one, that it is not a business principle and that the interests of the twelve factories should be held to be superior to those of any two out of the twelve. The hon. gentleman appears to be making an exception of binder twine because there are two factories exporting to the United States. If I am correctly informed they are only permitted to export a particular kind of twine; it must run a certain number of feet to the pound, and any other twines manufactured in Canada are not allowed to be exported to the United States unless they pay a heavy duty. The hon. gentleman has not given the protection to the binder twine industry that has been asked for. There have been deputations here praying and beseeching the hon. minister that he would give protection to the binder twine industry in which some 40,000 farmers hold stock and there is no line of industry in which they might better engage than in the binder twine industry. If he is going to except that industry from the dumping clause he is going on a false principle. I protest against the exception which is being made on behalf of two factories out of a dozen, ten of which perhaps do not export a pound of twine to the United States. I think it is a false principle and I hope the hon. gentleman will not press that proposal.

Mr. MILLER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) has stated the case correctly, if there are twelve binder twine factories doing business, if two out of the twelve send their products to the United States markets and the others do not, is it not possible that at least some of the ten factories that do not export to the United States may desire to do so? If two out of twelve may profitably export part of their product to the United States why can-

not the other ten do the same thing, and is not the most likely reason that the others are not exporting the fact that they have sufficient home market and are very well satisfied with conditions under which they are operating ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I was asking the question of the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) may know what is in the mind of the minister but I would prefer to get it from the minister himself.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I can give a happier answer than that which has been given by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller). Most of our manufacturers have used as an argument in favour of higher duties that they are excluded from the United States market. They say : If we could get access to the American market we would not feel so badly, but we are shut out. Here is a case where they are not shut out ; here is a case where they have the market of eighty million people that we hear so much about. Here are factories that are taking advantage of this market and they say to us : Do not do anything that will deprive us of that market. They have been shut out in a great many cases, they say, but in this one case they have given us a chance there and we ask you to protect us in the American market. We are trying to do it. I have no information that binder twine has been brought into Canada under the dumping system. I have no recollection that such representations have been made to us and I have no reason to believe that the other binder twine manufacturers in Canada would object to this. I should think for the reason so well stated by my hon. friend from South Grey that they would be glad to see that open door which now exists in the United States, and which has been taken advantage of by several manufacturers, kept open not only for those in Peterboro' but for those in other parts of Canada who wish to be enterprising and extend their trade.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I ask the hon. minister if it is not confined to a certain grade of twine—to twine that runs so many feet to the pound ? Perhaps that is not manufactured by other manufacturers.

Mr. FIELDING. They can manufacture it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it not confined to twine running a certain number of feet to the pound?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the privilege in the United States is limited to a certain class of binder twine. It is a complicated and difficult question and we think this is the best solution that can be proposed. I have no reason to think that it will be regarded unfavourably by the binder twine manufacturers generally. Of course, they have had no knowledge that this proposal was to be made and they will only hear of it through the proceedings of parliament to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. minister tell us what the output of the binder twine factories of this country each year is?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be very happy to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not say particularly but approximately.

Mr. FIELDING. It is very large and, of course, the proportion going to the United States at the present time, while it is large in itself, cannot be much in proportion to the total output. I will be happy to get that information at a later stage if desired.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is largely a question of balancing the advantages. Here you have now twelve manufacturers who are at work in this country. I think none of us doubt that the output in Canada is altogether out of proportion to the export to the United States. What you are proposing is to take away the advantage of the dumping clause to all the factories in the very large product which they are putting out for home consumption in order to give an advantage to one or two of the factories which are exporting a very small proportion of their product to the United States. Suppose you pass this, suppose that it has become law; the manufacturers of binder twine in Canada come to you and say: We are putting out so many million pounds of twine a year; we find the manufacturers of the United States are dumping their goods wholesale into this country ; they are actually doing it ; we are at a disadvantage and if this provision is retained we cannot keep up in the unequal race. What is your answer ? If this provision were not in existence, as it was not in existence before, you could say : We have provided for protecting you in this respect. We will immediately take measures to protect you from this unequal warfare ; we will carry out the dumping clause and prevent that slaughtering in the market which is so much to your disadvantage. Pass this clause and you are utterly powerless. If they come and tell you that nine-tenths of this whole output of binder twine is imperilled because the manufacturers of binder twine on the other side of the line have clubbed together and are slaughtering their goods on this market it will be small comfort to tell them that they will have preserved the United States market for one-twentieth or one-thirtieth of a peculiar kind of binder twine which they send over there. Therefore, I think the disadvantage is very much greater than the advantage and I would like to hear what the manufacturers think of this when it gets out to them, because

as the hon. minister had said this provision is unknown to them. It strikes me that if you take away the protection which you thought would be absolutely necessary in the form of the dumping clause from an industry which is carried on by the farmers and which is vital to them, you are offsetting that advantage by the quite illusory advantage of keeping a market open to an almost infinitesimal part of the product of these factories. I think this is rather an important question and one which ought to be carefully considered.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course my hon. friend assumes that the market of the United States is open to a very limited extent. The market of the United States is open to an unlimited extent for the particular class of twine which the American tariff provides for and it is open to every manufacturer. I quite admit that if the condition described by my hon. friend should arise it would certainly call for special consideration and perhaps special legislation; I acknowledge that at once, but while we must have some regard for the future, after all the great thing is to be sure that we deal with existing conditions and if changes come about we must meet them then if they cannot be reasonably foreseen. The existing condition is that there has been no complaint of the dumping of binder twine from the United States into Canada and therefore for the purpose of protecting the binder twine industry in Canada at present, whatever may arise in the future, the dumping duty is not necessary. For the present then we have not been called on for any immediate action unless in the form suggested by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) of putting a stiff duty on binder twine—and certainly the government are not prepared to do that, and I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) will find many on the other side either to support such a proposal. I throw that in as an incidental remark. On the other hand, we have an export trade with the United States of a considerable sum. even if it is not very large in proportion to the industry. That should be increasing business. If two factories can export that quantity of binder twine from Canada there does not seem to be any reason why twenty factories in Canada should not export it in the same proportion, and with that open door, with that door being used by some manufacturers, we have thought we ought to try and meet them in this respect so that the door would not be closed. If the condition described by my hon. friend should arise it would call for special legislation, and perhaps the exceptions we have now made would have to be abolished because the balance of advantage would be on the other side of the argument.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) see that while he is opening one door he is opening two? Does he not see he has had the dumping clause as a very effective protection against any attempt to dump into this country for the last three years?

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is wrong; we have not had it as respects binder twine. We are only going to have it now. There is no dumping now because binder twine is on the free list and no difficulty has arisen. My hon. friend will see that as respects the past there has been no difficulty, but there may be in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as that goes, my argument falls to the ground, but my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is opening the door to the American manufacturer of binder twine and advertising to them that there is no hinderance to them coming into this market, dumping their goods and thereby getting the trade in binder twine in this country. I am afraid it is a jump at legislation for a particular factory or two particular factories which may imperil the best interests of all of them.

Mr. FIELDING. You will have to put a postscript to that advertisement at once by having it understood that if this condition arises the parliament of Canada will be prepared to deal with it, as I am sure it will.

Mr. PATERSON. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is worthy of consideration, there is no doubt about that, but if this is to go to the country for discussion and future amendment there is this to be considered in reference to it: I do not know how many factories do export, but $363,000 is a trade worth having. I think my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is quite right that it will be a very small amount in comparison to the total output of these factories, I think that is probably correct, but if we can now send $363,000 there is nothing to prevent all our factories sending in an equal proportion. The point I want to make is this, that binder twine is free in the United States. That makes a wonderful difference. There may be dumping from the United States into Canada in certain lines under which the Canadian manufacturer is powerless because there is a 45 per cent duty against him putting his goods in there. But let a combination exist in the United States to keep twine at 9 cents a pound there and sell it in Canada at 6, the Canadians can go over there and sell their twine at 8 cents, bursting their combination at once and bringing them to time very quickly. They can do it when it is on the free list going into the United States, but they cannot if their is a heavy tariff against them. That is a matter that is worth consideration.

Mr. OSLER. It must be a particular kind of twine. Would the minister tell us why the Americans are so generous on that

one particular point, because evidently it is only a very small percentage of the quantity of twine they use and there must be some reason for admitting this particular quality ?

Mr. PATERSON. (reading):

All binding twine manufactured from New Zealand hemp, istle or tampico fibre, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any two or more of them, of single ply and measuring not exceeding 600 feet to the pound.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know which of the two factories sold that twine in the United States?

Mr. PATERSON. There may be more than two.

Mr. FIELDING. Peterborough and Montreal, but there may be others.

Mr. BERGERON. Those two are known to export.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) said that I advocated a stiff duty on binder twine. I was not aware that I had suggested that in any remarks I made. Probably the hon. gentleman inferred it from remarks I may have made on previous occasions, but I am not aware that to-day I suggested to the hon. gentleman putting a particular duty on binder twine, although I am sure for my own part I am strongly in favour of doing so. I do think the minister after his own statement and what has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should let the matter lie over until the remaining ten or more factories can be heard from. I am not sure they will not approve of it. The hon. gentleman has told the House that they were not prepared for it. I was not aware it was coming up or I would have been prepared. I did not know that this would come up under a special item and therefore I have not ascertained the views of the factories located in my constituency. I would very much like to have those views before the item goes through, and I think in view of the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) that he should allow us to hear from those other factories which do not do an export trade with the United States and see whether or not they would approve of this, and would be prepared in return for this small advantage to cast away another in order that one or two factories out of a dozen may do a small export trade to the United States. The hon. gentleman has not told us how much twine comes into Canada, but if I am correctly informed our factories were limited not to produce more than 66 per cent of the binder twine used in Canada or they would be closed up. That was the condition two years ago and I do not know if it has been changed yet. I think it would be more to the point to ascertain how much twine is coming from the United States, and I think the minister would find that the market in Canada is worth ten times that United States market to which the minister has referred. Under these circumstances I think we should consider the whole industry; do not let us legislate on behalf of the two factories that may be making a certain class of twine that goes over to the United States and neglecting the other ten that do not make that kind of twine. I think the whole industry should be considered together and we should establish some principle.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not necessary to let it stand. Some time must pass before we complete this matter and the resolutions will remain in committee and no objection will be raised to reconsidering it if necessary.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In the evening papers to-day it is stated that the minister will this afternoon give a list of the changes he proposes to make. I think it would not be a bad plan if, before we go out of committee, the minister should intimate what other changes will be made in the tariff so that it will go out to the public and give the same opportunity for consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there any changes?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The statement is made in the evening papers that there are other changes to be announced.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not that abiding faith in newspaper announcements that my hon. friend seems to have.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But it was in your own organ.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no organ except the 'Canada Gazette' and it has not made that statement.

Mr. FOSTER. And you don't have to support the 'Canada Gazette'.

Mr. FIELDING. Which is quite an important consideration. It is not our intention to-day to propose any changes. After we have disposed of the resolutions I purpose asking the committee to proceed to the consideration of the schedules and in the case of any item which we think it better to reserve I shall ask it to stand and I shall bring all these items up together so that whatever changes there are made may be made at the same time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That meets my view.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not intend to-day to announce any change. We will go on with the items with respect to which we do not intend to propose any change, and only in the case of a comparatively few items will we ask that they be allowed to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. You naturally want the deputations to come gradually.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad my hon. friend has referred to the deputations. He knows from experience that one of the great difficulties in framing a tariff is that deputations will come and that they do not seem to realize that there is a moment when the evidence must be closed and the court left to form a verdict. One has to be courteous to these gentlemen who come, but I want to say now that while we will give all consideration to representations that have been made to us up to the present time, whether by deputation or by correspondence, we cannot hold out the hope that deputations which come after this will be able to get interviews, because the probability is that the business of the House will not permit it. We shall hold over a number of items and at a very early date we shall give our judgment on these items and be in a position to ask the House to come to a final decision.

Mr. HAGGART. Am I correct in understanding that some years ago there was a provision enacted by which the Canadian manufacturer of binder twine was given some compensation for the advantage which the American manufacturer has in being able to get his manilla fibre cheaper. The United States manufacturers were allowed to import manilla fibre cheaper than it could be obtained by manufacturers in other countries, and I think there was a provision made by which a compensating duty was levied.

Mr. PATERSON. We gave the Canadian manufacturer a bounty to overcome that.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the Canadian manufacturer has a bounty on every pound of binder twine manufactured.

Mr. PATERSON. On the manilla.

Mr. HAGGART. But only when exported.

Mr. PATERSON. On all manilla.

Mr. HAGGART. On all the twine that is manufactured out of manilla.

Mr. FIELDING. No, on all the manilla used in the manufacture of binding twine.

Mr. HAGGART. How are you going to settle that when you export to the United States?

Mr. HALL. No manilla twine is sent to the United States.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you give a bounty on the manilla twine exported to the United States ?

Mr. FIELDING. If the twine contains manilla it will not go to the United States.

Mr. HENDERSON. It can go in at 45 per cent duty.

Mr. FIELDING. The matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) refers was regulated in the way of a bounty on the manilla used in Canada. Under the Spanish regime in the Philippines there was an export duty of three-eights of a cent per pound on manilla fibre. The Americans continued that export duty as respects all other countries, except the United States, with the result that the United States importer of manilla fibre can obtain his raw material three-eights of a cent per pound cheaper than the Canadian manufacturer could.

Mr. BERGERON. Or any other manufacturer except the manufacturer in the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. And as we were allowing the manufacturer of manilla in the United States to send his goods in free of duty we were creating an unfair competition with the Canadian manufacturer. Then, instead of granting a duty we provided that a bounty should be paid equivalent to the amount of that export duty on manilla fibre; it applies only to manilla used in the manufacture of binder twine. That will not apply to exports to the United States because if, in the binder twine made in Canada there is any manilla it does not go into the United States except under a very high duty. We have dealt with the matter as fairly as we could and we do not think it is in any way in conflict with what we propose here. No doubt, if our bounty were given on all twine exported to the United States we would be in the difficulty referred to, but as we give it only on the manilla used in the manufacture of twine, and as the twine containing manilla does not go to the United States, the difficulty has not arisen.

Mr. HENDERSON. A year or two ago a careful calculation was made by Mr. Haycock, and my recollection is that he stated before the Agricultural Committee that the consumption of binder twine in Canada was about 28,000,000 pounds per year. I apprehend that with the increased area of land under cultivation the consumption is greater now than it was then. We imported something over 14,000,000 pounds of twine last year. It would seem curious that while we are exporting binder twine we should also be importing it to such a large extent. There is an idea amongst the people of this country, a well founded idea I think, that there is a distinct understanding between the Canadian and American manufacturers of binder twine that the trade of Canada should be divided between the two. The United States manufacturers say to the Canadian manufacturers : We can swamp your whole market ; we can manufacture every pound of twine you consume ; we can ship it in under your free tariff and practically undersell you and wipe out every factory. But the American does not want to do that. He wants to get a good price for his twine and he says to the Canadian manufacturer: You maintain

a high price against the farmer and we will allow you one-half your own market and take the other half for ourselves. The Canadian manufacturer is making more twine than the Americans allow him to make, and consequently he has to export in order to get rid of the surplus. Under these conditions I do not think there is much reason to apprehend dumping by the Americans because I think there is a solemn compact and combine which prevents that. I have not the slightest doubt but that binder twine can be sold at a great deal lower price than it is sold to the Canadian farmer, but owing to this combine between the great American trust and the Canadian manufacturers the price is kept up. That will explain why Peterborough is exporting this large amount of twine. It is true, as the Minister of Finance says, that they can only export twine to the United States that does not contain manilla because the American government practically says: You cannot send to the United States any twine that contains manilla fibre unless you pay 45 per cent duty. But there is a very good twine which does not contain manilla and which satisfies the American farmer and perhaps ought to satisfy the Canadian farmer too. But our farmers are only permitted to buy 14,000,000 or 15,000,000 pounds of Canadian twine. The rest of the Canadian market, under the present arrangement, is specially reserved for the American manufacturers. Our Canadian binder twine manufacturers must give it to their rivals or submit to having their own market taken from them altogether by having the country flooded with the American product. No doubt the Americans have certain advantages. They can buy their manilla cheaper than we, and of course a large number of factories with a market of 80,000,000 people can swamp a small number of factories with a market of only 6,000,000 people. The arrangement now existing between the manufacturers of the two countries is simply for the purpose of keeping up the standard price. I am not afraid of this dumping clause being applied to binder twine because if it is it will break up the whole combine.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of bonus you give on every pound of manilla manufactured into binder twine in this country and the total amount you pay?

Mr. PATERSON. The bonus is three-eighths of a cent per pound.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount of bonuses? I want to know how much manilla was used in the country.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot give it at the moment but will get it. That comes under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would suggest that the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) include this item among those he is holding over for future consideration. It is easier for the House to revise its opinion before finally adopting any item than to reconsider its opinion after the item has been adopted and admit that it was wrong. This item should be held over until we hear from the manufacturers.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no substantial difference between my hon. friend and myself. The other items are not in these resolutions but in the various tariff schedules. It is desirable for the expedition of public business that we should get the resolutions cleared up. That will not in any way prejudice the matter being further considered.

Mr. FOSTER. They will not go out of committee?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to congratulate my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). He has struck about the right point as far as binder twine is concerned. I have always been in favour of giving our agriculturists as cheap binder twine as possible, but since we have had that article put on the free list, our farmers have been paying more for it. In the riding I represent some of our farmers—and I was one of the unfortunate stockholders—built and equipped, for its size, one of the best binder twine factories in the Dominion. All we want in this country is honest competition, but our farmers do not want to have to face the competition of combines. If Canadians were given an opportunity to make in Canada every pound of binder twine we require, our farmers would get it at the price they should. The Chatham factory, it is true, was an exporter of twine to the United States. But why? Simply because it dare not take an order in Canada lest it would be put out of business by the American combine. The result was that factory could not take any orders in this country, and had to manufacture for American concerns at prices one and a half cent a pound less than they should have got. And of course they were only allowed to export sisal. Some protection should be given the manufacturers of binder twine in this country. Today the twine is selling five or six cents per pound dearer than it did when we had protection, and that difference cannot be accounted for by the increased price of the raw material.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Clements) has said to some extent what I intended to say. Since the duty was removed from binder twine, our farmers have paid yearly more per pound than they did during the preceding eight years. That is due entirely to the action of the American manufacturers. No doubt the American manufacturers, through

the big agricultural implement concerns which handle the American output, came to the Canadian manufacturers and said to them: Unless you fix a price to suit us and agree to an output—and that output, I believe, is arranged on the basis that a Canadian manufacturer is allowed only to make two-thirds of the quantity consumed in Canada the other third being reserved for the Americans—we will freeze you out of the market. Well, the Canadian manufacturers had their money invested in their plant, the government had made the article free, and there was nothing for them to do but say to their American rivals: We will take what you will give us. Thus they are limited to supplying only two-thirds of the Canadian consumption and are obliged to sell at the American prices. If the hon. minister is going to hold the item over and will make inquiries of the Canadian manufacturers, he will find that what I say is correct. What the government should do is put a duty of 25 per cent to 35 per cent on binder twine and then the prices will come down to where they were before. There are machines enough in Canada to make more than the country requires, and that is the best way to give our farmers cheap twine. They got it cheap under protection, but since binder twine was put on the free list they have had to pay from three to five cents a pound more.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend reminds me of an incident which occurred during the speech of a very able advocate of high duties, who was arguing that the effect of putting on a duty was to make the goods cheaper. A small boy with a good maritime province mind and a maritime province school education interrupted him by saying: Mister, if you will double the duty, then we will get the article for nothing. That is just about the line of my hon. friend's argument—put a high enough duty on and you make the goods cheaper. If my hon. friend's argument is correct binder twine has been made dearer by the article being put on the free list.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has not been made dearer, but cheaper. But the price to the farmer is higher.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well—take it just as my hon. friend states it. In consequence of binder twine being made free, the farmer must pay more for his binder twine. That being the case, the farmer is naturally anxious to have it put back on the dutiable list.

Mr. TAYLOR. So I am.

Mr. FIELDING. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is not a farmer.

Mr. TAYLOR. But I represent a farming constituency.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no, my hon. friend has other spokes in his wheel. But here is the curious part of the case. We have met a great many of the farmers of Canada in relation to this tariff question, but we have yet to meet the first one who desires to see the duty re-imposed. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) does not represent the farmers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would like to have the answer to a question which, I think, is quite pertinent. Can the government tell us why binder twine has been so much dearer since the duty has been taken off than it was before?

Mr. FIELDING. Without going into the question of binder twine in detail, I may say that commodities generally are very much higher than they were a few years ago. I have no special knowledge of the binder twine business, but it is reasonable to suppose that the rule that applies to commodities generally would apply also to binder twine.

Mr. LOGGIE. I can tell the hon. gentleman why the binder twine is higher than in former times. I can tell him that ever since the Spanish-American war there has been a very great advance in the price of the raw material.

Mr. HALL. I desire to make one observation in regard to the question of combine in the binder twine industry. There is no combine in any sense of the term in the matter of sale or production of binder twine. A few years ago manilla was sold f. o. b., New York, at 4¼ cents a pound, the quality known as fair current. To-day that quality cannot be bought for less than 10 cents a pound. That is one reason why binder twine is so high in price. A few years ago sisal was sold in Yucatan at 2¾ cents per pound, and to-day it is 7 cents. This affects prices just as the price of any raw material affects the price of any finished article. Before 1896, wheat could be bought for about 55 cents to 57 cents a bushel, and flour then could be had for less than to-day when you have to pay 75 cents to 80 cents per bushel. The millers do not get the benefit of the increase—the people must expect to pay more for their flour when wheat goes up. The increased price of binder twine is due absolutely and solely to the advance in the price of raw material. Moreover, I may point out that there is no possible combination, no possible advantage whatever that the United States manufacturers can have over the Canadian manufacturers. We can manufacture binder twine just as cheaply as it can be manufactured in the United States. The reason why certain of our manufacturers send binder twine into the United States is to be found in the freight conditions. The Peterborough factory can send into New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio because of those conditions. The International Harvester

Company of Chicago has an advantage in our Northwest and in the northwestern states, simply because they get cheaper freight by way of the Mississippi on sisal coming from Yucatan. The manufacturers in each place simply take advantage of the current of trade. We cannot dam back the Columbia river and make impossible the flow of water into the United States. We cannot prevent the Red river from running northward from the United States into Manitoba. Trade follows its natural course, and like all force, follows the line of least resistance. It is because of this law that the Montreal factory, and the Dartmouth factory and the Peterborough factory send their twine into the United States. The factory at Brantford has not been on an export basis, purely for the reason that it has found sufficient market in the central part of Ontario, the production being a small one.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hall) is evidently conversant with the subject, so I would ask him what portion of the output of the Peterborough factory is consumed at home and what proportion is exported ?

Mr. HALL. About fifty per cent in each case—about 1,500 tons consumed in Canada and about the same quantity exported.

Mr. HENDERSON. The rule is half and half ?

Mr. HALL. No, I would not say that. Conditions might vary. I merely rose to point out that there is no combination whatever in the matter of binder twine. I might point out also the reason why we desire to have this binder twine exempted from the dumping clause. The United States impose a duty of ½ cent per pound on all binder twine entering the United States, 600 feet to the pound or under, and not made from manilla. In order that the Canadian manufacturer may take advantage of this, binder twine must be on the free list in Canada. The moment we impose a duty, then the duty of ½ a cent a pound on our twine going into the United States comes into effect automatically. The result of this would be that on the small product of Peterborough mills sent to the United States, they would have to pay $15 000 this year in order to fill the contracts that they have made. It will readily be seen that this is a strong reason why the Canadian manufacturers do not desire to have the dumping clause applied to binder twine. We have an immense market in the United States, one that is capable of great development, and therefore we do not wish to jeopardize our position. If the United States tried to dump binder twine into Canada, we could ship it back into the United States, because it goes into that country free of duty. That would not apply in the case of an article on which there is a United States duty. For instance, it would not meet the difficulty complained of by the lumbermen of British Columbia. They complain that the Americans can dump their lumber into the Canadian Northwest, and the Canadian manufacturer cannot send the American lumber back into the United States because of their duty.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. member (Mr. Hall) answer a question? He stated in a former part of his speech, in effect that there was practically no arrangement or combination among the manufacturers of binder twine in the United States. Why does the hon. gentleman make that limitation ? Is there any arrangement of any kind ?

Mr. HALL. No. I might say this—that the International Harvester Company can affect the price. They supply about 60 per cent of the twine consumed in the United States and the Plymouth Cordage Company about 20 per cent. As a rule, the Canadian manufacturers follow the prices that these firms make, because they cannot get more. As a matter of fact the margin of profit in the manufacture of binder twine made by the Canadian manufacturers is under ⅛ cents a pound. There is no possible arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART. If the Canadian manufacturers sold for less in Canada, would they sell more binder twine ?

Mr. HALL. I suppose that if a concern practically gives away its goods it can sell plenty of them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would that be permitted ?

Mr. HALL. Certainly. They can sell at any price they like.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is an important question. The hon. gentleman from Peterborough (Mr. Hall) seems to speak with the definiteness of certain knowledge. Would he object to tell us why he is so certain there is no combination except the one he mentions ? Some hon. members here say that there is a combination, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hall) positively denies it. I think it is due to the House that he should give hon. members the opportunity to judge of the value of his information.

Mr. HALL. I certainly know what I am talking about, for I am financially interested in the Peterborough concern.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. member for Peterborough tells us at the outset, that the reason that the Peterborough factory can do business in the United States is merely its favourable position in relation to the question of freights. I understood him to say so, and if that is correct, I want to tell him that Brantford now being on the main line of the Grand Trunk, is in quite as good a position as Peterborough in point of transportation. The hon. gentleman said the

Brantford factories were small, and intimated that they sold their output in the immediate neighbourhood, in other words, that the county of Brantford would consume more twine than these two large factories could produce. I know Peterborough is a big place, and contains some big industries. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has seen Brantford, but I can tell him that we are turning out a respectable amount of twine, and if we had the whole Canadian market we could turn out a great deal more. We are in a position in point of transportation to do what Peterborough can do, and I think a little more. I think we are a little nearer the border, both to the east and to the west, and if it is a mere matter of transportation, we are in a position to sell that twine in the United States. The hon. gentleman used these words, 'Speaking for the manufacturers of binder twine.' The Minister of Finance would not go so far as that, when I questioned him, but the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) presumes to use those words, 'Speaking for the manufacturers of binder twine.' The Minister of Finance said he did not know what their view was, but the hon. member for Peterborough pretends to speak the views of all the binder twine manufacturers in this country. If he does, then he comes into conflict with the Minister of Finance, and knows more about the subject than the Minister of Finance who is making this tariff. I think the member for Peterborough is a little presumptuous. I think, Mr. Chairman, the more we look into this matter the more we are convinced that it is better to let this item stand over until we can hear from all the factories. If the member for Peterborough can speak for all the twelve factories, then I would be willing to let the matter go through, that is, if he can say authoritatively that all the factories do not want the advantage of this dumping clause.

Mr. FIELDING. Since I spoke on the subject a little while ago I have received a communication which came to me like many others; this reached me through the member for Peterborough. I have had no conversation with him about it, but I know it came through him. It comes from the Brantford Cordage Company and while I suppose their communication implies that they would be happy to have the duty, they do not say so directly. But they do say with respect to this dumping duty that they approve of the exception being made, and I quote these words :

> We cannot see where this is going to help us——

This is alluding to the dumping clause being made applicable to free goods.

> We cannot see where this is going to help us one iota, and think it should be excepted, because there is no doubt that if the Act was put into effect the United States would impose an increased duty on Canadian twine entering into their market.

So we have from that company—how large it is, my hon. friend knows perhaps, I do not undertake to say—a communication which is quite in harmony with the views of the other factories ; at all events, the proprietors of that factory concur in the view we have brought before the House.

Mr. PATERSON. I will give the information asked for by the hon. member for Lanark as to the bounties. For the year 1904, the bounty was $25,452; for 1905, $13,789. Those figures afford an indication for 1906. In respect to the question of the member for North York as to the total product of the mills, we have nothing later than the census, and according to the census of 1901 the product was $2,212,663.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the number of pounds given?

Mr. PATERSON. No. I should say that that includes cordage, rope and twine; I have not the binder twine separate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs would give us later the information which has been alluded to. So far as I am concerned, I would like to know what proportion of the total product of binder twine in Canada can be admitted to the United States without payment of duty. There is a certain proportion of binder twine manufactured in Canada of such a character that it can go to the United States free. I do not suppose that what goes into the United States free is the whole of the particular quality referred to, I do not know about that. I do not know whether this twine which is sent to the United States is manufactured especially for that market. Perhaps the hon. member for Peterborough could tell us about that.

Mr. FIELDING. I will get that information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a certain grade of binder twine manufactured in Canada which goes into the United States to the extent, as I understand, of about $360,000. Well, there are two other items of information which I want. One is, what is the total product in Canada of binder twine that would be admitted into the United States market free of duty. In addition to that, what is the total product of binder twine of every quality produced in Canada?

Mr. HALL. I may say that there are four classes of binder twine, namely, twine that is 500 feet to the pound, another class that is 550 feet to the pound, another that is 600 feet to the pound, and another that is 650. The 500 feet twine which is sent into the United States is made from sisal, or from the New Zealand article, depending on the condition of the market at the time. All

that 500 feet twine goes into the United States free of duty, and that is the only quality that we send there. The reason is that you cannot make a longer length of twine unless you use in it a mixture of manilla. Probably one-third of the twine used in Canada is about 500 feet to the pound. About 70 per cent of the twine used in the United States is about 500 feet to the pound. The Canadian manufacturers, as near as I can ascertain, manufacture pretty close to 50 per cent of the total consumption in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What proportion goes to the United States of that Canadian product which might be announced free of duty into the United States?

Mr. HALL. About one-third of the consumption in Canada is that class of twine which goes to the United States.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So we use in Canada about $720,000 worth of twine which could go to the United States free of duty?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the member for Peterborough know whether there was an arrangement made some two years ago that the Canadian factories should not manufacture more than 66 per cent, or 66⅔ per cent, of all the twine used in Canada, that this arrangement was imposed by an American combination, and that if the Canadian manufacturers went further they could be snuffed out, so to speak, as they might very easily have been?

Mr. HALL. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that there was no such arrangement and that it never was suggested to the Peterborough company or any other company that I ever heard of.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman unable to tell us the number of pounds of binder twine manufactured in Canada?

Mr. HALL. Between fourteen and sixteen million pounds.

Mr. HENDERSON. So that is about half and half. The Yankees give us the half and we give them that advantage.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman says that he is not aware that any such arrangement was made. If I was correctly informed when I brought this matter up in the House some years ago there was such an arrangement. I believe there was some such condition attached to the manufacture of binder twine at that time. I had the documents then but I did not know the matter was coming up to-day and I have not the documents with me. In regard to the letter which has been read from the Brantford Cordage Company I may say that I do not know under what conditions that has been obtained. The Minister of Finance has evidently obtained it since the House sat this afternoon. It may have been obtained quite properly, but that company have committed themselves against the proposal before they have tested it. They say that they do not see that there will be anything in this. Perhaps that question has been propounded by the hon. member for Peterborough who may have asked them if they were ready to waive that. Can they say when the matter has not been tested whether there would be anything in it for them? Perhaps they wrote it offhand without knowing to what use their letter was to be put. If there is anything in the dumping clause at all, which I very much doubt, it is there for the benefit of the binder twine manufacturers just the same as for any other manufacturer in Canada. If the dumping clause is no good in this case it is no good in any other case. The dumping clause, if it means anything, should be able to protect the manufacturers of binder twine from the importation of foreign binder twine at less than it costs to produce. If the dumping clause is no good, then wipe it out. But, let the other ten factories which are not so fortunate as these other two have whatever benefit there is in it.

Mr. FIELDING. In regard to the letter which I read I may explain that representations were made to me in the direction of this amendment and my hon. friend from Peterborough addressed to me a letter inclosing a letter from the Brantford Cordage Company in support of his application. A letter was written yesterday but it reached my office after I had left, so that I had not time to read it. When this subject came up I sent over for it.

Mr. STOCKTON. If I understood the hon. minister correctly, the extract which he read from the letter did not apply to the export of such binder twine as is manufactured by the hon. member for Peterborough at all, but it only referred to that which is liable to duty.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course, I cannot say how my hon. friend from Peterborough may have approached them on the subject. I had better read the whole letter. The letter seems to be one of complaint that we have not done more for the binder twine industry, but as respects this particular matter they agree with him.

Mr. STOCKTON. I did not so understand the extract which the hon. minister read.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Peterborough evidently so understood it and forwarded it to me in support of his application. It is dated January 8, 1907, and is addressed to the hon. member for Peterborough.

Dear Sir,—I now beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 3rd instant in re-

ference to the dumping clause as applied to binder twine and I am very sorry that I have been unable to reply more promptly.

We cannot see where this is going to help us one iota and think that it should be excepted because there is no doubt that if the Act was put into effect, the United States would impose an increased duty on Canadian twine entering into their market.

Mr. STOCKTON. An increased duty but not to put a duty on where there is none now.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I think that is what it means. There is a duty now on certain classes of twine and this would bring it within those classes. However, I am not going to interpret the letter; it speaks for itself.

Mr. OSLER. Would the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) tell me why it is that the Americans are admitting this manufacture free ?

Mr. HALL. I am sorry I do not know what policy actuates them.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the binder twine manufactured at Kingston is sold at the same price as other twine ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) will have to answer that. He says he has not the information at hand. It can be obtained later.

Mr. BOURASSA. In the previous discussion the point was not made clear by the hon. Minister of Finance about that proviso :

Provided that the said special duty shall not exceed 15 per cent ad valorem in any case.

Is that 15 per cent calculated upon the fair market price or upon the selling price ?

Mr. FIELDING. Upon the full value.

Resolution agreed to.

On subsection 6, of Resolution 5.

That such regulations may provide for the temporary exemption from special duty of any article or class of articles, when it is established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Customs that such articles are not made or sold in Canada in substantial quantities, and offered for sale to all purchasers on equal terms.

Mr. FIELDING. The question has been raised as to what that expression 'equal terms' may mean and it is thought that it might be capable of an interpretation which would not be acceptable or which would not be in accordance with the intention of parliament. It might be said that 'equal terms' would mean that everybody must get the article at the same price. Of course, that is not the custom of trade. We propose therefore to add the following words:

Under like conditions having regard to the custom and usages of the trade.

The purpose will be apparent from the few observations I have made.

Amendment agreed to.

On subsection 11, of Resolution 5.

Mr. FIELDING. Section 11 deals with the procedure in relation to the establishing of a charge of conspiracy, combination, &c. The clause as it reads says :

That whenever from or as a result of proceedings in any court of justice it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, &c

The suggestion is offered that the expression 'any court of justice' is too broad. I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggested that we might consider whether other words could not be used of a more qualified character. After consultation with the Department of Justice we propose to strike out the words 'any court of justice' and to insert instead thereof 'the Supreme Court, or Exchequer Court of Canada, or in any superior court or county court in Canada.' That confines it to the county court and the courts above it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Who institutes those proceedings?

Mr. FIELDING. In this case they will be proceedings that might be instituted by anybody. It deals with disclosures that might be made in the ordinary courts of justice.

Mr. W. F MACLEAN. Is there any instruction in the Act to the Attorney General of Canada to proceed in these cases on his own motion?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why should it not be the law?

Mr. FIELDING. We have another procedure in another court.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know, but when we have a tariff law as we have here and we have a Railway Act—and I intend to elaborate the argument a little later—I say that the law should read this way, that

The Attorney General of Canada is hereby required to enforce this Act.

Not only in connection with this, but in connection with the Railway Act. The responsibility ought to be on the government of Canada and it ought to be especially on the Attorney General of Canada to enforce any Act of this kind, and it should not be left to the private litigant who may or may not care to prosecute. And, furthermore, I believe the expense of enforcing an Act of this kind should be borne by the public exchequer of Canada and not left to the private litigant. Perhaps the minister will give that matter consideration because I

propose to bring that up. The real trouble in Canada to-day in regard to such Acts for the protection of the public is that the enforcement of them must remain in the hands of some private party who may be a poor man; but a new doctrine has been laid down in the United States, and I believe it is a good doctrine. It is in the Interstate Commerce Bill and it is in other laws which they have in the United States for the protection of the public—there is a special provision explicitly stating that: The Attorney General of the United States is hereby required to do this and to do that, to enforce that law, and I say this law against combines ought to be in that condition in this country. The responsibility of enforcing it should be upon the government and especially upon the Attorney General.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course this is so much a question of law that I do not care to offer any opinion of my own. The criticism that naturally arises in my mind is that the administration of justice in Canada is to a large extent placed in the hands of provincial authorities, the Attorneys General of the different provinces, and only in certain special cases is the Attorney General of Canada the party in control. I only make that remark, however, as it is a matter for the consideration of the Minister of Justice, and I shall leave it to him.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The same conditions exist in the United States. The state governments largely administer the law, but in regard to the Railway Act, and I believe the Tariff Act, the United States have the administration. I will not vouch for that at this moment, but in the Railway Act of the United States the protection of the public against frauds in connection with that Act is expressly placed upon the Attorney General of that country. I say that the same thing ought to be the law in regard to the Railway Act in this country and in regard to the Tariff Act. I intend to look up this matter in connection with the Tariff Act in the United States.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not think this should pass without consideration being given to the point raised by the hon member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). There is no doubt that if we mean to make this operative we should not load those who are interested in breaking such combines with too large an expenditure. Under the laws existing under the previous tariff there was a great deal of difficulty in this respect. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) may remember the difficulties in connection with the inquiry into the paper combine. I think that by the amendment brought down, I do not mean the amendment of to-day, but the clause brought in by the minister, that difficulty of inquiry into these combines will simply be rendered greater because the people interested will undoubtedly hesitate a great deal before they go to any amount of personal expense to find out the evidence as to these combines. As the minister knows, when there is such a combine the parties interested take great care not to let the public know the circumstances and the terms of their combine. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), who was at the time Minister of Inland Revenue, knows himself what difficulty he had to find out the particulars of the combine arranged by the American Tobacco Company. He had to act in a very energetic and I might say arbitrary manner, but I think he acted in the proper manner. It was the only way to reach them and I do not think it would be proper in this matter, which is far more general than the tobacco combine was, to make the application of this clause more difficult to the public or to the parties who are interested against the combine. I think the government, before they pass this, should provide some more facilities and machinery for enforcing it.

Mr. BRODEUR. This gives more facilities than formerly existed. Under this new legislation when a contract comes before the court and it is claimed by one of the parties that a combination exists then if by the judgment of the court it is found that there is a combination, the government will be guided by that judgment, and will reduce the duties imposed upon the article in question; so that instead of it being more difficult for these parties to secure enforcement this provides another means of bringing the question before the court.

Mr. BOURASSA. What kind of proceeding will be instituted?

Mr. BRODEUR. If before the courts the question is raised—suppose a man brings a contract before the court and the point is raised that the contract is wrong because of the existence of a combination, then if by the judgment of the court it is found there is a combination the government will be governed by the judgment of the court.

Mr. BOURASSA. It will not be necessary to take special proceedings?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think we are entitled to have a statement by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and I shall call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Just before six o'clock I directed the attention of the government to clause 11 and subsection 2 of that clause which provide with reference to violations of the law in regard to combinations to unfairly enhance prices to the

public. I asked the Minister of Customs and especially the Minister of Justice what was the law other than is expressed in these two clauses, as to the prosecution of persons guilty of such improper combinations. I repeat that question. I ask the Attorney General for the Dominion to explain if there is any other law than is to be found in these two clauses for the suppression of unfair combinations to put the prices of goods that come within the meaning of this tariff Act.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I presume the hon. gentleman is acquainted with the general provisions of the criminal code under which the unlawful combination of any body of men unduly to enhance prices is a crime punishable as the code provides. The administration of that statute is within the duty of the various attorneys general of the provinces. It is no part of the duty of the Attorney General for Canada, so far as I am aware, (except in cases where it is specially made his duty by statute) to engage in the administration of criminal justice. I do not know that I am able to give any other answer to the hon. gentleman. If at any time it becomes the duty of the Department of Justice to enforce this law or any other law of Canada, then so long as I have charge of that department that duty will be discharged to the best of my ability.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have now had a statement from the Attorney General for Canada as to his duty in prosecuting not only violations of the tariff law, but of other Dominion laws, and I intend to contrast our position with the position of the United States in that respect. Clause 11 and subsection 2 of that clause in our tariff Act provide as follows :

11. That whenever from or as a result of proceedings in any court of justice, it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement of any kind among manufacturers of such articles or dealers therein to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may admit the article free of duty, or so reduce the duty thereon as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in the article, if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article.

2. That whenever the Governor in Council deems it to be in the public interest to inquire into any conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement alleged to exist among manufacturers or dealers in any article of commerce to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers in such article at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court, or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such conspiracy, combination, agreement or arrangement exists.

That is a very slack law and the administration of it is much more slack, and the Attorney General tells us it is no part of his duty to enforce that law. I intend to direct the attention of the House to the law of the United States on this matter, and the law of the United States is sometimes worth copying by us as is evidenced by the fact that in the labour legislation just introduced here many of its clauses are taken from the Interstate commerce law of the neighbouring republic. I quote from the United States compiled statutes, section 73, volume 3, page 3202, the Act of August 27th 1894 :

Every combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement, or contract, is hereby declared to be contrary to public policy, illegal and void when the same is made by or between two or more persons or corporations either of whom is engaged in importing any article from any foreign country into the United States and when such combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement or contract is intended to operate in restraint of lawful trade, or free competition in lawful trade or commerce, or to increase the market price in any part of the United States of any article or articles imported or intended to be imported into the United States, or of any manufacture into which such imported articles shall enter or is intended to enter; every person who is or shall hereafter be engaged in the importation of goods or any commodity from any foreign country in violation of this section of the Act, or who shall combine or conspire with another to violate the same is guilty of a misdemeanour, and on conviction thereof in any court of the United States such persons shall be fined in a sum not less than $100 and not exceeding $5,000 and shall be further punished by imprisonment in the discretion of the court for a term not less than three months and not exceeding twelve months.

There is the law of the United States which says that everybody who shall make a combination in respect of any article imported under the tariff law of the United States shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be subject to a fine and may be sent to jail for twelve months. Section 74 of this United States Act says :

The several circuit courts of the United States are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violation of section 73 of this Act and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts under the direction of the Attorney General to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations.

It is imposed upon the Attorney General of the United States to immediately institute proceedings which will restrain these unlawful combinations. He is charged with the duty, and it is expected that he will take out injunctions and immediately restrain any combinations in connection with the

tariff law of the United States. The Act goes on to say :

These proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violations shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed as soon as may be to the hearing and determination of the case, and pending such petition and before final decree the court may at any time make such temporary restraint order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises.

In this country all the law we have against these combinations and their crimes —for they are crimes under the criminal law—I say all the punishment we have here is that the duty may be reduced or wiped out, if the Governor in Council sees fit.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not in the criminal law.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I speak of the criminal law relating to combinations and restraint of trade.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all; there is no reference in it to the duty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is no reference to the duty in the Criminal Code. But I say that here there is no punishment except that the duty may be reduced; and, as in this case, there is no duty, there will be no punishment of that combination, though, as a matter of fact, if the Attorney General (Mr. Aylesworth) was in his place this afternoon, he must have heard what was substantially a confession of one of the parties interested that there was a combine among certain manufacturers of this country to put up prices.

Mr. BRODEUR. If there be a combination in restraint of trade, cannot the parties to it be punished under the criminal law?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes. But the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Brodeur's) colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has just told him that that did not apply to the customs law.

Mr. FIELDING. No. The hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said that the only punishment in such a case was in the reduction of the duty. That is not the case.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What I said may have conveyed that impression, but I did not intend it. What I say is that there is no punishment for combinations under the law of Canada in connection with the duty, but, in the United States, there is the punishment of a fine with the possibility of imprisonment, and the Attorney General of the United States is required to enforce that law. But there is something further. At page 602, volume 4, of the United States compiled statutes, I find clause 106 as follows :

That for the enforcement of the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate commerce,' approved February fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven, and all Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and of the Act entitled 'An Act to protect Trade and Commerce, against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' approved July the second, eighteen hundred and ninety, and all Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, and sections seventy-three, seventy-four, seventy-five and seventy-six of the Act entitled 'An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the government, and other purposes,' approved August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four, the sum of five hundred thousand dollars, to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the treasury not heretofore appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General in the employment of special counsel and agents of the Department of Justice to conduct proceedings, suits and prosecutions under said Acts in the courts of the United States.

Now, here we are trying to deal with combinations in restraint of trade, combinations that injure the consumers. And we propose to put these combinations down by certain clauses under this Tariff Act. But these clauses are so weak that they cannot have the desired effect. Further, as I have pointed out, there is no provision for the enforcement of the law and the punishment of the guilty parties by the Attorney General, who ought to be responsible for the administration of our law. Now, in the United States—and I hope the Prime Minister pays some respect to the laws of the United States—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not so much as my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) does.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, yesterday, one of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues, introduced a Bill which is taken from this same Interstate Commerce Act—practically a transfer from their statute-book to ours. I say that we have no provision in this tariff law against these combinations. In the United States they have a law under which punishment is provided. The Attorney General of the United States is charged with the enforcement of that law, every district attorney in the United States is charged with that duty, while the sum of $500,000 is appropriated for that work. And the Attorney General of Canada has confessed here to-night, that if he were so empowered and—I suppose—if the funds were at his disposal, he would do the same work. But he has confessed also that we have no such law in our code against combinations of this kind in connection with the tariff, and therefore there is no protection to the citizens of Canada. Surely the citizen of Canada is worthy of consideration. We are supposed to be legislating in his interest and for his protection. If these combinations exist, the duty on the article may be reduced and no more——

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the punishment, then?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has not examined this question very carefully. Had he done so he would have found that in our criminal law there is a definite provision on this subject.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is it?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the case of a combination in restraint of trade, the members of it are liable to be sent to jail.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says that that does not apply to the tariff.

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

Mr. BRODEUR. But these are two different matters. We are dealing with the Tariff Act now. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) says that no punishment by way of fine or imprisonment is provided under this Tariff Act for those guilty of forming a combination in restraint of trade. But it is not in the Tariff Act that that should be done. But, even though it is provided under another law the hon. gentleman says it is nothing. Well, it seems to me that a liability to be prosecuted under the criminal law and sent to jail is a point that most people would regard as worthy of consideration. But we are not dealing now with the criminal law but with the tariff law, and, under the tariff law, and in addition to what the criminal law provides, two things are provided under the Tariff Act as it is now proposed. First, there is the provision which existed under the previous law, that, in the case of an allegation of combination in restraint of trade, investigation can be ordered by the government, and, if the case is proved, the duty can be reduced or abolished. Investigation has taken place in two or three cases at least—in the case of the paper combine, in the case of the tobacco trust, and there may have been others which I cannot now recall. We go further now and provide that if in any proceedings or by any judgment rendered by any judge in any superior court it is declared that there is a combination in restraint of trade, the government can interfere and reduce the duty. This legislation, my hon. friend can see, is in the direction in which he desires to go, and I think it is enough to show that the government is desirous of taking every precaution to prevent combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has stated that there was a combination among the paper manufacturers. Well, was there a prosecution under the criminal law?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Was any complaint lodged by anybody?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We are told by a minister of the Crown that a combination was proven to exist, and when I ask if the parties were punished under the criminal law, the Attorney General of this country asks me if any complaint was made.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I was counsel for the newspapermen and succeeded in demonstrating that there was a combination.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And where was the Attorney General the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Aylesworth's) predecessor, for whom he is responsible at that time?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He was doing his duty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did he do his duty?

Mr. BRODEUR. Why did not the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) lodge a complaint——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let the hon. minister sit down. I have the floor—and he wishes to make my speech. And we are told that a tobacco trust was proven to exist. Perhaps the minister (Mr. Brodeur) who was Minister of Inland Revenue can tell us what was done in that case? There was a combination there. Was there any enforcement of the criminal law against this tobacco trust and the oil trust and all these others? No. Why? Because we have not in our law that mandatory statement which says it shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the Dominion and of any attorneys he may have at his disposal—and I imagine the Crown attorneys of every province are at his disposal.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then the hon. gentleman confesses that he has no attorneys at his disposal.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him? If he will refer to the provisions of the British North America Act, which is our constitution, he will find that the administration of the criminal law is in no respect assigned to this Dominion or the Attorney General of this Dominion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, I am going to cite a case where the hon. gentleman has failed to administer the law. I refer to the exposures of corrupt acts under the election law, which were brought to light in the police court in the city of Toronto. It was left to the attorney general in that province to enforce the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But did the previous attorney general, who happened to be a friend of this administration, enforce it? He did not. He said: I am not a constable.

That is all the administration of the law which we get in this country, and that is all we get in connection with these combines in restraint of trade. In the United States they have a strict law which makes such combines a crime. I have proved that the Attorney General of the United States and all the district attorneys under him are bound to see that punishment is meted out to these people, and I have proved that the resources of the United States are at the disposal of the attorney general of that country to enforce the tariff laws there. Let me take up some other acts in that same direction, just to show in what a fool's paradise we live as far as the administration of our laws is concerned. We are here every day passing laws to do away with bribery and corruption and other wrongful acts in connection with elections, but apparently we have not any machinery to enforce them, but are at the mercy, according to the British North America Act, of the attorney generals of the respective provinces. That being the condition, it is our duty to find a way to enforce the Acts we pass in this House in the public interest, especially acts to protect the public against the wrong doings of the great combines in connection with commerce or such great combines as the railway corporations. I read to the House the other day what the Attorney General of the United States is empowered to do in connection with the interstate commerce law, and I want to point out—and it is the greatest question, to my mind, before the people to-day—the apparent inability in this country to have our federal laws enforced, and the difference that exists between those laws and similar laws passed in the United States. In every American law, provision is made for its enforcement, and I propose to read two or three extracts from the Interstate Commerce Act, recently passed in the United States and now being enforced. To-day the attorney general there and all his special agents and counsel are after a man named Harriman—a man who by some peculiar methods has succeeded in acquiring the control of thousands of miles of railway in that country. He got hold of one road and by manipulation managed to mortgage it so as to buy other railways, and to-day is the terror of shippers in the United States. Men like him were the terror of all those engaged in business in that country until the government passed a law to regulate the existing conditions, and an essential condition of that law is that the Attorney General of the United States shall prosecute and retain any number of special agents to help him in the prosecution and prosecute the charges from one court to another. By virtue of that authority the Attorney General of the United States and his agents are prosecuting Harriman and all those guilty of rate discriminations, and those found guilty are to-day paying fines amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. The New York Central was fined over $100.000 the other day. So also was the Sugar Trust and the cooperage trust. High officials of railways have been fined and threatened with jail if they repeat the offences they committed in connection with discriminations and rebates. Let me read to the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Attorney General, for their special consideration, some provisions from the Interstate Commerce Law to show how drastic it is. Speaking of the Railway Commission, it says:

> The commission is hereby authorized and required to enforce the provisions of this Act.

Then, a few pages further on, I read the following:

> And the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed, whenever he has reasonable grounds to believe that any person, corporation or company has knowingly received or accepted any sum of money or other valuable consideration as a rebate, to institute, in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, civil action to recover such money.

On the next page I find the following:

> It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, whenever the Attorney General shall direct, either of his own motion or on the request of the interstate commission, to institute and prosecute such proceedings as are provided by this Act, and such proceedings shall not preclude the bringing of suits for damages by any of the parties injured.

Then at page 41—

> It is hereby made the duty of the attorneys of the United States by proper proceedings, to prevent any unlawful interference with the rights and equities of the United States under this Act and the Acts hereinbefore mentioned.

And again—

> It shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inform the Attorney General of all such cases of neglect or refusal and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to proceed at once to judicially enforce the forfeitures hereinbefore provided.

Thus in that great Act—somewhat similar to ours but much more drastic and much more in the interests of the people—there continually occurs this mandate, namely, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce the Act and it shall be the duty of the district attorneys to assist him in that enforcement. And it further provides that all the costs in that connection shall be paid out of the American treasury.

We have no such law in this country, and we have the confession to-night of our Attorney General of the Dominion that he enforces no law unless specially directed to do so. He confesses also that in connection with this tariff law, which we are now pass-

ing, it is not his duty to in any way enforce it. It may be the duty of the government, if it deems wise to do so, to do certain things in the way of reducing the tariff, but there is nothing which declares it shall be the duty of the administration to enforce the criminal law in connection with it. Then I say—and I am not holding this government any more responsible than its predecessor—that we are away behind the age in this matter. When dealing with this question, we ought to deal with it in a way that will protect the people against combine, whether in connection with the tariff or the railway administration of this country or our election laws.

Is there anything more humiliating to Canadians to-day than the exposures that have been made time after time in connection with our election laws? In fact our elections law are of this character, that no matter what the exposure may be in court, no matter how bad the state of affairs may be as to bribery, as to personation, as to all kinds of wrong doing, the proceedings can be immediately stopped by one side or the other throwing up the sponge; then nothing comes out, and there is no punishment to any one. We talk in this House of passing more laws. Let us devote our energy to finding a way of administering the laws we have, and then these evils will end, then these combinations will end, and then the railways will do the people justice. But if the responsible Minister of Justice of this House of Commons confesses that he does not conceive it to be his duty to enforce the laws of the Dominion, that, as he says, they are to be left under the British North America Act to the provinces to enforce, where have we landed ? We are in the midst of anarchy, because anarchy is the absence of an enforcement of law, and apparently there is no enforcement of law in this respect. There is nothing so near anarchy as those exposures in London. Let me direct the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice to the refusal of the Grand Trunk Railway to carry out a statute of Canada of the year 1852, which provided that, in consideration of their getting a valuable franchise at that time, and a great subsidy from the government, they assumed the obligation of giving the people a penny-a-mile fare; yet from that time to this that law has never been enforced. To-night I ask the Prime Minister what has he to say to the people of Canada in view of these facts ? Does he propose to introduce legislation which will enforce the laws we have passed in this House ? Does he propose to compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company —and there is a concrete instance for him to consider—does he intend to ask his Minister of Railways to enforce that law against the Grand Trunk and compel them to give the people a penny-a-mile service on that railroad ? If we are simply to sit here and pass all these laws and neglect to enforce them, where, as I said before, have we arrived ? We live alongside a nation that leads us in many things, who recognize these evils, and have a somewhat similar federal constitution to our own and they have seen fit to make these things crimes, to make the treasury of the state aid in enforcing law, and to make the chief law officer of the state responsible for its administration. If they have seen fit to do that, do my hon. friends opposite intend to do the same ? The Prime Minister bows acquiescence, and I hope he will bow a little lower when I bring forward some other instances. We go on passing laws, and apparently we have not got any machinery to enforce them, because the Attorney General tells us to-night that if we had the machinery he would obey the law and enforce it. Now that is a good beginning, we have got that far. He says he is not responsible for the breaches that took place in the past, but we have obtained from him that expression of willingness to act. Now I invite the Prime Minister to instruct his law department to go to work and to put this law of Canada on the same basis as similar laws in the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) I know is a close reader of American history, anybody who reads the Toronto 'World' can see that, because the Toronto 'World' is a good copy of some other worlds on the other side of the line. But I am afraid my hon. friend is not as good a reader of American books as he ought to be. My hon. friend remembers that when the Canadian confederation was established, the American constitution was under trial and a civil war had just concluded. He knows also that one of the reasons of that war was said at the time to be too great power given to the state. The authors of the Canadian constitution thought they would proceed differently, and one of the differences between our constitution and the American constitution is the provision with regard to the administration of justice. In the United States they have a system of federal courts and of state courts. The state courts are entrusted with the administration of state laws, and the federal courts are entrusted with the administration of federal laws. This is something which my hon. friend has always forgotten whenever he has brought to our attention the dispositions of the American constitution, and the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce American laws. But in our country we have a different constitution. We have no federal courts. We have federal laws, but we have no federal courts. We have provincial courts, and these are entrusted with the administration not only of provincial laws but of federal laws. This is something which my hon. friend should not forget. He asks: Must we submit to the humiliation of having laws with no power to

enforce them ? We have the power to enforce them, the power is vested in the provinces. And when my hon. friend directs his diatribes against my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and charges him with a failure to enforce our federal laws, I would ask my hon. friend to address himself to the Attorney General of the province of Ontario, and the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. He said a moment ago that when the Grand Trunk Railway was given a charter fifty years ago, one of the conditions was that the company should carry passengers for two cents a mile, and provide a third-class car. He says that this has not been done, and true it has not. He says, Why don't you enforce the law ? Well, Mr. Chairman, he has only to apply to Mr. Foy, the Attorney General of the province of Ontario, who is the party entrusted under our constitution to look after this matter so far as it concerns the province of Ontario. It is not sufficient for my hon. friend to read American newspapers, let him read the Canadian constitution, let him look at section 92 of the British North America Act, and he will find therein provided that :

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated: that is to say. . . .
>
> The administration of justice in the province, including the construction, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

And so on. There my hon. friend has his remedy. He has only to apply to the Attorney General of the province and tell him that that provision of the law imposed upon the Grand Trunk Company has been violated by that company, and there he will find his remedy.

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not wish to intervene unnecessarily in this exchange of courtesies between my hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and my right hon. friend the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But it seems to me that the First Minister has not exactly stated the whole case in attempting to answer my hon. friend from York. Under the British North America Act this parliament has the right to constitute a court to administer federal law. We have the Supreme Court of Canada, we have the Exchequer Court of Canada, we have the Admiralty Court in connection with the Exchequer Court and we also have the railway commission for the purpose of administering federal laws. Now, my right hon. friend has referred to the difference between the constitutions of the United States and Canada, but the residuum of power in the United States is with the separate states. The residuum of power in Canada is with the federal government and therefore the argument of my right hon. friend rather makes against the position he was taking in opposition to my hon. friend immediately in front of me (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I ask the hon. Minister of Justice if, in his opinion, this parliament has not the power to devolve upon his department the right to enforce the federal laws of this country? Will the Minister of Justice say that this parliament cannot pass an Act making it imperative upon his department to see that the laws are carried out and enforced ? I await an answer from the minister.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Nobody that I have heard has said anything to the contrary. Before the hon. gentleman was in the House this evening, I stated, in answer to a question by the hon. member for South York, that there were under special statutes of the Dominion special instances in which the enforcement of these special laws had been made the duty of the Attorney General for Canada. No one has ever questioned or disputed that, and that inquiry on the part of my hon. friend seems to be, with all deference, entirely beside the question.

Mr. STOCKTON. I thank my hon. friend the Minister of Justice for the statement he has made. What then was the object of the statement of the Minister of Justice in saying that under the British North America Act he had no power to act ? He now admits that this parliament has the power to put a law on the statute-book giving to the Department of Justice the power to enforce a federal law. I do not understand the position of my hon. friend from South York to be that my right hon. friend could not do that. He is asking that a law shall be passed so that the Department of Justice may have the power to see that when we pass laws in this parliament the officers of this parliament or the government can insist upon them being carried out. That is the position that I understand my hon. friend has taken and I think we have power to pass such legislation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The position taken by the hon. member for South York was that there was no machinery at the present time to enforce the law.

Mr. STOCKTON. Well, I will just take it in that way and the answer of the Minister of Justice, as I understand him, rather went to the point that under the British North America Act we had no power to make the machinery in this parliament to carry out that law. If we had the power —and I think we have the power—then the question arises : is it our duty to avail ourselves of that power and put a law on the statute-book to see that the laws that we pass are enforced ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For forty years the federal parliament has not taken such a view. We have had the administration of justice confined to the provinces

and it is probably adequate at the present time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the time has arrived to exercise that power. We have a court of federal jurisdiction in the Exchequer Court. Could not parliament enlarge the powers of that court and give to it, or the Supreme Court, the power to administer this law, or create a new court? It is a public scandal that this law cannot be enforced, and that the machinery is such that we are at the mercy of the provinces in that respect. If we want these laws to be enforced we must establish courts that will enforce them. There are a number of matters in which there is concurrent jurisdiction. In regard to the case of the Grand Trunk the Prime Minister tried to evade the issue. But, there sits the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to whom we pay a salary of $7,000 a year and to whom we have given all kinds of officials. He has a special law department of his own, he has a Railway Commission at his service to enforce the Railway Act, and I imagined it was his duty to enforce the Railway Act. The Railway Act applies to the charters of all railways in this country including the Grand Trunk. So, while he is charged with the duty of enforcing the Act and while it is not being enforced, the Prime Minister of this country refers me to Mr. Foy, of the province of Ontario. At the first opportunity I am going to Mr. Foy of the province of Ontario and I shall tell him that as a citizen I would like him to enforce that law especially because the Prime Minister of this country, whose colleague is responsible for the administration of the Railway Act, notwithstanding anything that may have been said here to-night, does not see his way to enforce it although the railways are within the jurisdiction of the government of Canada. I shall tell Mr. Foy that and I shall tell him in the most public way so that the people of Canada may be acquainted with this fact. It may be a clever evasion of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, but it will not satisfy the people of the country. I will give the Prime Minister another opportunity of saying whether he intends to bring the attention of his colleague to the non-compliance of the Grand Trunk with the law of this country in connection with the penny-a-mile service.

Mr. PATERSON. Will not Mr. Foy do it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We will see. Mr. Foy did something very efficacious in the police court in Toronto the other day. He may be prepared to do something very efficacious with Mr. Hays; in fact we have had Mr. Hays up in the police court in Toronto in connection with this transaction and it seems to have done him good. It certainly did some other gentlemen a great deal of good, and it comes down to this that the only court where you can get a satisfactory enforcement of the laws is the good old police court of Toronto which is presided ever by that worthy patriot, Colonel Dennison.

Mr. BOURASSA. Suppose we come back to the practical point of the discussion now. I do not say this in criticism of my hon. friend from South York, but I am afraid the discussion has taken a pretty broad scope. The point raised by my hon. friend is worthy of consideration as to whether we have provided machinery to enforce our law in matters of tariff. I followed the short argument made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) who pointed out that there were three provisions for dealing with combines. One is, the article of the Criminal Code which makes liable to criminal procedure any combine in trade. The other is the article which existed in the preceding tariff and which is maintained in the present tariff providing that in case of sufficient evidence being given to the government that there is a combine in existence the government have power to make an inquiry and if they find that such a combine exists to take off or lower the duty. Then there is a further provision in the resolutions now before the committee which says that in case any court, as defined by the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to-day, finds that such a combine exists the same remedy may be applied by the government. But, I think there is considerable to be said in favour of the argument which has been made by the hon. member for South York. The strongest punishment is certainly the one contained in the Criminal Code, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will admit that many private citizens and even many trade interests, strong as they may be, will hesitate before they undertake criminal proceedings on their own responsibility against any such combine; first, because of the difficulty which I pointed out this afternoon of finding out the evidence at great cost, and second, because if they fail in their evidence they are liable for false accusation against the parties. What I think is lacking is some ways and means by which the government of Canada would assume the full responsibility of taking the criminal action against these parties.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. Now, I would not dare, and I do not think it is practical to touch at the present time on the question of whether the government has the power or should use the power of organizing special courts for the enactment of such penal provisions. As favourable as I am to the maintenance of provincial rights I would not favour any disposition by which this government would institute courts that would come in conflict with the present criminal jurisdiction of the provincial courts,

but could there not be a more practical solution to the difficulty, one that would not involve any broad interpretation of the constitution nor any change in our present system ? Could we not for example in this law, without touching the application of the Railway Act which does not bear upon the present case, have some disposition by which the Attorney General of Canada could institute before the provincial courts those criminal proceedings against the parties combining. That is, instead of leaving on the shoulders of the private citizen or trade interest the responsibility and cost and the chance of damages by taking proceedings on their own responsibility, that the Attorney General of Canada could take those proceedings.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is there anything in the constitution contrary to that ? Here is a federal law, which is passed for the protection of trade. The government and the parliament of Canada think it is proper that we should adopt some measure to prevent combines. I think it is due to the dignity of the parliament of Canada that we should find the most practical means to see that this is put into operation ; just as I would not wish to see the government of Canada institute jurisdiction that might curtail the present jurisdiction of the provinces, at the same time I would not like to see the parliament of Canada sacrifice its dignity by waiting on the provincial governments to see that federal legislation should be put into force; and more than that I do not think it is proper to do so because it is a matter of trade and we are the only power to look after trade matters which interest Canada at large. Now here is a question which interests Canada at large, for example a combine may be instituted in which are concerned one firm in Quebec, three in Ontario and three in New Brunswick. It is not particularly the trade in any one province that will be interested but the trade of Canada, and in order to protect the trade of Canada and to protect the consumer in Canada the federal parliament thinks proper to adopt measures in order to prevent combines. My only contention is that as between the strong measures contained in the Criminal Code and the more lenient measure contained in the present federal Act there is not a sufficient bond ; the action of the federal government and the federal parliament is not strong enough to cover the whole ground. It seems to me the government of Canada should have the power to institute the criminal proceedings and should bear the responsibility of their cost as well as relieve the private citizen from the danger of the damages that might accrue in case the action is not well founded. The only suggestion I am making is that the Attorney General of Canada should be allowed to undertake these proceedings as any private citizen can.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Enjoined to do it.

Mr. BOURASSA. That might be the wording of the law but I would not go as far as to ask the government of Canada to institute criminal courts in order to act in the same position as the Attorney General of the province has the right to act, but simply that the government of Canada should make the petition for a writ, before any provincial court, just as a private individual can.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is provided in the Criminal Code.

Mr. BOURASSA. The article in the Criminal Code is strong enough but the attorney general of the province, as I think the Prime Minister will admit will not take any proceedings unless complaint is lodged with him by private citizens, and at the same time private citizens will not lodge a complaint, because if they cannot prove their charge they are liable to damages for false arrest or improper prosecution.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they are not.

Mr. BOURASSA. I understand that every time a complaint is lodged for the application of the Criminal Code, and the prosecution is not sustained, the accuser virtually is liable for false arrest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. BOURASSA. We see it every day.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Is not the person making complaint to the attorney general of the province under this put in exactly the same position as any man who makes a complaint in regard to any other offence under the Criminal Code ?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, he would not from a practical point of view.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. From a legal point of view.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am taking it from a practical point of view ; from the practical point of view the man who brings an accusation against a citizen for a specific act finds it more or less easy to get evidence, but here you have to bring an accusation against a powerful combine who have a large amount of capital at their back, and as a rule either the private citizen or the private trader, who is trying to bring a suit against the combine, has not from the practical point of view the same advantage that they have because their power is so great, the influence they exercise over the small dealers whom they force to accept the prices fixed by their combines is such, that it is almost impossible to find evidence.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The Criminal Code makes it a criminal offence for parties to join in conspiracy for certain purposes. The party who desires to enforce that law, makes a complaint to the attorney general

of a province and upon that complaint the attorney general initiates proceedings. What difference is there between the ordinary complaint against parties for conspiracies which are illegal under the Criminal Code and a conspiracy which would be a combine under this particular Act ?

Mr. BOURASSA. There is this difference: first the difference I pointed out, the very unfair position in which you put the individual, the traders or private citizens opposed to the great combine, and then there is the fact that it is not only the interest of a few individuals that might be at stake. We are here passing a law in the interest of the general trade of Canada. A combine may exist for a long time without any individual feeling hurt by it to an extent that will lead him to go to the expense and assume the responsibility of initiating criminal proceedings against that combine, but I say if we judge proper for the maintenance of fair trade in this country to adopt legislation by which we seek to prevent and to punish combines, we must go to the extent of providing machinery by which this government and this parliament will bear all the cost and all the responsibility of the application of that law. That is all I ask. As to the special procedure to be taken I do not pose as being a legal adviser to the government, but it seems to me it should be possible, without making such a revolution in our constitution, for the federal government and parliament to be strong enough to act in a practical manner, without leaving it to the private citizen to see to it that our laws are enforced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think there is a great deal to be considered in some of the remarks that have been made about the necessity of imposing upon the Attorney General of Canada the duty of enforcing legislation that is of immediate federal concern. I do not see, however, that this discussion is very relevant to the question before us. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) seems to imagine that some complaint is necessary for the purpose of inducing action by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BOURASSA. No. I said some complaint was necessary to have the articles of the Criminal Code applied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That applies to almost every provision of the Criminal Code. A person who makes such a charge although that charge fails in the end is not necessarily liable in damages.

Mr. BOURASSA. Not necessarily.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN It depends on whether he was acting in good faith and had reasonable and probable cause for making the charge. The clause immediately under discussion simply empowers the Governor in Council to take action. It is true the Governor in Council may base its action upon representations made to it, but I would not think that such representations could possibly impose any responsibility upon the persons who made them unless they were made falsely, wilfully and maliciously. There is a provision in the Criminal Code that persons conspiring to unduly enhance prices shall be guilty of a criminal offence, and the administration of that is left to the provinces and the Attorney General of the province is more immediately responsible. The object of that provision is simply to punish persons who have been guilty, and not to provide a remedy. The clause which provides for action by the Governor in Council is designed not to punish—except so far as a reduction or abolition of a duty may be punishment—it is designed to afford a remedy by creating competition. The first subsection of section 11 provides that when it appears from evidence in any superior court of justice that any conspiracy, combination, or arrangement to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers has been made, then the Governor in Council can take just the same action upon that evidence as they could have taken under the law as it previously stood, upon the finding of a commission appointed by them. It would seem to me that the first subsection of section 11 goes quite far enough, perhaps a little too far, for the reasons I stated when we were discussing this question before. I am as anxious as any member of this House that all possible laws should be enacted for the prevention of conspiracies and combinations of this kind, but I am also anxious that no person in this country should be subjected to any penalty or disadvantage unless he has had an opportunity of being heard in his own defence. I pointed out to the Minister of Finance that under this subsection persons might be subjected to penalties without an opportunity of being heard, and I rather hoped that he might have seen fit so to modify it that no person should be brought within the scope of that section without having had an opportunity of presenting his defence. However, the responsibility of enforcing this law will always be upon the Governor in Council and the government will be responsible to parliament for the action which they take, and that no doubt is to some extent a safeguard against oppression.

As to the enforcement of federal laws, the Prime Minister forgets that every day the Department of Justice has cast upon it the duty of enforcing federal laws of a criminal or quasi criminial nature. For example, the Minister of Justice acting for the departments of Customs or Inland Revenue is continually proceeding against those who violate the customs and excise laws. The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), and it is well worthy of consideration, is this, that in matters of federal concern a statute should impose upon the Attorney General of Canada the duty of seeing that federal laws are enforced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) was that at the present time there was no machinery to execute the laws passed by this parliament. I pointed out that such machinery does exist. I pointed out that when the Minister of Justice goes to the law courts he goes simply as the attorney for his client which is the government of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My statement was that in the United States the law was stated and the enforcement of it was provided for in the same Act, and I said we should have something of the same kind in this country and that the duty of enforcing the federal law ought to be enjoined upon the Attorney General of Canada as it is upon the United States Attorney General. I would assert that even if we had to provide special courts, but I do not think that would be necessary. This is a country of responsible government in more than one sense; there is a responsibility upon the government collectively to enforce the law and there is a responsibility upon them individually as heads of their several departments. If the duty of enforcing federal laws does not now devolve upon the Minister of Justice there should be a statute defining it to be his duty. According to the Prime Minister there is some kind of way for enforcing our laws, but I want a federal way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Up to the present time that has not been the policy or the practice of any party in Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But there is a new party now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was careful to say that 'up to the present time' it had not been the practice of any political party, but there is a new party to-day——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That will be the first plank in the platform of the new party.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may be the policy of the new party that this government should see to the enforcement of the laws against murder and petty larceny, but it has not been the policy of the old parties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not very sure that it has not been the policy of one of the old parties when it thought it convenient. For example in connection with certain election matters in the province of Manitoba one of the old parties found it convenient to interfere.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know to what my hon. friend is alluding.

Mr. FIELDING'S amendment:

That the words 'As the result of proceedings in any court of justice' be omitted and the following substituted: 'Or as the result of a judgment of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada or of any superior court, or circuit, district, or county court of Canada'.

Agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. In subsection 2, the provision is that we may appoint a judge of a superior court as a commissioner, and I propose to amend that by inserting the words 'or county court,' so that a county court judge may be appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. How would that apply to the province of Quebec where there are no county courts?

Mr. FIELDING. It will not apply to Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. Only judges of the Superior Court in Quebec would be entitled to act.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the amendment would not refer to Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would include Ontario and the provinces which have county courts.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) turn to page 5 and explain what is meant by the exception B to subsection 5 of resolution 1, 'goods of a class subject to excise duty in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of goods subject to excise, the duties are much higher than in ordinary cases, and to apply the dumping clause would make the duties excessive. As a rule the necessity for that clause has not arisen in connection with any goods subject to excise.

Mr. LOGAN. I understand that the resolutions are to remain in committee.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. LOGAN. Several weeks ago I gave notice of an amendment to confine the preferential tariff to goods brought in via Canadian ports, but at the request of some hon. members I postponed the discussion of the subject and intended bringing it up to-day. I however have been again asked by one or two members, who cannot be present to-day but who desire to speak on the subject, to hold over my amendment until next week, and on the first government day I shall take the opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. FIELDING. The resolutions will remain in committee and there will be opportunity for my hon. friend to do that.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have not heard any special explanation regarding the relations between the French treaty and the new intermediate tariff which is proposed. I understand that the French treaty provides that no special advantage which we may give any other foreign country can come into force unless we grant the same advantage to France; and at the same time we have no right to demand any similar com-

pensation from that country. Is that a good reading of that treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid it is. Under the French treaty we are obliged to give to France the most favoured nation treatment, but in the case of France extending concessions to other countries she is only obliged to extend them to Canada on the particular articles mentioned.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is my reading. Therefore, may I ask if the government contemplates any effort to have that French treaty amended so that we shall not be obliged to apply that intermediate tariff to French importations, without getting some quid pro quo, should we give the advantage of it to any other country.

Mr. FIELDING. Although we have nothing to record officially to the House, the government have made some efforts in that direction, and if the opportunity be afforded we propose to continue those efforts; but once a treaty of that kind is entered into—a treaty which in some respects we may regard as too one-sided—it is not easy to make a change. The matter, however, is engaging our attention and if the opportunity occurs, we shall endeavour to obtain a change.

Mr. BOURASSA. The circumstances would be more favourable now than they were twelve years ago for the negotiation of a treaty between France and Canada in which, I would not say we would get the better of that nation—because I do not suppose that any one would contemplate a treaty in that spirit—but in which we would get more equitable treatment than we get now. I am therefore glad to hear the answer given by the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) because when the intermediate tariff was proposed, I thought that just as it was impossible to apply the preference of 1897 without repealing the Belgian and German treaties, likewise the present intermediate tariff would be of no use, unless some change were made in the French treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct. The resolution relating to drawbacks we shall have to regard as standing because the drawback schedules may be amended. I therefore ask that subsection 9 of section 1 be allowed to stand. We will now take up the schedule items on page 8. I move that these schedules be considered item by item.

Motion agreed to.

On schedule A,

GROUP 1.

Animals, Agricultural Products, Fish and Provisions.

1. Horses, cattle, sheep, goats, asses, swine and dogs, for the improvement of stock, under regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free.

Mr. FIELDING. That is practically the same as the tariff hitherto. The only change made is one, which I hope will not be taken as containing any personal allusion. The word 'asses' is included.

4. Horses over one year old, valued at $50 or less per head—each—$10 under British preferential tariff; $12.50 under intermediate tariff.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there a clause in the American Customs tariff relative to horses under $50 in value?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a value limit, but it is higher than ours.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the present duty on horses coming in from Mexico?

Mr. FIELDING. They would come in under the general rate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What has it been heretofore? There has been a lot of inferior western horses, such as bronchos, coming into Canada in past years. What is the duty on them?

Mr. FIELDING. Twenty per cent has been the rate hitherto. The American item covers horses and mules valued at $150 or less, $30 per head specific duty; and over $150, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister how this sum of $10 per head, or $12.50 per head if they come from the United States, was arrived at? I may say that while it is quite true that in the province of Ontario at the present time, there is a good standing price for heavy animals. It is not so for the lighter class. The fact is that Ontario is overrun with the lighter class of horses—at least I can speak for the part of the country that I come from. Several loads of bronchos have been brought in, and there are many complaints from the farmers because of their introduction. What has been the provision in reference to this lower class of horse heretofore? Was there a special grade?

Mr. PATERSON. That was attempted to be carried out by fixing this valuation. I think you will not find any of these importations coming into the older provinces now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This does not say that they shall be valued at anything.

Mr. PATERSON. But it provides a duty of $12.50 which is a duty of 25 per cent on a horse valued at $500. Some bronchos did come in here at low prices, and, consequently at a low amount of duty for each horse. For instance, 20 per cent on a horse valued at $20 would mean a duty of only $4.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I referred to. I do not know what they cost laid down, but, at a sale by public auction very

few brought as high as $50. I think that there should be practically a prohibitory duty on bronchos and I do not think that this will be prohibitory.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be over 100 per cent on the old values that were spoken of.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not assuming that the old tariff was right. Here is a feature of the case that also must be considered: We are endeavouring in Ontario, at all events, to breed a superior class of horses, because the competition of the electric railways is interfering very much with the sale of ordinary horses produced in this province. The bringing in of these inferior horses, these bronchos tends toward a less valuable breed of horses. The tariff should not be $12.50 a head, but it should be simply prohibitory. These bronchos are merely a freak in the country. They are not of sufficient size or strength to make draft horses, and the dumping in different parts of the country of carloads of these horses brought in from the western states tends to depreciate our lighter class of horses. I would ask the minister on whose representation this rate of $12.50 was fixed? Was it upon the representation of the farmers or upon the representation of those engaged in the horse trade?

Mr. FIELDING. The duty of $12.50 per head, would be 25 per cent on a horse valued at $50 and more than that on a horse valued at less than $50, and this was the class of horses aimed at. By the tariff amendments some years ago the importation of mares and stallions of a low class were prohibited altogether. So I think that the object that the hon. gentleman has in view is met by the provisions of the tariff taken as a whole.

Mr. BERGERON. How does this compare with the items of the old tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. The duty under the old tariff was 20 per cent, which, of course on horses of a low valuation, would be less than this. And then there is the prohibition of the importation of low class horses to which I have already referred.

Mr. OSLER. I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) recognizes the fact that the farmer requires protection. I thoroughly approve of this, except that it does not go far enough. A few years ago—I do not know whether the same goes on now—I saw a herd of horses being driven in from Montana, and sold at $5 a head, and at $5 and $20 a head from Fort Macleod to Edmonton. Even a duty of $12.50 a head would not be a very high specific duty on horses of that class. The farmers are clamouring for protection, and they are getting it to a greater extent than any manufacturers. That is proven by the present item. I see in this list also protective duties proposed on meats, tallow, eggs, cheese, butter and so on. We find that the farmers are the people in this country who are getting the best and highest protection of any class. I do not grumble at that ; I think it is a good thing, and that it would be a wise thing for the country to hoist the protection another peg. In the case of these cheap horses, which are a detriment to the country, if a prohibitive duty were put upon them, it would be a benefit to the farmers and to the country at large.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Would it not be better in this item to have a similar difference between the general and the intermediate tariff as is provided in the next item ? The next item is 'animals, living, n.o.p.,' and these, under the preferential tariff, are 15 per cent under the intermediate tariff 22 per cent, and under the general tariff 25 per cent. I think that in the case of horses it would be better to provide that under the preferential tariff the duties shall be $10, under the intermediate tariff $12.50, and under the general tariff $15. I think this would give general satisfaction, in view of what has been said on both sides concerning this cheap class of horses coming in from the United States.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) speaks of the principle of protection on Canadian farm products. No one has spoken more loudly and emphatically against the principle of protection for the Canadian farmers than have the farm journals of this Dominion. I understand that the duty on the class of horses mentioned in this item, was not imposed because the Canadian farmers feared the competition of the American horsebreeders, but rather because of the difficulty suggested by the member from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)—that the bringing in of scrub horses from the United States was interfering with and defeating the efforts of the Canadian farmer in breeding up a better class of horses. There is also the item of the duty on hogs imported from the United States. I understand that the farmer welcomes that protection not because he was not able to produce pork in competition with the American hog raiser, but because American hogs were being brought into Canada and the pork shipped out as Canadian to the detriment of our product which is much superior to the American. The Canadian farm journals have pointed out that these are the only two items in which the Canadian farmers have been protected, or can be protected by the tariff.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the present tariff is an answer to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) says. Formerly mutton and lamb was on the 35 per cent list. Now the government have thought fit, in the interest of the farmers, to place mutton and lamb

under a duty of 3 cents a pound, a very material increase in the duty on a farm product, showing that the two items to which he refers are not the only items the farmers of this country want protection on. To my mind the farmers of Canada are protectionists. You cannot go into any county, I care not what the 'Farmers' Sun,' or any other advocate of that policy, may say, and induce the farmers to elect a man who says that he wants the protection on farm products wiped out. I congratulate the government in following the policy of their predecessors in that regard. I think they are to be congratulated, notwithstanding the protests that were made before, and notwithstanding the protests of my hon. friend from Grey, who tried to belittle protection to the farmers. They are entitled to it, and it is of the greatest value to them. We could not have an export trade in hog products if we had not a good round duty on hogs coming into this country. No man can raise a hog that he can cut into bacon and hams entirely ; you must have a market for the unexportable part of the hog. It is necessary to keep out the American hog, otherwise we would not have a home market for the unexportable hog products, because the home market would be overloaded and our pork packers would be compelled to close up their factories, or pay lower prices to the farmers. The very fact that we have a good duty on hogs is what preserves the prices to the farmers of this country. I would welcome the time when the present duty was raised to two cents a pound, I think it would be in the interest of the farmers.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before almost any thing else in this country I am a believer in protection to the farmers. But there are some farmers in this country who do not believe in the principle, and I intend to hold them responsible for that statement which I find in a copy of a memorial re the tariff which was sent to me by one of their secretaries. It is issued on behalf of the Dominion Grange, the Farmers' Association of Ontario, and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. The concluding paragraph of this memorial reads as follows :—

> We therefore ask, in the coming revision of the tariff, that the protective principle be wholly eliminated; that the principle of tariff for revision only, and that revision based on an honest and economical expenditure of the public funds, be adopted ; and, as proof of our sincerity, we will, if this position is adopted by the government, gladly assent to the entire abolition of the whole list of duties on agricultural imports.

This is signed by J. G. Lethbridge, Master Dominion Grange ; Jas. McEwing, president Ontario Farmers' Association ; D. W. McCuaig, president Manitoba Grain Growers' Association ; R. McKenzie, secretary-treasurer of Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. Now, I say they do not speak for the farmers of this country in that statement, certainly they do not speak for the farmers of Ontario. The farmer does want protection, and I believe, whenever the case is fairly put to him, he will declare for protection. The great bulk of the farmers are protectionists. In the United States the chief support of protection is the western farmer. I believe the Canadian farmer does not agree with the statement made in this circular on his behalf. Nor do the government believe in the abolition of duties on agricultural products, because time after time measures have been introduced in the direction of protecting agricultural products. The policy of the Minister of Agriculture has been in that direction. For instance, in the case of the importation of hogs in bond, he interfered in the interest and at the request of the farmer.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would ask the minister if there has been any appreciable reduction in the importation of animals since the value was placed at $50? I understand that many of those animals were imported at the lowest valuation. The Horse Breeders Association of the Northwest have asked for an increased valuation, not only because of the large influx of inferior animals, but also because of the importation of diseased animals which spread disease throughout the stock herds in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not able to give a definite answer to the hon. gentleman for the obvious reason that the horses would be entered at $50. But I feel morally certain in my own mind that the duty would be such a barrier to that class of horses that it has stopped, to a large degree, if not altogether, the importation of very cheap horses. Evidently a horse would be entered at $50, no matter what price was paid for him ; so I would not be able to give a definite answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. I think this does not go far enough. I agree with the hon. member for Simcoe that no horse should be entered at a value less than $100. It has been a detriment to the horse industry in this country to allow horses to come in even at $50. We are trying to build up a reputation for our Canadian horses. There are many men who are practical horse-men who follow out those lines ; other men, if these cheap horses come in, will buy them to the detriment of the native industry. I think that horses of that description should be prohibited entirely from coming in.

Mr. PATERSON. Speaking subject to correction, I think it was the Horse Breeders' Asosciation that recommended this figure, or a figure something like it. I think the limit they set was $50, perhaps some said $60.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the Minister of Customs give us any idea of the number of

horses valued at $50 that came in within the last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. If the horse is worth more than $50, he pays on more than $50.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many horses valued at $50 or under came into the country during the past year ? I presume there would be none, because they are absolutely prohibited.

Mr. FIELDING. A certain class.

Mr. HENDERSON. What class ?

Mr. PATERSON. Stallions and mares.

Mr. FIELDING. They were prohibited.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why was that clause dropped ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not dropped. It is not in the list as before, but we are making some changes in the prohibited list, and that is one which we find was omitted. The intention is to continue it.

5. Animals, living, n.o.p., 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. How does that compare with the old tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. Five per cent advance.

Mr. FIELDING. Under the general tariff 25 per cent where it was 20 before.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a diminution in that item.

Mr. FIELDING. An increase.

Mr. BERGERON. More protection.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I am very happy to have such a testimony of the way we are looking after the farmers.

6. Live hogs, per pound, 1 cent, 1¼ cent, 1½ cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That is substantially the same.

7. Meats, fresh n.o.p., per pound, 2 cents, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. BERGERON. How is that?

Mr. FIELDING. Substantially the same, except that the third column comes in.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is an increase on the preferential?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it was two-thirds of three.

8. Canned meats, canned poultry, and game ; extracts of meats and fluid beef, not medicated, and soups of all kinds, 17½ per cent, 25 per cent, 27½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. The general rate before was 25 per cent, corresponding with the middle rate in this tariff.

Mr. BERGERON. That is more protection again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

9. Poultry and game, n.o.p., 12½ per cent, 17½ per cent, 20 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. How does that compare with the old tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. The same.

10. Meats, n.o.p., per pound 1½ cent, 1¾ cent, 2 cents. Provided that the weight of a barrel of pork for duty purposes shall not be less than 200 pounds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the hon. minister whether the 2 cents is not a slight increase?

Mr. FIELDING. The old rate was 2.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister whether the advisability of increasing the duty beyond 2 cents has not been brought to his attention? I understand that a very large amount of that class of goods is coming into the country to the detriment of our farmers.

Mr. FIELDING. The rate is the same, but there is a difference in this respect that formerly the barrel was free while the barrel will now be dutiable and to that extent the duty is a little more than it was before.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the hon. minister should give the committee some of the information that was gathered by the minister and his colleagues when they were going out among the farmers with respect to these items. It seems to me that it would be very valuable information in the discussion of the tariff with respect to farm products. The minister has stated in a general way that the farmers are opposed to protective duties. I do not believe that myself. Speaking for the farmers I represent I will say that the farmers in my constituency are protectionists. Indeed I think it would be in their interests that some of the items now being considered should be increased, and I rather think that as the hon. minister and his colleagues had an opportunity of receiving information from the farmers this would be a very favourable opportunity for the minister to give the committee some of the information that was obtained pro and con with respect to the present tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I can only give the hon. gentleman my impressions of the general tenor of the information, and I thought that I had given that in my observations in the budget speech. That is that while the trend of the farmer's opinion generally is towards a low tariff, I have found in one respect that they are quite as human as the manufacturers, and that while they are very anxious to have a low tariff on the things which they have to buy a good many of them are not willing to have low duties on the things that they have to sell. We met some who were quite willing to have the duties increased on the things they had to sell. But, speaking generally, they were

in favour of low duties. It must be said in justice that in asking for lower duties they did not usually select the things which they produced but the things which they desired to purchase. I am not able to give my hon. friend, except in a general way, the information which was given at a good many points and on a good many subjects.

Mr. BLAIN. Speaking of the item of two cents a pound on pork, may I ask the hon. minister if any class of farmers in any part of Canada requested the government to take that duty off or decrease it? We have, as has already been stated by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), some farm journals in Ontario which are saying that the farmers are in favour of a decreased tariff. I think it would be well, if the hon. minister would state to the committee whether any class of farmers in any part of Canada had requested that the duties should be removed or decreased on the articles they produce themselves. It is important that we should know whether the information which the government has received, going in and out among the farmers for that special purpose, is to be taken or whether the statement of a journal that speaks for the farmers is to be taken.

Mr. FIELDING. The information received from the farmers, like the information received from other classes, varied to a considerable extent. I have already stated that there were farmers who came before us who desired increased duties particularly on things that they wished to produce, and when they wished to have a lower tariff and mentioned some particular items which they regarded as grievances, they did not usually select the items which they themselves produced. They referred particularly to agricultural implements or other articles which the farmer did not produce and which were necessary to him. In some cases we had representations from a farmer who only saw the particular matter in which he himself was interested, but occasionally we met farmers or the leader of a deputation of farmers, who would argue that if we were prepared to take the duty off things generally they would be prepared to have the duties taken off agricultural products. If I am asked to answer the question of my hon. friend if we found any farmers who were willing to have the duty on live hogs reduced, except as a part of a general policy I have mentioned, I would say that we did not.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. minister says that he had representations that if the duties were taken off different kinds of manufactured goods the farmers would be willing to have the duties taken off the products of the farm. I must say that in my opinion representations of that kind would be very rare indeed. I do not think that the hon. minister intends to convey the idea that representations of that kind were in any way general, because I feel confident that in Ontario at any rate no such feeling prevails. I believe that the farmers throughout Ontario—and I speak more particularly for them—believe that protection to the woollen industry is protection to the farmer, because, where the woollen industry is carried on extensively, a large number of workmen form a market for the consumption of the perishable products of the farmer and it is just as much a protection to the farmer to protect the products of the mill as to give a protection to a particular article that is produced on the farm. I would be glad indeed, and I think it would be in the interest of the farmers, to increase the duty on some of these meat products. Let me give an example. Of pork, barrelled and in brine, last year we imported 11,215,320 pounds. Why should that amount of pork be brought into this country from the United States and placed upon the market of Canada when the farmers of Canada can produce all the pork that is required for consumption here?

I think it is a very great mistake indeed, I think that the market of this country should be held for the farmers of this country, and that we should not allow such an invasion of hog products as that to which I have referred. I am sure the Americans would not submit to that sort of thing. Their policy is for themselves, to defend their own market, but here we have over 11,000,000 pounds of barrel pork imported into this country last year. I think the government are not careful enough of the interests of the farmers when they permit such a thing to take place. Then we have beef, salted in barrels 3,478,860 pounds. Surely the farmers of this country can produce all the beef required for the consumption of this country? They are able to export a very large quantity and why allow inferior meats to come in from the United States and monopolize the market of Canada, more especially that portion of the market which consumes the unexportable part of our meat products. I am certain the government would meet with the approval of the farmers of this country if they would increase the duty on pork and on beef just as they have increased the duty on mutton. Now I presume they increased the duty on mutton from about 1¼ cents to 3 cents a pound, for a very good reason; no doubt representations have been made to them to induce them to do so, and it seems to me that if representations had been made along the other lines the government would have met the wishes of the farmers by increasing the duty. Now with regard to the opinions of the farmers, I remember reading a report of what took place when the tariff commission visited Berlin, an industrious town located in the midst of an industrious farming community, and I think that the farmers

in Berlin—and I think the minister will bear me out—expressed themselves entirely satisfied that if the government would give them the market they would supply the stuff. That is what they wanted, they wanted the government to adopt a policy that would give them the market for their products and they would furnish the products that were necessary. Now that is the sentiment I believe of a great many farmers throughout the province of Ontario; possibly many of them had not the opportunity of meeting the commission and expressing their opinions, as thoroughly as in the neighbourhood of Berlin, but I think that to be a fair expression of the sentiment of the farmers of this country. I do not regard the statement read here by the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) as at all, in any shape or form, representing the feeling of the farmers of this country; it is as foreign to it as it possibly can be. I do not regard these men as representing public opinion on that question. How many farmers does Mr. McEwen, the president of the Farmers' Association represent ? I will undertake to say he does not represent one half as many farmers as I do, although he is at the head of an association which he calls the Farmers' Association. It is like the three tailors of Tooley street; Mr. McEwing, Mr. Drury, Mr. Smith, meet together and say, we, the farmers of Canada, say so and so, and I do not think they have 1,000 farmers in Canada who agree with them. We heard the representations they made a short time ago, when they waited on the minister, and I remember that the Minister of Finance (Mr Fielding) used some splendid protectionist arguments to combat them, and I thought he met them fairly well. We must not be led away with that kind of sentiment that is more political than in the interest of the farmers of the country. We must be guided by what the people tell us when we go into our constituencies. I would say that from 75 to 90 per cent of the farmers I have the honour to represent, and I would rather say 90 per cent, are protectionists, not only protectionists on agricultural products that they produce themselves, on grain and meat and fruits, but they are protectionists on manufactured goods because they say: These are the people who supply the market, we will supply the stuff if the market is only provided for us. Now we must not be led away with the kind of sentiment contained in the statement that has been read to us, because I do not think, with all respect to these men, that it fairly represents the sentiment of the farmers of this country. I am prepared to stand by agricultural protection; I think it is the proper thing, I think we have a market in this country which will consume about 80 per cent of the products of this country; we only require to export about 20 per cent and no man ever thinks of sending a barrel of flour or a pound of beef or cheese across the ocean except when he cannot sell it in Canada, he sends the surplus. Of course we have to send the best because we cannot find a market in the old country for the poorer class of products. Let us take care of the home market and give the farmers the very best market we can for their products and I am sure we will receive the thanks of the farmers, I care not what political party is in power.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. As I come from an agricultural constituency and as one of my constituents was here upon that delegation, of which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has spoken, I think it only right that I should say a word or two. I do not think, I cannot believe that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) means to intimate that these three gentlemen who came here, namely, Mr. McEwing, the president of the Farmers' Association, Mr. Drury and Mr. W. L. Smith, the secretary of the Farmers' Association, did not come here representing the various farmers' associations throughout the province of Ontario and as their duly accredited representatives. That association, I care not what the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says, is a large association, an association representative of the farming community, of the agriculturists of that province ; they support an influential organ which voices the sentiments of a large portion of the agriculturists of the province of Ontario. They are not a body to be belittled in the way in which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has sought to do to-night. Every word those gentlemen said should be given due weight, should be fully considered, and it cannot be said, that they do not represent a large proportion of the agricultural community of the province of Ontario. That association is an association which has been in existence for a considerable length of time. They hold annual meetings, their organization is very complete, as I have reason to know at least throughout my own constituency. In almost every township a farmers' association, duly organized exists, and each year during the exhibition at Toronto, representatives from each of those associations goes to Toronto where they hold their annual meeting and appoint their officers. At that annual meeting last September, Mr. McEwing was re-elected president, Mr. Smith, was re-elected secretary. Mr. Drury was associated with them on the deputation which met the government some few weeks ago. They presented their views, which were the views of that association, and I have yet to learn that any member of that association has repudiated the representations that they then made to the government. Those views may be criticised, our individual views may not agree with everything they said; in fact it may fairly be said that perhaps they did not actually agree among themselves except on the broad and general principle that they

wanted a reduction of duties and that they did not want a continuation of the steel bounties. They thought that the bounties on iron and steel should not continue beyond a certain time and that it should be made clear that they should cease at that time. Does the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) mean to say that does not represent the views of that association? It is at all events the views of a large portion of the agriculturists in the province of Ontario. I do not think he does, I do not think for a moment he can say so, it would not be a fact if he did say so.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is very kind of you to state that I do not state the fact.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that it would not be a fact if he did say so. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to say now that the Farmers' Asociation of Ontario of which Mr. McEwing is the president and Mr. W. L. Smith is the secretary, does not comprise thousands of agriculturalists of that province. I repeat that it would not be a fact if he did say so. The fact is indisputable that that association is composed of thousands of agriculturalists of the province of Ontario. They formulate their platform, they meet annually during the exhibition in Toronto, they have their accredited representatives who appeared here. I do not say that the members of that association comprise all the agriculturalists in Ontario, but so far as that association is concerned these gentlemen are the accredited representatives of it and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) should not seek to belittle them or those whom they represent. Now, I say that these gentlemen in what they said do represent a large proportion of the agriculturalists of Ontario ; that they agreed that the government had met their views ; that the tariff was better than they had expected ; that it was lower than they expected to see it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) says that the farmers of Ontario are all protectionists and that they want increased protection. Those representatives of the farmers said they did not ; they said they wanted lower duties and less protection.

Mr. BLAIN. On what articles did they ask for lower protection ?

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Weekly 'Sun' he will see published a list of the articles referred to by that deputation.

Mr. BLAIN. Did this deputaton ask the government to take the duties off or to decrease the duties upon any farm products that they grow on their farms ?

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. I am not discussing the details, but if the hon. gentleman looks at the Weekly 'Sun' he will see the representations made by that deputation. They did say that representing the people whom they do represent they had received at the hands of the government better treatment than they had expected ; that they did not expect the duties would be reduced but that they might in all probability be increased owing to the pressure brought by the Manufacturers Association. To that extent they were satisfied. They were not satisfied however with regard to the bounties on steel. They asked that these bounties should not be continued but if in the wisdom of the government they were to be continued during the period now named, that it should be definitely stated that at the expiration of that period the bounties should cease. These were the representations made by that deputation, and I was speaking for Mr. McEwing, and more particularly for Mr. Drury who comes from my constituency, when I said they were the accredited representatives of the Farmers' Association of the province of Ontario, which is an association composed of thousands of the agriculturalists of that province.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. L. McCarthy) in his usual style, endeavoured to misrepresent what I said. I defy him to find one word in my language which would show that I belittled the farmers of this country in any shape or form. On the contrary I gave the farmers of this country a great deal more credit for good sense and good judgment than to be guided by the representations made in the paper that has just been read by the hon. gentleman. Instead of belittling the farmers of the country I upheld them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) says there are thousands of farmers represented by that association, but suppose there are two or three thousand, what signifies that as compared with the vast number of farmers in this country. I have no hesitation in saying that I represent in this House more farmers than does the association of which Mr. McEwing is president. After the Minister of Agriculture came out from that deputation I met him and I asked : How many farmers do you think these people represent, and his reply was : I have no doubt you represent more farmers than they do. I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture was right, but at all events I have a high authority for my statement in that regard. The question of the bounties on iron and steel is not under discussion at the present time, but I may avail myself of this opportunity to say that I am not in favour of the bounty system all through. I have advocated bounties on beet root sugar and I stand by that and I will give my reasons at the proper time. But I do not stand for the large bounties that are given at the present time, and I shall make my position clear when the question comes before us. Even though these two or three men should come here in the name of the farmers association I do not regard them as representing the

great body of the farmers of Canada. In my county there is no such thing as a branch of the Farmers' Association; in fact I scarcely know where there is one. My impression is that the Minister of Agriculture was perfectly right when he said that I, representing the small county of Halton, represented more farmers than the whole of this great association. I therefore hold that my opinion is just as good as Mr. McEwing's. I am not belittleing his opinion, he is an intelligent gentleman. Mr. Drury is an intelligent young man and I have no doubt he expresses his own opinion and I may say he expresses it very intelligently and very well. But there is no reason why Mr. McEwing's opinion or Mr. Drury's opinion should prevail against the opinion of the great bulk of the people of this country, even though Mr. Drury is a constituent of the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) if he presumes to represent the electors of North Simcoe on the railway question ; is he thoroughly in accord with the farmers of that county on the railway question ? Perhaps he had better go back and settle that with the farmers of his county before he comes here to represent their opinion as to the duty on farm products. I do not think the farmers of his county will thank the hon. gentleman for standing up to oppose the modicum of protection that is given by this government to the farmers of North Simcoe in the hope of giving them the entire Canadian market and excluding American farm products. I think the government is wiser than my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy). Perhaps when he comes to reflect upon what he has said he will wish that he never had said it.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) upon reflection will be a good deal more sorry for what he said in his first remarks than I will be for what I have said, and I think he will also conclude that in his last remarks he has not succeeded in apologizing for his first remarks. As to my position with my constituents on railway matters, that question was very thoroughly fought out in the last campaign and yet the hon. gentleman finds me here. If my constituents are satisfied I don't think I need bother my head as to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) may think.

Mr. MILLER. There are a large number of items in this schedule to which the same principle will apply, and it may be as well discussed now as at any other time. I was one of the members present when the representatives of the Farmers' Association met the Ministers of Finance (Mr. Fielding) Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I do not think that the representatives of the Farmers' Association at that time or any representative of the farmers at any other time ever asked to have the duties reduced on any articles they produce or to have them increased. They appeared to be totally indifferent as to whether the duties on their products are high or low. They say that does not effect them one iota either way. The hon. members for Halton (Mr. Henderson), South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and Peel (Mr. Blain) claim to represent large numbers of farmers—as doubtless they do—and undertake to speak for the farmers of Ontario. I think that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has shown clearly that the representatives of the Farmers' Association deserve a hearing and that their opinion is well worthy of our consideration, but I would like to quote from another authority, namely, the 'Farmers' Advocate,' a leading farm journal published in Canada, having a large circulation all through Ontario and our Northwest. In its issue of the 1st November, this very question is discussed. The editor of that journal there says :

> Most strongly of all we repudiate the gold brick suggestion that the farmers should join in the demand for more protection, which, in the nature of the case, can do us little good, and is only desired in order that our friends the manufacturers may have a show of justice for requesting increased duties on their products.

I read that article on the 1st November and have read each succeeding issue of that weekly journal, and I have seen no protest or letter from any subscriber to that paper remonstrating with the editor because of these utterances or expressing any opinion different from that expressed by him, namely, that the suggestion for increased duties on farm products is merely thrown out as a gold brick by the Canadian manufacturers. I claim that the 'Farmers Advocate' is a better authority than even our persuasive friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson.)

Mr. KEMP. The question arose on the point whether any farmers were in favour of abolishing the duty on the agricultural products covered by group 1 of the schedules. I was present when a number of farmers appeared before the Tariff Commission and when Mr. McEwing, on their behalf, advocated doing away with the duties on agricultural products. But I agree with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that no gentleman represents the farmers in this country when he says that they are in favour of doing away with the duties and making the agricultural schedule list free.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think Mr. McEwing said that. He said on certain conditions.

Mr. KEMP. I shall read what Mr. McEwing said. I am referring to the first meeting of the Tariff Commission in Toronto, and I am reading from the report in

the Toronto 'Globe' of November 14, 1905, I shall read a few passages so that the hon. gentleman may see that I was justified in making the statement I did. Replying to Mr. McEwing, who is the president of the Farmers' Association of Ontario, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said :

You have claimed that except with regard to market gardening there is really no substantial advantage to the agriculturist under the present tariff. Could the duties be abolished without any injury to farming interests ?

Practically that would be the result, I think, Mr. McEwing replied.

Mr. Fielding called attention to the case of hog products on which there was a duty of two cents a pound, which the lumbermen had complained was a serious burden. What was the association's views on that duty ?

Mr. McEwing thought it made little difference to the farmers as they produced a different class of hogs, whose products went into hams and bacon.

Then Sir Richard Cartwright said :

So far as the great mass of the farmers are concerned, asked Sir Richard Cartwright, a tariff on articles which the agriculturists produce is of no earthly value to you—there are a few exceptional cases along the frontier where it may be of value—but as regards the great mass of the farmers, this is the case ?

I think you have stated it exceedingly clear, replied Mr. McEwing.

I do not believe with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), that Mr. McEwing represented the farmers of this country. I think that the members of this House, who represent farming constituencies, are in as good a position to judge as these gentlemen who represented farmers before the Tariff Commission, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to say that he agrees with Mr. McEwing's views with respect to the agricultural schedule.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I wish to say that I agree fully with the remarks of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). I agree with him that the gentlemen who appeared before the Tariff Commission and those newspapers which pretend to be the organs of the farmers do not represent the views of the farmers generally. I cannot speak for the other provinces, but I am certain I can speak for my own county and those adjacent to it. However, strong the Farmers' Association may be in some places, it is not in Wentworth. At one time there were, I think, two societies there in affiliation with the central society, but they are practically defunct and disbanded, and I believe that to be the case to a large extent throughout Ontario. That is largely due to the fact that some gentlemen at the head of this association appear to run it for political purposes, and these same gentlemen are still trying to make use of the farmers of Ontario for the benefit of the political party to which they belong.

Mr. MILLER. What party is that?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. We all know the party to which the secretary of the Farmers' Association, Mr. W. L. Smith, belongs, as well as Mr. McEwing and Mr. Drury.

Mr. FIELDING. To which party do they belong ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. To the Liberal party. Mr. Smith pretends to be independent now and possibly is, but he did belong to the Liberal party. He is, however, now publishing an independent paper, and of course his politics are laid aside for the moment. That I believe is a fair representation of the Farmers' Association in a great number of counties. In my own county there are still two or three men who pretend to represent the Farmers' Association but I do not believe they have had a meeting for a year. However they appear on every public occasion and pretend to represent the farmers of Wentworth. One of them I believe went before the Tariff Commission at Hamilton and advocated such sentiments as those to which Mr. McEwing gave expression in Toronto. If it were not for politics no man to-day could get 200 votes in Wentworth county who talked about free importation of agricultural products or free trade or revenue tariff or anything but a protective tariff, which helps to build up the city of Hamilton and the other towns in the county of Wentworth. Why, but a few years ago the farmers in Wentworth were getting moderate prices for the things they had to sell in Hamilton. To-day however everything they produce brings high prices in that city, and they see before their eyes the reason. There is an increase of 10,000 in the population, owing to the establishment there of large industries brought about by the national policy. From what I know, you could not make anything but protectionists out of the farmers of Wentworth. At the election in 1896 the Liberal party there was to a large extent held in line because of the secret promise that the national policy would not be touched. They would have been defeated in that contest by 500 votes if the Liberals there had believed that that policy would be disturbed. It may be said that the farmers in Wentworth are largely market gardeners and fruit growers, and in that respect differ from the general farmer, but this is not the case. But the advantages of a larger population reach out to the limits of more than one county. In almost every county in Ontario the same sentiment to a large extent prevails. I do not know what may be the feelings of farmers in distant parts of this country, but I know that in the county of Wentworth the farmers are protectionists. Any representations made by Mr. McEwing or Mr. Smith are practically their own opinions—and no more than their own opinions. It is very easy for a number of gentlemen to get together, sent as delegates from associations to pass a resolution, which resolu-

tion may be brought to the attention of the government and of this House as purporting to represent the opinions of those engaged in the great farming industry. I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has stated the case correctly when he says—and the same might be said of many others in this House—that he represents far more farmers than do the few men who passed resolutions and came down here to see the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. I represent a constituency which is, in a great part, rural, and I am here to say that I believe that the farmers of the province of Ontario, and more particularly the farmers of East Simcoe, do earnestly desire protection on all the products they raise. Particularly do they desire protection on hogs. And for this reason, part of the riding of East Simcoe finds an excellent market with buyers from Collingwood, which is the riding of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy), and where there is a very large, prosperous and extensive meat concern. I should have expected in the face of the figures shown by the returns that that hon. gentleman would have advocated very strongly the prevention, if at all possible, of the introduction into Canada of a single pound of pork from the United States. But I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is content with the tariff as it stands. What do the figures show? There were imported into Canada last year from different countries a total of $775,876 of bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, the bulk of these coming from the United States. Of pork barrelled in brine the import was $785,905. Besides these our import of live hogs from the United States was $7,233. That is to say, there was a grand import of hogs and pork of $1,569,014. Now the farmers of East Simcoe, and, in fact, of the whole county of Simcoe, east, north and south, are greatly concerned in that meat industry in Collingwood. Buyers come from Collingwood all over East Simcoe looking for hogs, and purchasing them wherever they are to be had. The result is that prices have risen very perceptibly in that part of the country, and I do not believe that there is a farmer in East or North Simcoe who would not be pleased if the government placed an almost prohibitory duty not only on the live hogs, but on every hog product. It is all very well for my hon. friend from North Simcoe to talk about Mr. Drury. I have nothing to say against Mr. Drury. He lives in the riding of North Simcoe, in the township of Oro. He has the good fortune to have had a wealthy father who left him a magnificent farm. He is a politician and my hon. friend (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) had better look out for him, because Mr. Drury is looking for the nomination. Perhaps that is why the hon. gentleman says such kindly things of him. The hon. gentleman knows that he himself is not in very good odour with the farmers. The township of Nottawasaga, which usually gives him a large majority, in the last election gave a large majority on the other side.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. How large?

Mr. BENNETT. Enough to make the hon. gentleman feel very timid until the last of the returns came in. The township of Sunnidale gave a large majority against him. The township of Vespra, for the first time in its history, gave a majority against the Liberal candidate. The township of Floss also went against him. But where did the hon. gentleman find solace? In the town of Collingwood. And why? Because the immense bonus of $300,000 had been given to the Collingwood ship building industry. And they turned out strong for their $300,000. While it gave him many votes in Collingwood, it cost him a lot of votes among the farmers, so much that his majority of 500 dwindled to about 40. I do not wish to pursue this subject, and I only touched upon it because my hon. friend was so boastful about the facts that he was here and the other fellow was not here; he knows that if it had not been for that $300,000 bonus to the ship building industry he would not be here to-night; the farmers were not the men who assisted to send him here. But, seriously speaking, I am here to say that the farmers want more in the way of protection than is being given by this government. What has the government under this tariff given to the farmers of the country? I was so deeply interested in finding out the facts concerning the great benefits conferred upon the farmers by this tariff that I went through the items carefully. I have here the names of a number of articles that are on the free list to-day for the benefit of the farmer which I will read for the information of the House, and in case some hon. gentleman may desire to use it in the future. The farmer is asked to rejoice and be glad because this government, so friendly to the farmer, has placed on the free list the following articles:

Goats, pheasants, quail, bees, sausage casings, mushroom spawn, caraway seeds, turtles, leeches, ice, mineral water, paper for gun wads, jinseng, jalap, ipecacuanha, squills, dragon's blood, celluloid, curling stones, diamond dust, tails in raw state, quills, hoofs, indian corn, and staves.

I may have forgotten something, but in that case I have no doubt that my genial friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will supply what I have omitted. Here is a tariff for the farmers of Canada. How the farmers of Canada will rejoice to know that ice may be imported free into this country. And the same is true in regard to other articles that I have enumerated. The fact is that this government have

been playing with the farmers of this country for years. They went from one end of the country to the other declaring—as is shown by 'Hansard' and by other reports of their speeches—that iron was to be on the free list when they came into power, and that the same would be true of agricultural implements. When the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made his tour in the west at every hall in which he spoke he found streamers bearing the inscription 'Free Agricultural Implements.' That was the cry everywhere, and he assented that that was a part of his programme. And where are these hon. gentlemen to-day? They are dangling before the farmers reduction of the duty on harvesters to 17½ per cent. The two gentlemen in the red chamber who represent the Massey-Harris and the Frost & Wood concerns hold them down to a reduction of 2½ per cent. There never was a government in Canada upon which such demands were made by the manufacturers, nor has there ever been one such an easy prey to the manufacturers as the government of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a clause in the law which provides that, when disputes arise, the parties may be summoned before a committee of the government and may be dealt with. Some reference has been made by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to the case of the oil people. It was a notorious fact that the consumers were being ground between the upper and nether millstones of the Standard Oil Company and the Gall-Schneider concern. When the case came before a committee of the government the interest of one side was represented by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) as counsel. He appeared for the Gall-Schneider Company. I think he will not deny that statement of the fact.

Mr. BRODEUR. And working for what?

Mr. BENNETT. I refer to the case in which the dispute arose between the Gall-Schneider people and the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. BRODEUR. As a matter of fact I appeared before the committee asking that the railway companies, which had made contracts with the Standard Oil Company, should be forced to cancel the contracts. And I am glad to state that the government agreed to our request and prevented the combination.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to have before me the reports, and if the hon. gentleman will give me the date I will hunt up the newspaper reports of that time. But I know there was a conflict between these two companies, and my recollection of the matter at the time was that it was more a question of the rights of one company being invaded by the other company, or a supposed invasion, which was a detriment to the general public. But when one of these wealthy companies saw the fat was in the fire, they reached out to the hon. gentleman, who was not then a minister of the Crown, and engaged him as counsel, and he says that his side won. Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman had such influence with the government—I think he was then Speaker of the House—that he succeeded in winning out for his clients. And so to-day that clause in the Tariff Act is looked upon by the general public as an unworkable clause, for the reason that influences are exerted upon the government by powerful friends of the government, and the result is that the public interest suffers. But be that as it may, I stand up to advocate the interest of the farmers of East Simcoe, and the farmers of Ontario and the rest of this Dominion, and to say that I believe it is to their interest that the duty should be so increased upon pork products that they shall not be imported into this country to so vast an amount as a million and a half dollars worth every year of hogs or their produce.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we are receiving some testimony from hon. gentlemen opposite which is quite valuable, and which I am anxious to have noted. First we have the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) making the emphatic statement that the farmers under this tariff are the best protected class of people in Canada. We are glad to have that assurance; the farmers are all right. Then we have the assurance of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that this is a manufacturers' tariff, that no government ever did so much for the manufacturers, no government is so amenable to the claims of the manufacturers as this government.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to qualify that if the minister will allow me. I mean that in certain quarters political friends of the government are making suggestions in favour of the manufacturers.

Mr. FIELDING. And of course the hon. gentleman thinks these quarters are numerous and wide spread. So we have the happy condition that the manufacturer is satisfied with this tariff, that he has a pull with this government, and can get things fixed to suit him. The farmer also is satisfied, he also has a pull with the government, and so everything is lovely. Now with regard to the duty on pork products, let me say that in all these cases it is the desire of the government to reach a happy medium. The duty on pork, for instance, is regarded by the lumbering interest of the country particularly as rather a serious burden, and we have at times—not so much of late, because we have indicated that we are not going to yield to it—but we have been asked to reduce that duty in the interest of the lumber industry, which is a great interest. But I think the House will agree that if we had proposed to increase the duty on

that article the lumber industry, which thinks it does not get much out of the tariff, would think that it had some reason to feel aggrieved. We have tried to reach a happy medium. Now take the subject of bacon and hams. The hon. gentleman has read that we have imported some $700,000 worth of bacon and hams, but he forgot to tell us that we exported at the same time $12,000,000 worth of bacon and hams. I think an industry which is doing so well is not in very bad circumstances.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I represent an agricultural constituency, and I think I can safely say that I know the feeling of the farmers in that constituency. I think the population of my constituency is about as large as that of the county of Halton, and I must say that I cannot find, so far as I have searched, a single farmer in the south riding of Renfrew who thinks he can be benefited one single iota by any duty that this government or any other government can place upon agricultural products. They are perfectly indifferent as to whether the duty is put on or taken off.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman vote to take off a duty of 2 cents a pound on pork ?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. If I had a chance I would in a minute vote against any duty on pork, or any agricultural articles whatever. I believe our Conservative friends are merely trying to pull the wool over the farmers' eyes in calling for higher duties. I want them to understand that the farmers of this community are a reading class of people, and they know how many beans it takes to make five just as well as these would be politicians. Now how do they suppose that they can increase the price by putting a duty on bacon ? We export nearly all our bacon, and the price we get for it is the price it brings in England. The same thing applies to cheese, the same thing applies to butter, and there is no use in saying that the price can be changed in that way. Then with reference to the article of pork. The pork which we raise here goes into the manufacture of bacon, and I am not anxious that we should raise that kind of pork which they grow in the United States, a cheap, heavy mess pork. We do not want our farmers to do that, and they are not anxious to do it themselves. We are quite content to let the farmers of the United States grow that low class of pork, while we will grow and manufacture the bacon that brings us far more money, in our section of the country at least. So I want it distinctly understood that the farmers in my constituency are thoroughly opposed to putting any more duty on anything which goes into the use of the farmers of this country. Furthermore they are determined that whenever they have an opportunity to vote for more free trade, they will vote for it.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BARR. It is extraordinary to hear these men who support the government on every occasion condemn the duty, and while they are condemning the duty they are prepared to support the government who, by this revised tariff, are increasing the duty on farm products all along the line. They pretend to have great confidence in farmers' associations, yet when a deputation of farmers came to the government, what was the result ? The government turned them down, they did not change the tariff one iota in answer to their request. Why was this ? Because, while it is claimed that these institutions rule the government, the government knew well that they were a political institution, that is an institution formed for the purpose of assisting the government. I do not think we have any reason to take much stock in those newspapers which claim to represent the farmers. The farmers are quite able to represent themselves, and they do represent themselves at the ballot box. I venture to say that there is not an agricultural constituency in Ontario that would elect a man who advocated free trade. In the great west they do desire a little more free trade, and probably that is the only part of the country that does want more free trade.

Under these circumstances we think that the government have very wisely chosen their course and not taken the advice of their friend. We have heard here to-night a declaration that they would be prepared to support free trade in so far as farm products are concerned. I do not believe that there is any class of the community more strongly in favour of protection for their products than the farmers. I do not believe that there is any part of the community that receives greater benefit from protection and from the national policy which was brought about by the hon. gentlemen who are now on the left of the Speaker in direct opposition to the present government and to their followers at that time who declared that when they came into power they would kill protection and trample it under their feet. They have departed from that. Why have they done so? First, because they had pledged the manufacturers that if they came into power there would be no change made and they assured them that they were perfectly safe in their hands. That has been proven up to the hilt. We have proven the same thing at the present time. Notwithstanding that these deputations came down here, patted the government on the back, and said that they were thankful to them for the favours they had received, for the 2½ per cent reduction on farm implements and for the protection of farm products, we can quite understand that they and the government understood each other perfectly well, and that whilst there are a few who might possibly be prepared to oppose them when they came to vote, the government's followers will vote for protection. We have

stronger proof than the Farmers' Association that the farmers demand protection. We have the agricultural associations at the present time meeting in the schoolhouses and halls throughout the country, and there is not one of these that has declared for free trade. There is not one of them that would say that the duty should be taken off pork, hogs or horses, but on the other hand they are prepared to support the party which is prepared to increase the duties and give them stronger protection. Yet, notwithstanding, we do find the government say that whilst the farmers are free trade in theory they are in practice protectionists and that therefore they are carrying out that principle. Now, we have gone over a very long list of articles in which the farmers are mostly interested and on every one of these the government have increased the duty. For months past they have had deputations of all kinds coming down here. We had the commission which went from east to west throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion and wherever the farmers met this commission we find no proposal to adopt free trade. They desire, it is true, to have cheaper farm implements and we believe that if the Conservatives had been in power it would not have been a 2½ per cent reduction, and at the other end giving the manufacturers an advantage in regard to the material which entered into these implements making up more than the ground which they lost in the 2½ per cent, but we believe that they would have followed the course which they laid down at the time the national policy was brought into existence. At that time they said they believed that they could change this Dominion into a manufacturing country. They succeeded admirably, but they said that as soon as the time came that these manufacturers were in a position to protect themselves, when they were strong and powerful enough, when they had made sufficient money, and when these industries could continue without such support, they would no longer be protected to the extent that they had been in the past. After an experience of the number of years in the manufacture of agricultural implements the duty was cut down from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. At that time it was distinctly stated that they believed that in the near future it would once more be cut in two. I believe that such is the case. I think the only demand that the farmers made was that the duty on farm implements should be lessened to a greater extent than it has been. The very fact that the manufacturers of farm implements can to-day compete with the world is a sufficient reason why this demand should be complied with. We find that the exportation of farm implements is greater than the importation. If they can send their implements to Australia and other parts of the world and compete and if they can send them to the Northwest and compete with St. Paul and other parts of the United States at 20 per cent, the question arises whether the time has come when they would be able to compete with a duty of 10 per cent. We all know that labour is cheaper here than in the United States. We know that the material entering into implements is quite as cheap as in the United States, and under these circumstances we ask the question whether they, having grown fat and rich as we know they have in the past, would not be amply protected at 10 per cent. I do not know whether my hon. friend who has just sat down will be prepared along that line to assist the farmers by reducing the duty on farm implements, but we believe that it is the only reduction that the farmers have asked for. As far as the items which we have before us are concerned, I believe the only difficulty is that the farmers are not sufficiently protected. Our agricultural friends are quite capable of taking care of themselves. They do not find their advocates in lawyers or even in newspapers nor are they properly represented by those newspapers which claim to be the representatives of the farmers. I do not believe they have received the consideration from them that should be expected, but there never was a time in the history of the country when he farmers were stronger protectionists than the present.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. In reference to the statement of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) that no farmers' association or meeting has passed a resolution or taken any action in reference to free trade, I wish to call his attention to the fact that recently the Fruit Growers' Association of Michigan, in conclave assembled, passed a resolution requesting the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario to join them with the object of having free trade in fruit between the United States and Canada. The Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario met last Tuesday in the city of Toronto and they passed a resolution, without one single person voting against it, appointing delegates to meet a delegation from Michigan with the view of having free trade in fruit between Canada and the United States. There is a case in point which I think it is well for the hon. gentleman to know. There is a case in point which I think it is well for hon. members to know.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am astonished to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. A. A. Wright).

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT No doubt for you were not there.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. Wright) is correct in stating that the twelve directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association passed a resolution of that sort without any opposition my information is incorrect, for I am told there was

not only very serious opposition but opposition of the strongest possible kind from the only man there who represented the commercial tender fruit interest of Ontario. These twelve directors meet together and their decisions go forth to this country as representing the fruit interests of Ontario. Ontario is divided up into twelve districts by the Fruit Growers' Association. Very nearly three-quarters of these districts buy the tender fruits and have none to sell; are the gentlemen representing those districts representative of the fruit growers of Ontario? Not much, over one-half of those districts grow even apples to sell, but they are consumers. My hon. friend (Mr. Wright) is one, he is a director, he is a consumer of apples and tender fruits. They are buyers and not sellers, consumers and not producers. What right have these gentlemen to speak for the fruit growers? This is the second time they have got together and pretended to represent the Commercial Fruit Growers of Ontario, and I am quite sure that they will hear more of that resolution. The fruit growers of Ontario are protectionist to the hilt and if these gentlemen sat in Toronto and passed that resolution, they knew little of what they were doing or what they were talking about, and if the opportunity presents itself, if that resolution was passed, the constitution of that body will be changed. If these gentlemen are going to meet and pass such a resolution as that it is time it was changed. My hon. friend (Mr. Wright) does not represent the fruit growers, neither do one half the men who met there, and I am astonished that they should be so ignorant of the feelings of the fruit growers of Ontario as to be foolish enough to pass such a resolution as that. If the resolution only goes to the extent of meeting with some one in Michigan and talking over reciprocal free trade in fruit, I can tell my hon. friend there is no danger of it having the effect of bringing about that result. We would have a rebellion in the fruit district if that were seriously proposed. The people who grow fruit, not those who eat it, would almost rise in rebellion at the thought of such a thing. Without going into details of this matter, why should the fruit growers of Ontario want reciprocal trade with the United States in fruit? Almost every state in the Union grows fruit and has it for sale and export. Only a limited portion of Canada grows fruit and there are boundless areas being settled where there is no fruit grown that are markets and although the fruit districts are small they are large enough to grow all the fruit the Dominion can consume. Who can conceive of any one being so unutterably stupid as to propose that under such general conditions there should be reciprocity in fruit in Canada. But my hon. friend need not worry, he may go there with others like himself who are consumers of fruit, and pass such resolutions, but such resolutions will never have the endorsement of the commercial fruit growers of Ontario.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I wish what I said to be distinctly understood. It was that when this resolution was voted upon, and there were directors there from every part of Ontario, from the Niagara district and from every part of the western section of this province, when that resolution was voted upon there was not one single person who voted against it.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Did not Mr. Peart oppose it ?

Mr A. A. WRIGHT. I said there was not one single individual who voted against it. There were one or two who spoke against it, but as a matter of fact, when the vote came, every director present voted in favour.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Did they take a vote?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT, Certainly they did and every director voted for it. I was there and you were not.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Did they call for the yeas and nays?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. No, they did not.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have been considerably surprised in listening to one or two gentlemen on the opposite side of the House trying to prove by statements that the farmers of this country are in favour of high protection. I have simply been astonished. I have been in touch with the farmers of Ontario considerably during the past year and in fact with quite a few during the holiday time. I took occasion to speak at three different meetings during the holidays to farmers on both sides of politics and the complaint I have found invariably has been from both Conservatives and Reformers, that the reductions given were not sufficient, that the government had not done enough in the way of lowering the tariff. I do not think the Conservative party in this country are ever going to convince the farmers that protection is going to be any great benefit to them, and if they follow that line of argument until doomsday, they will not get into power by it. I am decidedly of the opinion that protection cannot and will not do the farmer any good. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has stated the conditions as they exist regarding our export trade in pork and while it is a fact that we do import from the United States articles that we produce we also export those very articles to a very large extent. The experience we have had with the deputations who at different points throughout the country appeared before the Tariff Commission does not bear out the statement that the farmers of Ontario are prepared to adopt a high tariff. I would like any hon. gentleman opposite to point to one single deputation of farmers who appeared before that commission asking for a higher tariff. I do not know what

better evidence we can get than the evidence of the experience of the Tariff Commission as they went through the country. Statements from individuals in this House are not sufficient to change the conditions, I think that the expressed opinions of the farmer is the best guide as to what they wish.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I can give the hon. gentleman an answer to the question he asks. When the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was in Brantford, a deputation of farmers waited on him and asked that the duty on onions be 25 cents a sack. I think the hon. minister will remember that. There is an instance. And further, it is well known that a very large proportion of the farmers of Ontario are in favour of a duty upon agricultural products. Look at the item under discussion, look at the vast import of these particular goods, look at the amount of importations of the lines of meats we are now discussing: 7,140,000 pounds of imported hams and bacon, 3,478,000 pounds of beef, and 817,000 pounds of canned meats; 11,000,000 pounds of pork in barrels and so on. There is a vast amount of goods imported that can be and are being produced in Canada as well as or better than in the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much was exported?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us $12,000,000 worth. I have not the figures but when speaking about manufactures the other day it was asked: If we can export why are we not able to control the home market? The same argument could be applied to the farmers and it might be asked: If they can export such vast quantities why can they not control the home market? The hon. gentleman tells us that we export so much more than we consume in the country. That is not in keeping with the facts. The main part of the product of the farm is consumed in Canada. The hon. gentlemen opposite have undertaken to speak for the farmers of Canada to-night. I do not know any man in this country who is qualified to speak for all the farmers. According to statistics prepared by the Minister of Agriculture there are 471,833 farms in Canada and about 1,000,000 farmers and those employed upon the farm. If this organization which was spoken of represents a handful of farmers or a few thousands what is that against a million? We want to get at what the actual facts are and the actual facts have been proved to be that we can produce plenty of products in Canada of the necessary quality and quantity to supply the home market. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would be justified in placing a higher duty upon these imported meats so that we might consume Canadian meats alone.

The argument advanced by my hon. friend that the protective tariff is of no advantage to the farmers of this country, is absurd. Such a contention is not, and never has been assented to by the farmers of Canada. The last election in the province of Ontario proved that a large proportion of the farmers of that province are in favour of moderate protection for their products, and I believe that the next election will prove the same thing. Indeed the farmers of Ontario would be foolish if they did not stand by the policy of protection, because it secures for them the home market, and as we know the home market is the best market of all. The statistics prepared by the Minister of Agriculture show that while we produced in Canada in 1901 farm products to the value of $363,000,000 we exported only $114,000,000 worth, showing that we consumed in Canada two dollars worth of the products of Canadian farms for one dollar worth that was exported. The best market is, therefore, the home market and the best market is afforded by the manufacturers who employ the workmen who consume these products. I believe that in the city of Toronto alone, certainly in the city of Montreal, there is consumed more of the farm products of Canada than is exported together to foreign countries. That is a thing well worthy of consideration. I am, therefore, surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite say they would throw down the tariff barriers in the case of fruit or any other of our natural products. I myself have introduced to the Finance Minister a deputation from the people of my county, and that deputation asked him to put a duty of 25 cents a sack on onions, the growing of which is a large industry in my county. This year they shipped from a small section of that county upwards of eight carloads of onions to different parts of Canada, and they asked that Americans be prohibited from sending onions in here as they recently did, when two or three carloads of American onions were distributed from my riding in order that they might get the benefit of the good name which has been built up for that product by the farmers of my constituency. I have recently had a letter from my constituents asking me to urge upon the Finance Minister that he should give them the necessary protection on that branch of their industry. As regards the particular item under discussion, I believe that the government should go further and place such a duty on meat products as would secure the entire market of Canada for Canadian beef. We can produce pork and beef and poultry of the very best quality and the tariff should be so framed that these Canadian products should be consumed in Canada. The question as to whether protection benefits farmers has been thrashed out for the last thirty years in the province of Ontario, and during all that time

the majority of the farmers of that province have steadfastly voted for protection and will steadfastly vote for it in the future. I might say further that the British farmers have recently presented a demand for protection to their products, which shows that in that free trade country they too believe in protection.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer a few suggestions on the very important question of the imposition of duties on the imports of agricultural products from foreign countries. For the past few years the Conservative leaders in this House, have insisted upon the necessity of revising the tariff in the interest of the people of this country. They deserve credit for their devotion to a cause of this magnitude. On the other hand the government was aware of the desirability of acquainting itself with the needs of the various classes in the community and with that object in view appointed a commission for the purpose of gathering information on the condition of our industries and agriculture. The farmers of the county of L'Islet, which I have the honour to represent in this House ask for an increase of duty on all agricultural products imported from foreign countries. My hon. friend who represents my constituency in the legislature of Quebec, Mr. Joseph Edouard Caron, a well-read farmer, thoroughly conversant with the needs of the farming community in our district, submitted an important memorial to the Tariff Commission. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read to the House the leading features of this memorial in order to show the necessity of increasing the duty upon all imported agricultural products. Here is what Mr. Caron says:—

Representing as I do a farming constituency and speaking in the name of the farmers of the lower part of the province of Quebec. I wish to submit the following memorial which includes the tariff amendments asked for by the farmers of that district. I shall subdivide them in three different classes, namely, those articles which originate usually from the farm, such as live stock, dressed meats of all kinds, eggs, wax, honey, apples, seed grain, &c., on which the farmer asks higher tariff duty and a more extended protection; then those articles of every day consumption on the farm and which the farmers consider to be in many instances too highly taxed.

In the third place, I give a list of some articles which should be admitted free of duty, such as Paris green, fertilizers and such sundry articles which cannot be dispensed with and the use of which tend to improve and increase the crops.

The reduction in duty as regards the farming community could be made up by a corresponding increase on articles of luxury such as diamonds, fine jewellery, silks and expensive goods, which can easily be made to contribute more largely to the revenue of the country without incumbering to a perceptible extent the wealthy classes of the people.

An increase of duty on slaughtered hogs, dressed fowls, the products of the apiary would give a great impetus to this particular branch of the farm industry and help materially the farmer in securing a better market for his hogs.

Our farmers especially require protection on all farming implements and tools.

I may add that so far the farmers were overburdened with very high and at times prohibitive customs duties in order to protect the rising industries. This system which has now prevailed for twenty-five years has given a solid basis to the manufacturers and in many instances, it is unquestionably proved that enormous profits have been realized for the manufacturers. On the other hand, the farmers have been seriously handicapped by the burdensome charges which have been heaped upon them. They have more than contributed their legitimate share to the revenue of the country. For many years past some relief has been promised them, and they hope that the present tariff commission will seriously entertain their legitimate grievances and will see that more protection is granted to them in the future than has been in the past. Reductions granted in favour of the farmers can be more than made up by a proportionate increase on articles of luxury.

Mr. Auguste Fafard, a farmer from L'Islet has also expressed similar views. I have given minute attention to Mr. Caron's memorial. I have conferred with the farmers of my constituency, and the consensus of opinion seems to be that what is actually needed by the farmers is more protection on agricultural products and less duty on farm implements.

As my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) so eloquently said in his speech on November 23 last: 'The farmer is the corner stone of our national edifice; if he be prosperous and contented, so will every class of the Canadian community.'

Canada is essentially a farming country. Agriculture is the foundation of our national wealth. The duty devolves upon the government to extend its protection to this fundamental industry, the basis of all others, in order to foster and develop it, and to take such means as will keep in our country the vigourous youth of our rural districts.

In increasing the duty upon farm products the government will be conferring a great favour to the farmers of this country. The farmers of my district are in great need of more protection. They don't by all means bend under extreme poverty, but they don't get that degree of welfare which is to be observed in the Eastern Townships. in the Richelieu valley and in western Canada. Of course some of them extend their farms and improve their buildings, but from every parish there is an annual exit to the United States. The Tariff Commission were in a positon to judge by themselves of the accuracy of my words. What do we see by the census of 1881, 1891 and 1901 ? The population of L'Islet was 14,917 in 1881; it had dropped to 13,823 in 1891 and was again 14,439 in 1901. In the county of

Kamouraska, the population gradually dropped from 22,181 in 1881, to 20,454 in 1891 and to 19,099 in 1901. For the county of Montmagny, we find that the population which was originally 16,422 in 1881, had fallen down to 14,726 in 1891, and had finally reached the stationary figure of 14,757 in 1901. These figures evince a certain feeling of uneasiness among our people. It is fortunate that we find a ready market in Great Britain for our dairy produce, and better transportation facilities would greatly improve agriculture in my constituency. It is with no little anxiety that we are awaiting the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway. There is some dissatisfaction, however, as to the increase of second-class rates on the Intercolonial Railway. Quebec is our local market and the government has imposed a new burden upon the farmers in increasing the rates on the Intercolonial Railway.

Our farmers are in absolute need of more protection, and if the American farmer, notwithstanding the fertility of the soil, still clamour for a wider scope of protection for his products, much more should the Canadian farmer ask for such protection. Our farmers deal especially in swine, poultry, sheep, &c. They also deal extensively in meats, eggs, bees' wax, apples, plums and combed honey. They require more protection on live stock. It was formerly 20 per cent; they now ask a duty of 25 per cent. They also ask a duty of 2 cents per pound on live hogs. The government did not see its way clear to meet the requirements of our farmers by granting an increased duty on such products when imported from foreign countries. I must thank the government, however, for listening to the farming community at large in amending the old tariff in a more protective sense.

I have gathered some information from an expert. Mr. Auguste Dupuis, of the town of Des Aulnaies, on the subject of bees. Here is what he says: 'It is wise to allow bees, which are a raw material, to enter free of duty, in order to develop and extend that industry.' As far as honey is concerned, the following duty is imposed:

Preferential tariff, 2 cents; intermediate tariff, 2½ cents; general tariff, 3 cents.

I express Mr. Dupuis' opinion when I say that the duty should remain at 3 cents per pound on honey, without a preference for Great Britain, which does not supply enough for its own domestic consumption and consequently is liable to export to this country adulterated honey or honey of an inferior extraction. The old duty on bees' wax was 19 per cent ad valorem. Under the new tariff, the duty is as follows:

Preferential tariff, 5 per cent ad valorem; intermediate tariff, 7½ cents ad valorem; general tariff, 10 cents ad valorem.

Mr. Dupuis says on this point that bees' wax entering at 5 per cent under the preferential tariff will cause a serious drawback to the Canadian industry which is in a fair way of developing itself in Canada. I should be happy if the government saw fit to adopt Mr. Dupuis' suggestions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that the Tariff Commission is not without having noticed that farming in the district below Quebec does not enjoy that degree of prosperity which is so apparent in other parts of the country, and as I have already stated, the population in the counties of L'Islet, Montmagny and Kamouraska show a very marked decrease since 1881. The government can aid substantially in their betterment in increasing the customs duty upon agricultural products. In rushing the construction of the National Transcontinental, it will develop our transportation facilities and thereby contribute to the prosperity of those counties. I may add that the government can also contribute to their welfare in reducing the duty on farm implements and articles of first utility to the farmers.

Mr. THOMAS MARTIN. I had the pleasure of introducing to four members of the government a deputation from the Farmers' Association of Ontario, and these gentlemen stated that the president of the 'Dominion Grange' would be present but for illness. I believe that these gentlemen represent a very large number of farmers throughout Ontario ; I know that in my riding they represent a large number of very intelligent farmers some of whom I know are not on the same side of politics as I am. These gentlemen, if they do not represent as many as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), voiced the sentiments of nine-tenths of the farmers of Ontario when they stated they were anxious for the lowering of the tariff and that they had come here for the purpose of inducing the government to lower the duties on many of the articles in the customs tariff. I am very sorry that old parliamentarians such as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) should try to belittle these gentlemen who came here to interview the government and who had just as much right to come here as any other deputation from any other interests. So far as I am aware, only one deputation from the farmers came down to take up the time of the government whereas there were many deputations from other interests. Yet I have not heard one of these gentlemen find fault with these other deputations for coming to Ottawa. In my opinion it is contemptible for any member of this House—I care not on what side he may be—to find fault with the farmers of the country coming here to present their views to the government, and I shall strongly express my disapproval of any such attitude or criticism so long as I have the honour to have a seat in this House. It is to me

remarkably strange and peculiar that these gentlemen should take that position because they represent farmers just as I do, and I know that the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) represent just as intelligent a class of farmers as I do, and I believe that they are as intelligent a class as can be found in the Dominion or in any other quarter of the globe. For these hon. gentlemen to rise in this House, and give expression to views in opposition to the men who put them here is something I cannot understand. They have not, so far as I can see, given any evidence in support of their statements. The hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) cannot be sincere and honest in what he says. I know farmers from his county who have told me that they were after him during the holidays in order to induce him to protest on their behalf in this House against any increase in the duties. Therefore I cannot help coming to the conclusion that the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) must know very well that the farmers of his riding are in favour of a lower tariff. I challenge either of these gentlemen to present any evidence from any farmers in their riding to show that they are anxious for higher duties or for protection of any kind. No doubt before we are through with this question, they will have ample opportunity to get letters from all parts of their constituencies, and I guarantee that they will not receive one letter supporting the position they take and I challenge them to bring forward one. I have a great many letters on my desk from farmers in my county, some of which I propose to read before I get through, to give the House some evidence that I am giving expression to their views. I attended the meeting of the Tariff Commission in Toronto at which the farmers delegates were present, and I failed to hear one of these gentlemen make before that commission one statement in favour of an increase in the duty. I guarantee that if the report of that meeting be read through, you will not find one statement made by the farmer's delegate in the meeting at Toronto which will support any of these hon. gentlemen who have spoken as the hon. members for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and Dufferin (Mr. Barr) did tonight. I attended also the meeting of the Tariff Commission in Guelph, and I did not hear any farmer present say a word in favour of a higher tariff. And I am confident that if the record of that meeting be turned up, it will verify my statement. Let me read you some of the letters I have received. I have here a letter from a friend of mine, who is not and never was a supporter of mine. He is president of the Minto Farmers' Association. He wrote me on two questions, the tariff and the bounties—but the latter I shall not touch as we are not now discussing it. He says:

Mr. T. MARTIN.

I firmly believe that our tariff needs to be revised and that what we need is a tariff for revenue purposes and not for protection purposes. I look upon a protective tariff as injuring a large majority of the people, more particularly the agricultural class.

Every one of the letters and petitions I have in my hand endorses these words. Not one of the letters I have received hints in any way that the farmers want protection or anything but a revenue tariff. Here is a resolution which was passed in December, 1906, at a meeting of the Minto branch of the West Wellington Farmers' Association, at which a large numer of members was present. It was moved by George Phillipson, seconded by James McMillan and resolved:

That while we appreciate the very short step taken in the right direction in the way of tariff reform, we do not consider it satisfactory. We think the principle of protection should be eliminated altogether as we do not think it right for the government to take the earnings of one man or one class of men and give them to another. We also think that the bounties to the iron and steel manufacturers should absolutely cease in the month of June next.

W. H. MALLETT, president.
S. LAYBOURNE, secretary.

Mr. BLAIN. Would that apply to the protection on farm products?

Mr. THOMAS MARTIN. I shall answer that question by reading the following:—

We therefore ask, in the coming revision of the tariff, that the protective principle be wholly eliminated; that the principle be one of tariff for revenue only, and that the policy of a revenue based on an honest and economical expenditure of the public funds, be adopted; and, as proof of our sincerity, we will, if this position is adopted by the government, gladly assent to the entire abolition of the whole list of duties on agricultural imports.

J. G. LETHBRIDGE,
Master Dom. Grange.
JAS. McEWING,
Pres. Ont. Farmers' Assn.
D. W. McCUAIG,
Pres. Man. Grain Growers' Assn.
R. McKENZIE,
Sec. Treas. Man. Grain Growers' Assn.

That is the statement and those are the signatures. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke of the interests of the farmers. The hon. gentleman ought to feel kindly towards the farmers, I remember his colleague from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) last session told us that a jury of Conservative farmers had whitewashed the hon. gentleman in a libel case he got into and they would have whitewashed him more only they did not understand the case.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman had better read 'Hansard' for that, for he is not getting very close to the facts.

Mr. T. MARTIN. I do not desire to misstate the case, and I think I am giving the facts with sufficient accuracy. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was anxious about the pork and bacon trade. He knows that that trade depends upon export business. The very fact that last year we exported about $12,500,000 worth and imported only $1,914,000 worth is proof that the industry is not kept up by protection but depends for its success upon the care and wisdom shown by the present government in opening new markets for our produce. I trust, that, in future, when the discussion of the tariff is before us, the members of the opposition will at least avoid abuse of the members of the Farmers' Association and members of the Dominion Grange who come to this House and present their case so ably and well as did the members who appeared here the other day. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told me himself that it was one of the best deputations he had in the whole affair. I felt that it was a great honour to introduce these gentlemen to the hon. minister.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess that I am somewhat surprised at the way the hon. gentleman (Mr. T. Martin) has wandered from the question before the committee. I was under the impression that we were discussing the tariff items on the first page of these schedules—agricultural products. The hon. gentleman wanders away into the question of protection generally, including protection on manufactured articles. The hon. gentleman, under cover of this general discussion, tried to make it appear that we were seeking higher protection for the manufacturer. At present we are dealing simply with the farmers' schedules and expressing the opinion that in many instances the duties should be increased. There will be time enough to discuss the general question, when we get through with the agricultural schedule. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman who comes here and says that he represents the farmers who want low duties. I find no fault with any man who wants low duties on what he consumes, and the farmers have that right. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. T. Martin) who advocates low duties on agricultural imports, is himself a high protectionist. He is an oatmeal miller. He was not satisfied with the old duty on oatmeal, but went to his friends the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, and demanded more protection, and he got more protection. Of couse, he supports the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does he deny it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think he will deny it. Under the old tariff, oatmeal was dutiable at 20 per cent. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that, and so he had it raised to 60 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. T. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what more protection there is in that ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Very considerable more. If the hon. genltleman will tell me the price of meal, I will tell him.

Mr. T. MARTIN. It is only a change from an ad valorem to a specific duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the Reform party always protested against specific duties on the ground that they were protectionist duties. I do not know whether I can say off hand what a pound of oatmeal is worth——

Mr. T. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman ought to be sure of his facts before he makes a statement.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not stated the difference. But I am certain that if there had not been a material difference in his own favour, the hon. gentleman would not have asked for a change. He wanted to benefit his oatmeal industry, and so had the duty put up ; and Scotchmen like myself who eat porridge may have to pay more for our oatmeal. What does he care, so long as he is protected? And now, this hon. gentleman comes here and rails against those who ask for higher duties on farm products. I do not begrudge him the protection that has been given him. I am glad to know that the oatmeal industry in this country is flourishing. And I am glad to know that it flourishes under the policy of the Conservative party. Why, we are winning friends every day. They may protest like the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Wright), but he too will be a strong protectionist in a year or two, even though he says now that farmers want no protection on farm products.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He wants protection on electric power.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, the hon. gentleman is satisfied with that, just like the hon. member for North Wellington with his oatmeal mill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. T. Martin) wants to know how much his protection was increased. Well he knows better than I do. But he knows that it was an increase, for I am quite sure he would not be generous enough to ask for a reduction. Now, I repeat that what I have been attempting to discuss all the evening is the duties on agricultural products and not the general question of protection. The present tariff, I think, gives, on the whole, increased protection to the manufacturers of this country. I think the present government have met the wishes of their friends the manufacturers in many things. I am not going to blame them for that. They know what their duty is and the support they get from these people. That is a matter that will come up for discussion later on. Meantime, I take

nothing back of what I said on agricultural protection. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. T. Martin) says that I belittled the farmers and objected to their coming here and presenting their case. I did not object to those who were farmers, coming here and presenting their case. But what I did object to and what I object to still is the pretension that these three gentlemen had the right to speak for the farmers of this country. I say they did not represent the views of the farmers of this country, and had no right to assume that they did. They represented themselves, and those with whom they were immediately associated. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) estimated that this association numbers 2,000 or 3,000 people. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has shown that there are about 1,000,000 people connected with the farming industry of this country. Will any man say that an association of 3,000 is entitled to speak for a million people ? The matter should have been put fairly. These gentlemen should not have said that they represented the farmers of Canada, but that they represented a small fraction of the farmers of Canada holding views peculiar to themselves. Now, I am not aware that on that occasion they asked for any reduction in the duty on agricultural products. I do not think they did. They did not ask that pork be reduced, they did not ask that oatmeal be reduced.

Mr. MILLER. Did they ask for any increases?

Mr. HENDERSON. In agricultural products, I do not think they did.

Mr. T. MARTIN. Has the hon. gentleman any request from the farmers of his constituency asking for increases?

Mr. HENDERSON. I tell you the tariff is now as we left it on agricultural products, and our people are satisfied with it. We left them a legacy of a good thing.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case we had better pass it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am prepared to pass it now. But I do not want the idea to go forth that these people who came and presented a case to the government represented all the farmers, because I assert that they did not represent the farmers I represent. Now, I am prepared to allow these items to go through. I do not assume that the farmers are going to get any more protection on meat, and I presume that item will likely pass.

11. Rennet, raw and prepared, free.

12. Sausage skins or casings, not cleaned, free.

13. Lard, lard compound and similar substances ; cottolene and animal stearine of all kinds, n.o.p., per pound 1½ cent, 1¾ cent, 2 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to ask the Finance Minister if this will include the item in the former tariff under the name of oleostearine which was on the free list. For a number of years, I think, since the present government came into power, that has been on the free list. I do not find oleostearine in the new tariff, but I find a word here which possibly would cover it, 'animalstearine of all kinds.' Now, what we understood by oleostearine was an animal stearine which was the hard substance that was left after a heavy pressure had been placed upon the kidney of the beef when heated to a pretty high degree, and the oleo or oil taken out of it. What was left was called oleostearine. It is an animal stearine and as it is not specifically mentioned in any part of the tariff, I apprehend that it is intended to transfer that from the free list to the 2-cent rate. Is that the intention?

Mr. FIELDING. Our intention was that this item should stand, because some arrangements may be made in relation to the drawback which would affect it, and we desired to discuss them together. So we will let that item stand for the present. I want to say that we have been discussing a very wide range of subjects to-night, and on the whole, although not quite according to rule, this general discussion on the agricultural schedule was perhaps necessary, and may help us in the discussion of details later on. But I would not like it to be made a precedent, because it is rather too broad. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you go on with the tariff to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Agriculture will probably take up his Bills, and we will take up the tariff in the evening, or perhaps earlier. But the agricultural measures will have priority.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 11, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the penitentiaries of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1906.—Hon. A. B. Aylesworth (Minister of Justice).

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) to confirm certain agreements between the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Canadian Pacific Railway, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus, and between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company—Mr. D. Ross.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ratz.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. G. H. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—Mr. D. Ross.

SURVEYS AND SURVEYORS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) respecting the surveys of the public lands of the Dominion, and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys. He said: This Bill is made necessary by the amendment of the Dominion Lands' Act. Hitherto the Dominion Lands' Act has contained provisions respecting surveyors and surveying, but as these provisions are of a different nature from those respecting lands administration, they can, we think, be better embodied in a separate Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTRIC POWER AND CERTAIN LIQUIDS AND GASES.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) to regulate the exportation of electric power and certain liquids and gases. He said: The provisions of this Bill will probably require very little explanation because it is a reprint of the Bill which was introduced last session and discussed at considerable length in Committee of the Whole House. The only variation is the addition of two clauses dealing with the possible imposition of export duties in connection with the delivery of the commodities referred to in the Bill. The House will recollect the general scope of the Bill as presented last session. What was then contemplated was a provision for the issue of licenses, permitting the export of electric power and of natural gas from this country, under terms and conditions to be fixed by the minister issuing the licenses, in accordance with regulations previously settled by His Excellency in Council. The Bill was not gone on with, but valuable contributions to the knowledge of the subject were made by different members during the discussion. During recess the Bill was submitted to the First Minister of Ontario, and his views with regard to it are expressed in a letter subsequently received in the Department of Justice. This measure repeats those provisions regarding the issuing of licenses and provides that the Governor in Council may by proclamation impose export duties not exceeding an amount to be fixed by the House, but with power also to the Governor in Council, by similar proclamation, to exempt from such duties those who comply with the conditions of their license and are supplying for consumption in Canada such an amount of electric power or natural gas as the Canadian consumer is prepared to take and pay for. The whole purpose of the legislation, as explained last year, is not the collection of revenue alone, but the affording to the Dominion authorities an efficient control over companies engaged in the production of power and the means of ensuring to the Canadian people the enjoyment of the great natural advantages which they have by reason of the wonderful waterpower at Niagara. Naturally public attention has been directed to the suggestions embodied in the measure of last session and the Bill I am now presenting. There have been expressions of apprehension that this is a proposition to interfere unduly with the vested rights of capital and of companies engaged in these enterprises, and that this is legislation of an extraordinary character proposing to interfere with the management of a man's own business. No doubt any regulation, governmental or otherwise, is necessarily an interference to that extent with the management of a business that otherwise might be carried on at the will of its owner without regard to the interests of the public at large. But except to that extent, it is not a measure which should cause the least apprehension to investors of capital or the owners of property of the character involved, nor is there any suggestion in its provisions which should give alarm to any investor or owner of property. The rights of the property owner are intended to be conserved to the fullest extent and are in no sense infringed upon to his detriment. He naturally will wish to carry his goods to the market where he can obtain the most favourable results, but in that regard his interest, it seems in the present situation, either does or may conflict with the interests of the general public in this country, who are vitally concerned in having at their disposal this now practically essential commodity, electric power, and

where the two interests do conflict, those of the individual ought to give way. The interests of the individual in this instance can be perfectly safeguarded and conserved. There is or undoubtedly will be in the immediate future, ample market in our own country for the consumption of a considerable proportion of the electric power which may be developed at Niagara, and so long as the producer of that commodity is able to obtain a reasonable price,—as good a price it may be in this country as he can elsewhere,—it is no detriment to him that he should have to look to this country, in which the commodity is made, for his market. With regard to two, at any rate, of the companies now engaged in the production of electric power at Niagara, agreements have been made purporting to secure to the people that particular advantage and restricting the exportation of power or the supply of power to the United States in accordance with the terms of those agreements. I do not know to what extent it may have been found practicable to enforce the terms of those agreements against the companies. That is a matter which has not in any way come before my notice, but so far as one can gather from public reports, and so far as I am able to form an opinion on the subject from an examination of the terms of the contracts in that regard, I should think that those whose interest it was to enforce the contracts as against the companies would welcome a provision of the nature contained in this Bill, as it will certainly afford a means for carrying out the object they must have had in mind. If there is, under the provisions of this Bill, found necessity to act, if any particular producer does not supply to Canadian customers the proportion of power which Canadian customers are desirous of having, and which it is reasonable he should supply, there is at once means to force his hand in that regard by imposing upon any power which that man seeks to export, a duty which will be practically prohibitive, a duty which would make it his interest at once to supply the Canadian demand first, and which would in that way secure to the people of this country the enjoyment of their own natural advantages. That, in brief, is the whole purpose of this legislation, and it has seemed after consideration that the means which we are here adopting by the proposal to issue licenses on the conditions described, supplemented by the power to impose a duty if it should be necessary as a restriction upon an undue amount of exportation, is a way in which the desired end can be well accomplished.

I ought, I think, to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say just one thing more. The whole question with regard to the supervision of water-power at Niagara Falls especially, as well as at other places along the boundary between this country and the United States, is, as the House is aware, a matter which for some months has been under the consideration of an international commission. The reports of that commission are before the House, and a reference to these reports will show that in every instance where necessity for it has appeared the commissioners of the Canadian section have taken occasion to acknowledge the spirit of fair dealing which seemingly animates the commissioners representing the United States. A perusal of these reports and a careful consideration of the results and recommendations which have been made jointly by both sections of that commission, lead me certainly to the same conclusion, and lead me to think that this opportunity ought to be taken advantage of to give this meed of justice to the representatives of the United States on that commission. There seems certainly every spirit to deal with this matter fairly, and no evidence of a desire to take an unfair advantage, but a willingness to give up something for the sake of international friendship and good feeling which might otherwise perhaps have been insisted upon.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. From the statement which ha just been made by the Minister of Justice it is evident that wisdom was shown last session when this Bill was held over, because the intention then was to put the Bill through without making it apply to the companies then in existence. If that Bill had gone through, no company in the country would have been brought under its scope. In connection with the statement that has just been made by the Minister of Justice that it may be necessary to interfere with companies already created, to interfere with their supposed rights, I have in my mind's eye at least an eminent member of the bar who argued before a committee of this House that once these companies were incorporated parliament could in no sense interfere with them, because they had a sacred contract with parliament that could not be interfered with. That is not sound doctrine, we have heard to-day the Minister of Justice say that it is not sound doctrine, and that he proposes in some way to interfere with these corporations. I wish I could say that this Bill was not intended to facilitate the export of electrical energy out of our country into the United States. I will delay, until the Bill is printed and I can see it, passing that judgment upon it. But from my present impression of this Bill, and from what I gathered from the Bill of last session, the object of both was to facilitate the export of electrical energy into the United States. I hope that is not the case. I hope we are not now passing legislation that may facilitate the establishment of a great electrical merger in connection with the water-powers of Niagara, dominating not only the American side of the line but the Canadian side. That is the thing to be feared. The people of this country will

watch this measure, and will criticise it in the most careful way. I hope that the Bill will be printed at an early date, and that the provincial authorities will be consulted in regard to the matter. I do trust, although I must say I look at it with some suspicion, that the Bill will have the effect of putting such a duty on the export as will keep all the electrical energy of this country for use in this country. We can use all the power that can be generated in this country, and it would be the height of absurdity, in a matter of national policy, that we should go to work and generate power and then facilitate the export of it into a foreign country to help build up and light that foreign country, and to drive its factories.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIFE ALLOWANCE TO EMPLOYEES ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to establish a fund to provide life allowances to certain retired employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, and to authorize a contribution by His Majesty to the said fund out of the gross earnings of the railways, of an amount not exceeding $100,000 per annum.

He said : The consent of His Excellency has been received to the introduction of this resolution.

Motion agreed to.

TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to discuss for a few minutes a question of urgent importance to my province, of which I have given Mr. Speaker notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Martin, of Queen's, asks leave to move the adjournment to call the attention of the House to the interruption of telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada. I think this is a matter coming within the scope of the rule. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of introducing the matter.

Leave granted.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House very long. The House is aware that telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is not under the control of the government. I have information that the submarine cable, the only means of telegraphic communication, between my province and the mainland, has been broken, so that telegraphic communication by means of that cable has practically ceased. The House will, I think, agree with me that that is a very serious position for that province to be placed in. It is one of the terms of the agreement with Canada that telegraphic communication shall be maintained at the expense of the Dominion government. This submarine cable, a very expensive cable laid down by the Anglo-American Cable Company, has parted. The service is disorganized. The only service we have at present is through the winter boats. The Marconi system has been established there and to some extent communication is carried on in that way. On the southern side of the province, as the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) may know, there is a Marconi station and the suggestion has been made that the Marconi station should be utilized in carrying messages across the straits in connection with one of the boats in the meantime while the government are making arrangements to restore the usual means of communication. This may be a very good time for the government to interfere and have that communication maintained by two Marconi stations, one in the province and one on the mainland. The House, I have no doubt, knows something of the difficulties existing between the Anglo-American Cable Company, which claims to have a monopoly, and the Marconi company, but their cable having parted and it being supposed to be a very expensive cable to mend, I think the government should now go to them and see what terms they would make in order that the government might establish a different system. However, I have done my duty in bringing the matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I received, as acting Minister of Public Works, a telegram informing me of the interruption of telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I immediately ordered that the company should be notified that they must take steps to re-establish communication as quickly as possible. I confess that I do not know yet, having no report on the matter, as to the possibility of re-establishing that communication at this period of the year and I can quite understand that there might be difficulties in the way, which difficulties, however, it is the duty of the company to overcome under their contract with the government. I do not know that I can do much more except to say that my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) had said rightly that in regard to a change in the method of communication by, for instance, the establishment of the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy across the Northumberland straits, there is some doubt as to the monopoly or rights which the company he alludes to have in regard to communication with Prince Edward Island and that be-

fore the government could undertake to change the system of communication it would have to consider these rights and see what would have to be done, if there are rights existing, to extinguish them. The arrangement has now been going on for some little time between the government and the company and, speaking from memory, I think this is the first time that there has been an interruption of this kind in the cable communication. Certainly, if interruptions occurred frequently it would be wise, I think, in the interest of the island and of the country as a whole, that some other arrangements should be made. I hope in a day or two to have further information which I shall be glad to lay before the hon. gentleman and the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. As the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) has referred to Marconi and his system I will take this occasion of asking him whether that Atlantic Marconi company which we subsidized some years ago has yet got into working order?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. minister whether or not under the terms of the contract between the government and this company to which he has alluded, any particular remedy is open to the government against the company in case they might fail within a reasonable time to protect the communication which has been broken? As I understand the company have certain special privileges. At one time they had an exclusive privilege—perhaps they have that exclusive privilege still—of carrying on telegraphic business in Prince Edward Island. I presume there must be some concurrent obligation on the part of the government and some redress from that concurrent obligation.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) I may say that I have not had sufficient time to examine the contract sufficiently to enable me to answer the points at issue, but I will do so and I shall be glad to give him the information.

Mr. STOCKTON. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux)—I regret he is not in his seat just now—and in his absence to the notice of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a complaint in which I think all the members of this House are interested. The Minister of Labour introduced a Bill nearly a month ago and I notice that it is No. 10 on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the discussion will have to be confined to the particular matter for the discussion of which the motion has been made.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understand it is a motion to adjourn and therefore——

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule says that the discussion must be confined to one matter.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I wish to add one or two words. I would suggest to the minister, that, there being a likelihood of some time elapsing before the company can restore their cable, in the meantime if the government would allow the company the use of the Marconi system which has been established on the southern side of the province and of the winter boats to carry on communication in some kind of way, it would expedite business to some extent.

Motion negatived.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE AT ST. HYACINTHE.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I might be allowed to ask my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it is the intention of the government to appoint a judge at St. Hyacinthe to replace the late Judge Madore, who, I think, died over two months ago. A friend of mine put the question to me and I would be very glad if the right hon. gentleman could give me an idea when the appointment will be made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Two months is not a very long time. The matter is under consideration at this moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister says a few months is not a very long time. He is no doubt alluding to the fact that there has been a vacancy on the Nova Scotia bench for ten months. He might give us some information in regard to that. It seems to be rather a reflection on the bar of the province, at least on the Liberal members of the bar, that no gentleman can be found to fill that vacancy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a longer time I admit. It is not a reflection on the bar of the province. It means rather that it is difficult to make a selection where there is such a plethora of material. But I hope we shall be able to fill the vacancy before long.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Naturalization Act.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

INSPECTION OF CANNED FOODS.

Bill (No. 33) to provide for the further supervision and inspection of canned food products, meats and fish.—Hon. Sydney Fisher—read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 2—definitions—

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This Bill is a somewhat important one, and requires, it seems

to me, considerable attention before it is passed. I should like to ask the minister whether in the recess copies of the Bill have been sent to the various canners of fruits, vegetables and meat products in the country. It seems to me that before any further action is taken on the Bill copies of it should be sent to all of those interested in order that we might obtain their opinions ond views upon it, as it proposes some very drastic measures in regard to the canning not only of meats, but of fruits, vegetables and other food products. So far as I am personally concerned, I think many of the features of the Bill are very commendable. It may properly be divided, I think, into two parts. One part refers to an inspection of the factories, for the purpose of seeing that the products to be canned are clean, healthy and sound and that the factories and their surroundings are in a similar condition. Everybody, both producers and consumers, will agree that this is a step in the right direction. The only objection that can possibly be urged against this feature of the Bill is that, in the province of Ontario at least—I cannot speak for the other provinces—we have already just such a periodical inspection. We have under the authority of the provincial government an inspector who goes around to all the factories several times in the season to see that they are in a sanitary condition and that the products to be canned are in a sound and healthy condition. Therefore the Bill seems to propose a duplication of work, at any rate in that province. However, perhaps more frequent inspections can not do any hurt, though for that province they involve an apparently unnecessary expense. The other division of the Bill, with regard to the marking of all packages, is perhaps more debatable. It is proposed that in all factories where canned meats are put up there shall be an inspector or inspectors continually, whose duty it shall be not only to inspect the live animals and the carcases, but to examine the processes of packing from the beginning to end, and I understand that the can itself is to be marked and stamped by the inspector. In other words, the canned goods go out as government inspected. This of course will necessarily be quite costly. I do not know that that portion of the Bill relating to the wholesomeness of the product to be put into the can can be objected to, except perhaps on the ground of cost. It may be said that it is an interference to a certain extent with the trade and commerce of the country—with the man who at present is wise enough to put up his products in a first-class manner. It is perhaps an interference with the superior position he now occupies owing to his good sense and prudence, bringing up to his level the man who, though he may not put into the cans anything which is injurious to health, is not putting them up in as wholesome a manner as the inspector might possibly desire. I cannot, however, take serious objection to this, as it is in line with an amendment to the Fruit Marks Act which I had the honour of introducing in 1903, and which the Minister of Agriculture turned down on that occasion on the ground that it was costly. That amendment was as follows :

> Whenever any person having at least a carload of fruit packed in closed packages——

—if it were not in closed packages the purchaser would see the articles. That is the reason why, I presume, the minister proposes in this to have the cans marked by the government because the purchaser cannot see the contents. The amendment was as follows :

> Whenever any person having at least a carload of fruit packed in closed packages ready for shipment desires it, the Department of Agriculture shall send a qualified inspector as expeditiously as possible to examine the same and brand upon the packages the grade of the fruit therein.

This amendment did not go as far as the present Act because it provided that the cost of the inspection should fall to a certain extent, if not entirely, upon the person who desired the inspection. The object of that was to protect the consumer that he might be sure that when he bought a package marked No. 1 or No. 2, he would get just that kind of package and to show that under the present operation of the Fruit Marks Act there is not perfect satisfaction permit me to read a short letter received by one of the members of this House from a gentleman in Rosthern, Saskatchewan. He says:

> I have, however, a matter which I think should be brought to the notice of the Department of Agriculture, and which I have to-day brought to the attention of our local member, Mr. McCraney, telling him that I was writing you on the subject too. It is the matter of branding and inspection of apples. I recently bought a car-load of apples (through a Winnipeg house), from Ontario which are not, in a great many cases, anything like what they are branded. I have northern spies, branded No. 1, which are utterly unfit for shipment at all, small, green, bruised, worm-eaten and certainly should not even be branded No. 2, yet they are branded No. 1. There is an occasional barrel branded 'spy' which is some other apple altogether. This might easily be an accident, but barrel after barrel of such an assortment as farmers in Ontario feed to their pigs, is no accident. I could bring lots of proof to substantiate what I say. There is, I believe, an Act of parliament covering this sort of thing, but apparently it is a dead letter. It is small wonder Canadian fruit is under a cloud in the English market if such samples are shipped there as we get out here.

This only goes to show the necessity of having these packages of apples marked as suggested. Had they been marked by an inspector with a government stamp this could not possibly have occurred and so I say I am somewhat surprised that the min-

ister, after having turned down a proposal to mark packages of apples at the expense of the person desiring to have them marked should now propose to have every two pound can of meat put up in this country stamped and marked by a government inspector at the expense of the people. It is questionable in my mind whether the government would be warranted in incurring this very heavy expense, because it must necessarily be a heavy expense, for it is proposed to inspect all the cans containing meats which would include, I presume, fowl. Fowl is canned in almost every fruit or vegetable canning factory, or in a very large number of them in Canada, and it would include, I presume, an article called 'pork and beans.' This article is put up in a great many factories in Canada. I do not know how many factories there are to which this part of the Act would apply but it would be a very large number; it would be a very costly matter to do this and it is certainly a debatable question whether or not the government of Canada is warranted in spending so large a sum of money for the purpose of stamping and marking every 2 or 3-pound can of meat put up in this country. However desirable it may be to see that the food put into these cans is wholesome and sound it seems to me that before this Bill goes further at any rate before it is passed, the canneries of all kinds of products proposed to be affected by this Bill should be heard from, that the Bill should be delayed for at least a couple of weeks and that a copy of the Bill should be sent to these canneries. I dare say that a list of these canneries can be had, it is probably in the hands of the Department of Agriculture It would be no difficult matter to have these in the hands of the canners in forty-eight hours, and ask them, possibly in a circular letter accompanying the Bill, their opinions in regard to it. We should then know if there are any objections to this Bill and would have some data to go upon.

Mr. ALCORN. As has been observed by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) this Bill deals in a very drastic manner with the business of a large number of commercial houses in this country. In the county I have the honour to represent we have some thirteen canning factories, and the business of each one of these will be subject to the supervision of the inspectors to be appointed under this Act. During the recess I received one copy of this Bill and have since applied for further copies, with the intention of placing one in the hands of each of the gentlemen engaged in that business in Prince Edward county. So far I have only been able to get four copies of the Bill and I would certainly think that my duty was not done unless I placed within the power of each gentleman engaged in that business whom I have the honour to represent, full information of the contents of the Bill. Therefore I would join in the request of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that the Bill be delayed, certainly for a couple of weeks, until these factories can be heard from and their views made known.

Mr. MACLAREN. I may say that I have a similar request to make. On Tuesday last I came down with a member of a firm of pork packers from the county I represent, Mr. White, of the White Packing Company, and he was very anxious this should be looked into before it became law, and requested some delay. He would like to have a deputation of canners and pork-packers visit the Minister of Agriculture before the Bill is finally passed and I would also request that the Bill be laid over and an opportunity be given to investigate the matter. I sent a copy of the Bill to that gentleman yesterday at his request and I think the canners will be heard from, they would like to have an opportunity of placing their case before the House before this Bill is made law.

Mr. FISHER. I would say in regard to the points raised by my hon. friends, that before we separated for the Christmas recess I was asked to have the Bill printed and distributed. Before the new year the Bill was sent to every member of the House. It was available then for every one of them to get any number of copies he wished. When the resolution was up before the House a very complete report of the nature of that resolution and the discussion upon it was published in all the newspapers of the country. I have had a considerable number of representations in regard to the Bill in the form of letters from various people interested, but practically no protests against the principle of the Bill. The parties interested could have got the Bill if they had applied to either the department or to their representatives in parliament. The only actual protest that I have received has been a request on the part of some people engaged in the business to be heard before the Bill is finally put through the House. I certainly wish to have that occur. As a matter of fact I did not expect or propose this afternoon that the Bill would pass through committee. I expected that before we got through that stage I would have to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, and I expected to do that this afternoon, but I think it would be unfortunate if we were not now to discuss the Bill in its details as it is printed and before the House. I have no expectation of bringing the Bill out of committee this afternoon but would ask the House to discuss it at all events for a while, and before six o'clock I shall move that the committee rise and report progress. Then the details of the measure and the discussion will go before the country and

people will be given ample opportunity to make their representations on the subject. I shall be only too glad to receive any representations made or if necessary deputations.

Mr. KEMP. Have the meat packers received copies of this Bill? And has the hon. minister received any letters from these packers?

Mr. FISHER. Those who have applied for copies of the Bill have received them. I did not order copies to be sent to all the meat packers, but I sent copies to the members and I supposed they would ask for other copies if they required them for their constituents. There has been a number of applications for copies of the Bill and copies were sent immediately I could not say whether the requests came from meat packers or not, but no doubt some of them did. When the resolutions were passed through the House, a pretty complete synopsis of the explanations given were published in all the leading newspapers, and after the Bill was printed copies were given to the newspaper correspondents here and its main features were republished in the newspapers at the great centres. A number of articles have appeared in various newspapers on both sides of politics discussing and rather endorsing the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. KEMP. I expect that the letters which the minister has received are based upon the remarks he made in the House when introducing the Bill and not on the terms of the Bill we have before us now.

Mr. FISHER. Most of the letters called for copies of the Bill and copies were sent.

Mr. KEMP. Those interested have not had time to criticise the Bill and study all its clauses.

Mr. FISHER. They have had the Bill for a week or so.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I wrote for half a dozen copies and only succeeded in getting two. That was all they could spare.

Mr. FISHER. I did not undertake to order the Printing Committee as to how many copies of the Bill they should print. Some 500 copies were sent to the department, most of which have been distributed.

Mr. ALCORN. I understand the hon. minister to say that copies were sent to those who applied for them. I received one copy during recess and applied for four. I only obtained three.

Mr. FISHER. To whom did you apply?

Mr. ALCORN. To the distribution office. It is a serious matter to a large number of firms in the county I represent that they cannot procure copies and do not know the provisions of the Bill before it comes before the House.

Mr. MARSHALL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Alcorn). This Bill requires very serious consideration by the packers. I have been anxious to get some copies for some of the fruit packers but could not. A number of the clauses, are, I think, in the right direction, but I consider that the inspection, so far as the quality of the article itself is concerned, is unnecessary. The inspection of factories to see that they are properly kept and that the surroundings are as they should be, is a move in the right direction, but there is no need for an inspector to inspect the article packed. It would be very hard indeed to get efficient men to do such inspection. Very few men could tell when corn or peas are in proper condition for canning. Besides such inspection is rendered unnecessary by the fact that so keen is the competition, that if the goods are not properly packed and in good condition, the packing House will soon have to give up business. The inspection under the Ontario government is made by both men and women inspectors. The man sees that the shafting and belting are properly protected against accidents, and the woman looks after the women's department where the women are at work. That inspection, so far as I know, has been very satisfactory. It would be very expensive to have the quality of the articles canned inspected, and get the right class of men to do it. Besides that would create a certain amount of jealousy. We all have different methods of putting up our goods—methods which we think very valuable—and we pay very high prices for some men. The inspector, going from one factory to another, would give these methods away and create a good deal of trouble. For that reason I would not think it necessary to have an inspector to inspect the quality of the goods put in the can; but if it be thought necessary to have a second inspector appointed by this government to inspect the factories and see that they and their surroundings are properly kept, it might be well to do so. There is one provision I would like to see in the Bill, and that is to have the name of the packer labelled on every can. We have a number of special labels and are bothered by customers who want special labels. They do not want the name of the packer put on, but we want it put on in letters that may be easily read.

Mr. FISHER. The name of the firm.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. I hope the hon. minister will see his way clear to let the Bill stand because there are many things in it which require consideration. I would like to have the Bill sent to all our factories.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be true that the minister is not directly responsible if sufficient copies are not obtainable, but that does not remedy the situation. A number of people are very materially affected by

the Bill, and it is only right they should have knowledge of its contents and have the opportunity of making any representations they desire with regard to it. It would seem reasonable to have a number of additional copies struck off at once. That would take but a very short time and should be done as soon as possible. How does the hon. minister propose to give audience to those who desire to make representations—a departmental hearing or by a committee of the House?

Mr. FISHER. It would be better to give them a departmental hearing. The department is responsible for the legislation and every opportunity will be given those who desire a hearing and also to members who desire to introduce delegations. It would delay business to refer the Bill to a special committee. I have no desire to push the Bill through, but simply to have a discussion in the meantime, and I think that the discussion this afternoon will help very much to a future understanding of the measure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is any objection to that.

Mr. FISHER. I think this discussion will be reported, and, as the newspapers are read by almost everybody, it will facilitate the future discussion and understanding of the Bill by those who may wish to make representations with regard to its provisions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister might perhaps be willing to adopt the course that I have seen adopted on previous occasions, that is, to consider any section on which discussion is necessary as not finally passed, in order that every part of the Bill may be discussed hereafter.

Mr. FISHER. That is what I was going to propose. There are some sections that, I think, nobody would object to, but any section at all involving discussion might stand. But I confess that I thought that I had taken fair precautions to have the Bill well distributed, and I am very much surprised to find that there is any difficulty in securing copies. Of course, that shows a large interest in the Bill, of which I am very glad. The distribution during the holidays was for the express purpose of giving publicity to the measure, so that we might be in a position when we came together again, to discuss it. Taking it for granted that the House is ready to go on and discuss the Bill in that form, I may say a few words in answer to my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall)—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. minister goes on with that, may I suggest that some hon. gentlemen who take a deep interest in this subject would rather have all the sections, of the Bill stand over,—not have any section passed now. I suppose there would be no objection to that?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it will retard the progress of the Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to call the attention of the hon. minister to a letter that I have received from one of the most practical farmers in my constituency who had read in the papers some account of this Bill. The letter is as follows.

December 14, 1906.

George Taylor, Esq., M.P.,
Gananoque.

Dear Sir.—I have noticed, in the 'Montreal Star' your discussion on cold storage and pure foods. It has struck me that if the people are to have protection against adulterated human food, the farmer who is buying food for his cattle and hogs ought to be protected also. During the past few years. there is a glaring outrage being perpetrated on the farmers of this county by having worthless feed sold them, under very stylish names. And while many of them have found this. to their sorrow. some of them are still being duped.

Now, I thought that something might be done by your esteemed friend, the Minister of Agriculture, to assist the farmers by providing some means whereby this feed could be sold by its correct name, or have its value ascertained by analysis. Most of the stuff is really valueless and is composed of oat hulls. corn chaff. buckwheat shucks, &c. I am sending you five samples. No. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are from the McAllister Milling Company, Peterborough. No. 5, which is the best, is from the Ogilive Milling Company. No. 1 is known as buckwheat and oats feed; No. 2. as buckwheat. corn and oats. No. 3, as mixed chop; No. 4, as ground middlings; and No. 5. as oats feed.

Now, if you wish to find out the food value of any of this stuff, put a pinch in your mouth and chew it. But an expert will soon tell you it is no good. And yet our farmers have been paying from $22 to $26 per ton for this stuff. It is largely the refuse of the Cereal Works in Peterborough, and it is more fit for fuel than for feed.

I am sorry I have no sample bags or I might have sent you larger samples. But I feel the farmers have here a very sore grievance, though they do not all know it, because this stuff is so well mixed and ground that they are unable to detect the fraud.

Now, I am not requesting you to make use of this. It is all in your own hands, use your own judgment in the matter.

This is the statement made by one of our most up-to-date farmers. He sends samples of the stuff he has been buying and feeding to his stock, and says that if it is analysed, it will be found to be practically of no use except for fuel. If the minister allows this Bill to stand over, as requested by the manufacturers, I think he will hear something more with reference to this matter. I think this Bill ought to make provision for animals as well as for human beings. The Department of Agriculture should certainly deal with this matter.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) correspon-

dent. I know there is a good deal of difficulty throughout the country from the cause he refers to. I have been considering, more or less, what could be done to remedy that difficulty, but I confess that I have not been able to find any machinery that would meet the case. I would be glad if I could find the remedy, and the fact that I have not yet found it, does not at all mean that I have ceased to try to find it. At the same time, I think the subject is rather foreign to the purpose of the Bill now before us, and can hardly be provided for under this measure. The statements of my hon. friend's correspondent, I have no doubt, are perfectly accurate. It is very difficult for the ordinary farmer to judge of the value of these foods, and there is such an infinite variety of them, and they are sold under so many names, that it is almost impossible to classify them or to control them. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says they are almost all by products of the mills which make other foods of various kinds, and they vary very much according to the mill from which they come and even according to the time when they are produced. I admit the difficulty, but I cannot but think that it is foreign to this Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall send these samples to the minister, and he might have them handed to his analyst to see if the statements of my correspondent are not correct.

Mr. FISHER. We are constantly analysing feeds of this kind at our farm laboratory and giving information concerning them to those interested, and this we are ready to do at any time. But a man might get analysis of a certain food, but, when ordering it by the same name from the same mill, he might find himself supplied with a totally different sample. It depends so much upon the way in which the machinery of the mill is running, as to how much of the nutritious qualities are left in the by-products.

Mr. BLAIN. I am inclined to think this Bill a very good one in some respects, and I believe that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has a right to compliment himself upon having a good object in view. But, I think also that it would be in the interest of the public, and would add greatly to the information of this committee, if he would give us some statement of the different provincial laws now in force for the inspection of canned meats and other goods. There is a growing impression in the province of Ontario that we have too much legislation, some of it from the provincial House, and some from this parliament, and that there are a good many laws on the statute-book that are not very well enforced. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) has pointed out that there is already an inspection of the canning establishments in Ontario. He tells us that one inspector is charged with the duty of learning whether the machinery is in proper condition, another inspects the process to know whether the goods are properly put up. I should be glad if the minister would give a rather complete explanation of the legislation now in force in respect to canned goods in Ontario and in other provinces as well.

Mr. FISHER. In a general way, the legislation which covers to a certain extent some of the points of this Bill, is what is called public health regulations under the provincial governments. These are for the preservation of the public health, and are aimed at ensuring sanitation in the different localities. As a rule they are under the direct administration of boards of health. I can speak rather positively for the province of Quebec with which I am familiar, and I understand that the provisions in the province of Ontario are very similar. I know that in the province of Quebec such regulations are carried out under a Provincial Health Act. It provides for a board of public health in every municipality, which board has authority, for instance, to close a slaughter house, to prevent a nuisance and to interfere in any way where they consider that public health is endangered. If, in their investigations on this subject, they find that any butcher shop, or slaughter house, or any other machinery which is supplying food, is in any way unsanitary, they can close it up. This seems to be a work which is entirely under the management and control of the provincial authorities, but one which does not at all interfere with work that the parliament of Canada may undertake. I am not prepared to say that the parliament of Canada could not constitutionally interfere somewhat in such work. I have consulted my colleague the Minister of Justice and he is not prepared to say that under all circumstances we have no power to interfere in such work, but he says that practically such things are relegated to the provincial authorities, and that it is only under conditions which so far as we can make out do not exist that it would be necessary or advisable for the federal authorities to intervene.

The inspection of factories to which I have alluded is made for sanitary purposes. The inspection that the hon. member for East Elgin described is, I think, made under what is called the factory inspection law, a law that provides for the safety of employees in factories, that the machinery should be safe, that it should be in good condition, that a boiler, for instance, should not be likely to explode, or a fly wheel likely to burst. It is a factory inspection for machinery, and has nothing to do with the products of the factory or with the materials used therein. What the hon. gentleman said with regard to a female inspector is provided for, I believe, under a law for the protection of women and children in factories, to provide, for instance, that child-

ren should not be employed before reaching a suitable age, and to see that hygienic conditions prevail in factories. I do not think these factory inspectors would be called upon to do the kind of inspection that is contemplated under this Bill.

I did not perhaps quite catch what the hon. member for East Elgin said in discussing the advisability of inspecting the materials used in manufacture. Now, one of the provisions of this Bill is that these materials should be inspected, and that they should be of good quality. I rather think that is an important provision of the Bill. I think it is advisable that in the inspection of factories the inspector should have power to investigate whether, for instance, vegetables or fruits which are in the factory for the purpose of being canned are sound. I have no idea that they should decide, for instance, whether the corn is just at the proper stage of ripeness to be used, or whether the peas are just ripe enough or are of the proper size to be canned. But I think there should be inspection as to whether corn is in a sound condition and fit to be put up, and the same with pease, tomatoes, fruit and meat. That is the kind of inspection, and the object, which it is proposed to secure under this Bill.

In regard to the Bill applying only to goods for export, which in the second clause means export abroad, or goods sent from one province of the Dominion to another, when the resolutions were being discussed some suggestion was made that the Act should apply to the local trade as well as the foreign trade. I received these suggestions with the utmost respect, I understood their motive, and appreciated what was said in regard to safeguarding the food of our own people as well as that which is sent abroad. There are, however, two main objections to doing that under this Bill. The first and most important is that it would be a physical impossibility to do it. If we were to undertake to apply the provisions of this Act to local butchers' and meat shops, and slaughter houses, and all other kinds of business which produce articles for home consumption as well as for export, it would be practicably impossible to carry them out. One of two things would inevitably occur; either such provisions would be entirely inoperative, or else we would have to modify it in such a way that it would lessen the safeguards with which it is intended to surround the export trade. I think that is a very practical difficulty in the way. I think it was my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) who referred to the Fruit Marks Act. The Fruit Marks Act does not provide for the inspection of every closed package of fruit. If we were to undertake that it would be a physical impossibility to carry it out. That is one of the chief reasons why we did not, in the Fruit Marks Act, undertake that kind of inspection. We did, however, provide for such inspection at any time if it was found advisable or feasible; that has been done, and done satisfactorily, and I think I may say without boasting, done well. So in this Act, if we were to undertake to apply all its machinery to every local butcher's shop and slaughter house all over Canada, in the country parts as well as in the more populated localities, we would find it physically impossible to do so. If we attempted to cover that ground we would have to reduce the machinery largely, and lessen the safeguards which the Bill ought to provide for both the export and interprovincial trade, so far reduce it, in fact, that it would be rendered altogether ineffective as far as benefit to our trade there is concerned. Even then, if we were to so reduce and modify the provisions of the Bill, I believe that we would hardly be able to carry out any provisions in regard to inspection and marking which would apply to every little meat shop and every little store where these food products might be produced or sold. Under these circumstances I feel that there is the practical difficulty of applying this Bill to the home or local trade.

There is the other difficulty and the other reason why it is not advisable. Under the Health Acts of the different provinces there is very fairly effective provision in regard to that. The provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and I think the other provinces—but I know these four—provide in their Provincial Health Acts for a pretty complete sanitary supervision and inspection. This applies generally in a practical way to all the little local butcher shops and slaughter houses. It applies to the inspection of retailers and markets in the towns, and I think it has pretty successfully guarded the public health in times past. But this provincial or municipal control and inspection are entirely powerless and ineffective when they are applied to the production of goods which are going to be sent out of the locality in which they are produced and the local or provincial authorities cannot, by their constitutional rights and powers, interfere with that kind of trade. Therefore, it is required that this parliament must deal with it. I forget which of the hon. gentlemen opposite it was that seemed to think that perhaps this Bill was not necessary at all. I will not go into that at any length except to say that I explained the reasons for the introduction of the Bill when the resolutions were passed, and I think that explanation on the whole met with the approval of the House. But I want once more to reiterate that if a Bill of this kind is not made law in Canada I have abundant proof that our trade in meats and canned goods in the old country will be at a great disadvantage with all trade in the old country from other countries which provide these safeguards, and especially will be at such a disadvantage in competition with the United

States trade there that it will practically be good-bye to our present supremacy in many of these lines in the British market. I am so convinced of this that I might almost set it down as a positive fact and I think that is not only a justification but a positive proof of the absolute requirement of legislation of this kind. I think the House was convinced of that when the resolution was put through and that it will not be prepared to go back on that idea now. If there are any other questions I shall be glad to answer them before proceeding to the consideration of the different features of the Bill.

Mr. MACPHERSON. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) introduced the resolutions the other day into the House he suggested that the cans when inspected should be dated. That question was debated a little. In looking over the Bill which has been brought down to the House I did not notice whether such a provision had been incorporated in it.

Mr. FISHER. No, the present Bill as printed provided for regulations and that question will come under the regulations. If my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) will turn to the seventh section of the Bill he will see that the first part does not cover what my hon. friend refers to.

All articles prepared for food in any establishment and packed in cans or similar receptacles, or in any package whatever, shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation and packing.

That does not cover the point, but the next clause does.

All such packages shall be marked or labelled in such manner as the minister directs.

That covers the point of all markings which may be required by the regulations to be put upon the cans. A later section in the Act gives power to the minister to provide such regulations and the regulations would contain any of the markings necessary to be put on the cans. I at once may say to my hon. friend that the question of putting the date upon the cans is one that is quite open. I want to find the sense of the House and of the country on that question. I have been urged by some people to require that the date should be put on. I have had numerous representations from people engaged in the canning industry saying that that would be very detrimental to their trade. There are evidently two sets of opinion in the country on that question, and my own feeling at the present moment is that it might be left open as to whether it would be advisable to require the date to be put on the can. At the same time I understand that there is considerable public demand for it. I may say in that connection, that, while I do not wish to quote it as an authority, in the United States, where this question came up and was pretty thoroughly threshed out and discussed, the final decision was not to put the date upon the cans. While I think it is quite possible that in the future that requirement may come I would not be prepared to-day to draw up a regulation requiring it unless there is a very decided preponderance of opinion in the House in favour of it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am a little afraid that the regulations may give too much power to the department. I think that if the House were wise they would settle this question once and for all in this Bill. I gave this Bill my most hearty support. They would settle once and for all that it is ill-advised to put the date on canned goods. It is a well known fact that sardines, for example, are infinitely better for remaining five or six years in oil. I have in my hand here two cans of salmon. Of course, the proof of the pudding is the preein' o't, as the Scotch say. These two cans of salmon were packed in 1901, nearly six years ago. I will undertake to say that this salmon is infinitely better than canned salmon put up this year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have you a can opener ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) comes from Halifax and we all know they carry can openers with them. He may have one. The only object I fancy the hon. minister has in view is to protect the public, but if there were an attempt made to date the cans, especially of salmon,—and I speak of salmon more especially—he would simply be trying to protect people who do not require to be protected. That is the public would not be protected in the way he assumes. There can be no chemical reaction in a can of salmon after it is hermetically sealed. The only difference that can take place is that the bones become a bit softer. It is a well known fact that the best salmon is the red salmon; it sells better on the market than the white. If an attempt were made to colour the white salmon red, which could be done by means of analine dyes, the bones would immediately show the presence of the chemical used for colouring. Canned salmon which is put up this year is not offered for sale in the markets of the country until next year; yet the average man buying a case of canned salmon in 1906 would naturally ask for the salmon canned in that year. I am of opinion that this House could not do any greater damage to the canning industry of this country in the first place and to the public at large afterwards than to require the date of canning to be put upon the label. I venture to say that if you open these two cans, you will find them to contain just as pure and wholesome food as was ever put into a can.

Mr. GUNN. I would like to corroborate every statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), having

sold canned salmon and other canned goods for a quarter of a century. I believe canned salmon improves with age, and I am satisfied that it would be a great mistake for this House to enact legislation requiring the date to be stamped on the label of the can. It is a well known fact that the trade of the country buying from the packers in British Columbia can buy large quantities at very much better rates than small quantities. A provision of that kind would also inflict a great hardship on the retail trade.

Mr. BLAIN. Looking over the Bill, I do not see any clause dealing with the inspection of the can. I am not very familiar with the canning industry and therefore my opinion may not be very valuable, but I find that a great deal of the complaint in the province of Ontario against canned goods has been that in many cases the goods have been rendered unfit for use by the inferior quality of the material used in the can. I understand that the can is usually made of thin steel or black iron afterwards tinned over, in some cases a very light coating of tin being applied; so that if the can stands for a number of years, the tinning comes off and the contents come into contact with the original steel or iron and so become tainted and unfit for use. I would like to ask the minister if in this Bill there is any clause calling for the inspection of the can itself or the material used in the manufacture of the can. While it is important that the goods should be thoroughly inspected, it is equally important that the can should be inspected, in view of the fact that in some cases canned goods stand on the merchant's shelf for years.

Mr. FISHER. That was not contemplated under the Bill. I say to my hon. friend frankly that I had not considered that question at all. It was rather supposed that the quality of the can used would be a matter of interest to the people using it. I suppose we could inspect the can if it affected the hygienic quality of the goods. Possibly that might be done under section 12, though it might be straining the clause. The point raised is worthy of consideration.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a very important point. After this Bill was introduced I had some correspondence with some of the large can manufacturers on this subject, as the canners have no guarantee, when buying cans, of the quality of tin they are getting. The cans are made of steel plates, coated with tin. A heavy coating of course costs more than a light coating. This is a matter I was going to mention, but it was suggested by some of the tin men not to do so. We want some guarantee when we buy tins that we are getting good tins. In exporting canned apples and tomatoes we have met with heavy losses as a result of the acid eating through to the steel and in some cases through the can. In a box of tin consisting of 112 sheets 14 inches by 20 inches, there should be not less than 2½ pound of tin. I think this is a matter that should be considered. A great deal of our tin is bought in the American market, but in it we have found many spots where the tin does not properly cover the plate. The Welsh tin is much better. The hon. minister spoke of the inspection of boilers. We have now three inspections a year under the Ontario Factories Act. That part is well covered, we have what we call a steam inspection and a cold water inspection. With that we feel quite satisfied, in fact we are compelled to have our boilers inspected twice a year. We have them inspected three times a year to be sure. The boilers are an important and very dangerous part of the plant of a factory and sometimes we cannot readily secure skilled men to handle them. For that reason we have an inspection three times a year although we are only compelled to have one twice.

Mr. FISHER. Under this Act there is no contemplation of inspecting officers or anything of that kind which is provided for by provincial Act. In regard to what my hon. friend said about the tin I am not surprised that he has more satisfaction from the Welsh than from the American; I am glad to hear it but I had no doubt of it. The question of inspecting the quality of the packages was not contemplated when the Bill was drawn, but it is well worth consideration although perhaps a little outside the scope of the Bill. What the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) says however might be fairly well said to bring it within the scope of the Bill if the result of inferior packages is going to be the destruction of the contents of the tin, so that the contents might be made unsuitable for food by reason of the inferiority of the package. If that is the case, it is a debatable question whether we should not examine the packages and see that they are not such that the contents would suffer by reason of their inferior quality. I would be glad to ascertain the sense of the House on this matter, and if it is the feeling of this chamber that the packages should be included it is quite possible and proper to introduce an amendment to the Act.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me rather useless for the government to be so very careful about the inspection of the produce and pay no attention to the package in which it is placed. That is the point for consideration, and I am glad the minister will look into the matter before the Bill is finally passed because I think it is one of some interest to the general public who are using canned goods, particularly in this age when there is a much larger quantity of canned goods used than ever before in the history of Canada. I think this matter should be dealt with in this Bill. Did I understand the min-

ister to say in the explanation that he gave to the House of the law in force in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario that the inspectors did not deal at all with the products that were packed?

Mr. FISHER. I think only in this way that anything that they consider unsanitary, they would destroy or forbid the sale of.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the Act in Quebec and in Ontario go so far as to call upon the inspector when he enters a factory to inspect the products that are being packed ?

Mr. FISHER. The Ontario Act provides:

Any medical health officer or sanitary inspector may at all reasonable times inspect and examine any animal, carcass, meat, poultry, game, flesh, fowl, fruit, vegetables, grain, bread, flour, or milk exposed for sale or deposited in any place for the purpose of sale or in preparation for sale, and intended for the food of man.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I wish to supplement what the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) said about the inspection in Ontario. He mentioned two inspectors, the woman inspector who has certain duties to perform in inspecting factories, and another inspector, probably under the Ontario Factories Act whose duty it is to examine into the machinery and the safety, &c., of the factory ; but we also have a third inspector, under the Health Act who comes around to examine into the sanitary condition so that if we have an inspector under the Dominion Act also we will have four inspectors and be pretty well looked after. The section of the Ontario Act which the minister read would seem to cover the intention of this Act as far as fruit and vegetable canning factories are concerned. It therefore seems that it is a duplication of machinery, in Ontario at any rate, whatever may be the case in other provinces. This may not do any particular harm, in fact the more inspection the better, but it would really seem to be unnecessary to have two men doing the same thing, one under the provincial and one under the Dominion government. I wish to say that I quite agree with the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) who spoke in regard to regulations. It seems to me that in this Bill as in many other Bills there are too many things left open for regulations. The Bill is cast, in one of its sections at any rate, in such a broad way that it might cover almost anything. It seems to me that the fewer regulations we have left to be framed afterwards, the more complete the Bill is made when it passes this House, the better. In regard to the dating of canned goods, I cannot speak from experience but I know, as the minister has suggested, that this matter was thoroughly threshed out for several years in the United States and when their Pure Food Bill was passed, no dating on the can was provided for, the reason being that it was shown that a can of fruit or vegetables or any other article that is hermetically sealed, once preserved, will last a great many years and that the can is equally as good the second or third as it is the first year. Putting the date on the can simply prejudices the consumer against it to such an extent that the public would not purchase cans that were dated two or three years old, not knowing, for few of them could be expected to know, whether that can was as good or not ; they would take it for granted that being old it was not good and would not buy it, and consequently the retail merchant would not dare to buy except from hand to mouth, the wholesaler would be in the same position and goods could not be shipped in carload lots to towns in Canada that could only take one or two cars of canned goods in a year. They are bought now for a year ahead, and they are not particular, they are able to carry the goods over, some are carried over to the second year. Under a dating system that could not be done and the goods would have to be shipped in small lots at local freight rates so that each grocer could have a small quantity that he could dispose of immediately. For that reason it seems to me that dating the cans would be unnecessary and unjustifiable unless it can be shown as it has not been shown in the United States that these goods depreciate rapidly with age.

Mr. MARSHALL. I might say that since the Bill was introduced I have been spoken to about it by a number of wholesale grocers. They say that if we want to ruin the business we want to date the cans. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) is quite right when he says that goods are as good five or six years after as they are the day they are packed. As a matter of fact they are. We have goods in our factory that we have had for ten years. We retain them to see how they keep, and I venture to say if we opened a can of the goods that we packed ten years ago, and a can of the goods packed last year there is not a man in the House who could tell the difference. I do not say that canned fruit and vegetables improve with age; I think as far as fish is concerned, that is true, but they do not deteriorate at all. Then we may order a lot of labels with the date printed on them, and if we should have a short pack that year we should not be able to use one half of them. That would be a serious matter.

Mr. BARR. There can be no question that the quality of the food we eat is one of the most important subjects we can deal with. In fact there is nothing of such vital importance as the health of our people. We have been told that those canned goods will keep in good condition for five or six years; but if they are not labelled and the dates of canning printed on the labels, how is the

purchaser to know that the can he is buying may not have been on the shelf some ten or twenty years? Thus the object of this Bill might be frustrated if we do not insist on the labels being dated. If the labels are dated, the purchasing public will soon find out whether the goods have been too long canned to be fit for consumption. As regards vegetables we know that in the past the public have been served up with canned goods labelled as consisting of certain kinds of vegetables which were not in the cans at all, and we know that in many cases diseases have been caused by the consumption of such goods. We know that glucose has been substituted for orange and so on. What we have to consider is not the interests of the canning industry, which is but a small part of the community, but the health and interests of the public, and I trust that this House will not run away with the idea that we should make everything as convenient as possible for the canners at the expense of the consumers. Our first consideration should be the public health. Those who have had any experience in canned goods know that in many cases the tin is worn off and the contents have become deteriorated and unfit for use. But in some cases they are so little tainted, that the deterioration is scarcely perceptible. In my medical experience, I have met many cases where canned fish has been used, which had become tainted, with the result that poisoning followed. We know that similar results have been experienced in the use of every other kind of canned goods. In a number of cases I have been called in and have found that the patients had been eating goods taken from cans where the tinning had been worn off and the contents tainted, and they had become seriously ill in consequence. I hope the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will not allow himself to be carried away by too much consideration for the interests of canners but give his first and chief consideration to the great public most interested.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have listened patiently to the discussion the other day and to-day, and I cannot see any need for this legislation. I do not see that any evil has been shown to exist, and I apprehend many difficulties should we adopt this measure. I know of no outcry for any such legislation and have heard no good reason given why the Bill should pass. The only reason given is that it will secure pure food for the people. But we have provincial legislation to-day which deals with that subject. We have legislation in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which provides for the inspection of all the products of those factories, whether for export or home consumption. Therefore I cannot see any need for this parliament interfering with the provincial authorities and undertaking to make another inspection, at expense to the people, which inspection must be absolutely unnecessary unless it be held that the provincial authorities are not doing their duty. In Ontario and Quebec there is inspection by the provincial officers of all the food canned in these factories, and if the food be not found fit for consumption it is confiscated and the parties responsible punished. Either we must assume that the provincial authorities are not taking any action at all or that the action they do take is ineffective, and I am not aware that any such charge has been made. It may be said that there is not legislation of this character in all the provinces; but if the action taken by Ontario and Quebec is effective, we should naturally expect the other provinces to follow suit and thereby accomplish all that is required by the measure we are now asked to pass. I do not see why we should attempt to apply a remedy without first being certain that an evil exists. It is idle to talk about trying to remove an evil which may not exist. Until we are positive that there is an evil which calls for legislation on our part, we should not pass any legislation because otherwise we shall only be apt to make trouble. As far as I can gather from the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) the whole object seems to be to conserve the public health.

And, as I said, we want the public health to be taken care of. But it is being taken care of under special Acts of the provinces—or ought to be. There is no doubt that, under the British North America Act, the provinces have power to deal with this matter, and they are dealing with it so far as they find it necessary. If all the provinces look after the public health within their own boundaries, the whole Dominion is looked after. Then is left to be considered only the health of the people who buy our goods. Now, if these goods are fit for our use in Canada, they are fit for export, and they are found to be fit for use in Canada if the provincial legislatures do their duty and the officers appointed under their laws carry on their work in a proper way. If we of this parliament idly add another staff of inspectors and another lot of machinery under federal jurisdiction to interfere in these matters, we are going to make trouble both for the consumer in Canada and for the producer also—and not only for the producer in the sense of the manufacturer but for the producer in the sense of the farmer who grows the fruits or vegetables or produces the animals that are sold to the manufacturer. If the manufacturer must be worried by unnecessary inspection, the injury must reach those from whom he procures his supplies. An hon. gentleman pointed out here—I think the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith)—that they have now practically three inspectors in some of the factories. If there is to be a fourth, if the manufacturer is to be unnecessarily worried and compelled to give a considerable portion of his time to these matters of inspection and dealing with the numerous inspectors, he must be more or less interfered

with in his business and in his relations with the man from whom he gets the material he uses. The whole business of the country is going to be bothered; and, as was stated by some hon. gentlemen in the debate on this subject some weeks ago, these new inspectors are not necessary and are expensive and their work must clash with that of the provincial authority. I am bound to say, after listening to all that has been said in support of this legislation by the Minister of Agriculture, that I feel it my duty to enter my protest against the Dominion government interfering at all.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has missed one of the main objects of this Bill. He says that the object is to protect the public health. It is true the Bill will have the effect of protecting the public health in Canada as well as abroad. But the main reason why it is necessary at this time to introduce this Bill and make this new departure is the preservation of our trade abroad in these goods. I will not go over the ground again, but will simply say that I have accumulating evidence that if we do not provide some federal legislation of this kind which will lay at rest suspicions and doubts in regard to all our canned goods going to markets abroad, we may bid good-bye, in the near future, to that outside trade.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. minister allow me to interrupt? Would not provincial legislation reach that as well as federal legislation?

Mr. FISHER. No, for there is no provision in the provincial legislature for marking the goods so that it may be known whether they have been inspected or not. The provincial law provides that they can be inspected, and, if the inspectors do their duty, the goods are inspected. But the consumer abroad has no means of knowing anything about that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is he not justified in supposing that the duty of the inspector has been done?

Mr. FISHER. My information is that the consumer will not consider that a sufficient guarantee to induce him to buy the goods. Therefore, as far as canned meats are concerned, we propose to put a label upon them to show that they have been inspected, so that the consumer may have direct evidence before his eyes that the goods are what they purport to be.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Will the hon. minister allow me a question just there? He says in effect, that the principal object of the Bill is to prevent our trade abroad in these canned products from falling off, and that the lack of inspection by Dominion government officials and labelling the goods with a warranty to that effect will cause the consumer abroad to refrain from buying our products. Now, the people who are interested in that matter are the people who can the goods——

Mr. FISHER. Not alone.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But chiefly. Now, I would ask the minister whether he has ever had any petitions or appeals from the people who make these goods and are shipping them abroad for legislation of this kind?

Mr. FISHER. I would say, in the first place, that these people are not the only people interested, by any means. The producers of what is to be canned are as much interested as are the canners.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Well, have any of these asked for this legislation?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say that any individuals have asked for it. But I think that it is our duty as a parliament, as well as my duty as a minister, to try to foresee any evil that may threaten and prevent it if possible. I have no hesitation in saying that I have information which probably, these people have not, that there is danger to this trade. I have been informed, by agents of the government in England that very considerable agitation is going on in regard to this matter there. I have under my hand at this moment, a letter which reached the department within the last few days, from Mr. Harrison Watson, in London, in which he tells me of a discussion he had with Mr. Collingridge, who had noted the statement in the Montreal 'Gazette' that we had introduced this Bill and who expressed pleasure to know that this had been done. He went on to tell Mr. Harrison Watson of a large number of seizures of canned goods that had taken place within the last few weeks——

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Canadian goods?

Mr. FISHER. Not necessarily—though some of them may have been, and, I believe, were. According to Dr. Collingridge a great deal of analysis work has been carried on. Mr. Harrison Watson says that he understands that a recommendation will be made in the official report which Dr. Collingridge has been authorized to prepare. Dr. Collingridge is the chief medical officer for the city of London—that it shall be compulsory for all canned goods to undergo a process of complete sterilization which, according to the views of scientific men who have been engaged in the examination of the subject, is the only satisfactory method to prevent decomposition. The authorities propose making strong recommendations that all canned goods packed by British firms or imported into the United Kingdom, shall bear the date of packing clearly indicated on each package. This measure, Mr. Harrison Watson says, is sure to awaken a great deal of opposition on the part of the canners and packers, but he thinks that in due course legislation will be adopted enforcing this compulsory dating. As to sterilization,

the method favoured is that the contents of the tins be first heated and then allowed to cool before being sealed. This letter is one of many proofs of the extra care and interest being shown in regard to this trade in canned goods. I feel most strongly that if we do not take the necessary precautionary measures and do as much as other countries are doing, and as much as other canners are doing in the old country and in foreign countries, our goods will be placed at a great disadvantage in the English markets, and that would be a very serious blow to a large industry in this country and to the producers of the articles which are put up in our canning factories. This is one strong reason, though not the only reason, why I consider legislation of this kind necessary. It is all due to a recent unusual, but, as I believe, probably, permanent, strong feeling in regard to these canned goods which has been excited by the revelations made so dramatically in regard to the Chicago packers a short time ago.

Mr. KEMP. When the minister speaks of the Chicago revelations, he has reference to canned meats ?

Mr. FISHER. I think it applied to canned goods, generally.

Mr. KEMP. Could the minister inform us what our exports of canned meats amount to ?

Mr. FISHER. I will be able to tell the hon. gentleman in a few minutes.

Mr. ALCORN. Apart from canned meats and canned fish, I would like to ask the minister if he has any authentic information of canned fruits or vegetables, after exportation abroad, becoming so deteriorated from any cause as to be unfit for human food?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember at the moment that we have any such report. We have had one or two instances of goods that have been condemned, but I do not remember whether they were meats or vegetables.

Mr. ALCORN. I think the minister should find out whether there have been such cases. One of the causes of the spoiling of canned fruits and vegetables has been referred to I think by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall), namely defective tin of which the cans are made. I think at this stage of the trade the cans are mostly made in separate factories, and any inspection to be effective should be of the tin before it is used in the local factory. The canner would be the last man to use cans made of defective sheets of tin, because he knows that within a very short time the contents of that can would spoil. So we find that inspection may run mad. Surely the canners themselves can be trusted not to pay their good money for cans made of inferior tin. Surely the government and the public can trust the trade to look after their own interest, to that extent, at all events. The manufacturers of cans are not at all likely to use defective material when they know perfectly well that even before the goods were shipped out of the factory they would begin to swell and would be unfit to put on the market.

Mr. FISHER. I have not much personal knowledge of this question, but the hon. member for East Elgin has given instances where that difficulty occurred, and has himself suggested that the inspection of tins would be advisable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not think the inspection of cans can be made successfully. You would need to inspect the sheets of tin before they are used to manufacture the cans. We have shipped goods to the old country in first-class condition, and for some reason or other they are condemned there, and we think a lot of that trouble is caused by poor tins. That is particularly the case with apples. We are large packers of Canadian vegetables, and we do not export more than 10 per cent of our output. We are sorry to say that we cannot get the English people to take our pease and corn. We do not pretend to ship tomatoes there, because we can find a market for them at home. We are anxious to ship pease and corn, but the English people are slow to take hold of corn. Apples is the principal article we export to England. We are packers of poultry, but not of meat. But little of our poultry goes there, most of it is consumed in this country. I think if we could get a better tin we would have less trouble with our goods, both in this country and the old country.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot see why the can could not be inspected for the quality of tin used in it. If an inspector understands the quality of tin, he can tell just as well after it is manufactured into a can as when it is in an open sheet, no difficulty about that. The tin is either one coated or two coated, as the case may be; and a man who is sufficiently well posted to become an inspector of cans would be in a position to know at once, when he picked up a can, whether it was manufactured of one coated or two coated tin; he could tell that just as well as if he went into the factory and picked up a sheet of tin before it was manufactured into a can. I think the Bill should be so amended as to allow the inspector to inspect the can after it is manufactured instead of being required to go to the factory and inspect the tin.

Mr. ALCORN. I do not know whether I made my meaning clear. It seems to me that the canner would be the last man to use inferior tin in his cans or to buy inferior cans, because he would know perfectly well that the goods put up in an inferior can, if he succeeded in getting them off his hands, would show deterioration in a short time.

He would not be able to get one year's product off his hands before it would spoil. Surely the canner can be trusted in his own interest to use proper tin in the manufacture of the cans, or to see that the cans are made of proper material. The government might carry the system of inspection to ridiculous lengths. They might just as well inspect the food of the animals that are slaughtered in abattoirs, to see that they are fed nothing deleterious; they might as well inspect the persons or clothing of the men taking care of these animals before taking them to market.

Mr. BLAIN. In proposing that the can should be inspected I had in view the statement of a gentleman who is at the head of the canning industry of this Dominion, at least of the province of Ontario, when he states in the presence of the minister that he knows of his own knowledge that canned goods have been rejected, or have become unfit for the market, because of the quality of the tin used in the can. While I agree with my hon. friend's argument, nevertheless I cannot see why it is important, or that the minister should feel it his duty to pay so much attention to the inspection of the quality of the goods that are to be canned, and sets aside altogether the inspection of the can itself into which these goods are placed. For my part I think it would be useless for the government to attempt to make such a thorough inspection of the quality of the goods that are to be canned and pay no attention whatever to the can in which the goods are placed.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) asked me a few minutes ago if I knew the value of the canned goods exported. The value of meat products was about $1,700,000 last year. If we include the fruits and vegetables, the total export would amount to about $2,000,000. But I wish to remind the committee that this Bill also applies to meats not canned, such as bacon and hams, the export of which amounted last year to about $12,000,000. We think that an inspection which would give confidence in the quality of the meats, would increase the export by perhaps $2,000,000 more. I should say, roughly speaking, that our trade in the goods which would be affected by this Bill would come, upon the exportation of last year, to some $16,000,000 or $17,000,000 with probably a very large increase in the near future.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I would like to ask the hon. minister in what way our canned goods that are not stamped by the government inspectors are going to be put in a better position in the old country markets. How will the people know that these goods were inspected and are wholesome on account of having Dominion government inspection any more than on account of having provincial inspection? I could understand it if the goods were stamped but when they are not stamped I cannot understand how they are going to know.

Mr. FISHER. As far as canned vegetables are concerned simply by knowing that this Act is on the statute-book and that it is being operated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you think it will be of any advantage to have an inspection without any stamping of the cans?

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be a decided advantage to the consuming public to know that there was such an inspection as this Act provides for. I grant that when the individual can comes before the consumer, if it had on it a government stamp, it would be a very great additional advantage and were it feasible I would be very glad to stamp other canned goods than meats but in considering the question and in discussing it with those who have what I may call expert knowledge of the trade it seems to be impossible to do that in connection with the very large number of small establishments where fruit, vegetables and fish are put up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The subject is one of very great difficulty and I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said by gentlemen who are familiar with the conditions. As far as I understand the hon. minister's argument, it, for the most part, has proceeded upon this basis that even if we might be absolutely assured that every can put up in Canada was put up in the most highly approved manner, nevertheless, there is a necessity, by reason of the interest which has been aroused by the investigation in the United States, that in the markets where our goods are consumed there should be the assurance to the consumer that there has been a government inspection. That is to say, that unless we put ourselves on the same level as other countries with regard to government inspection of goods of this character designed for export we are likely to have a very material falling off in our trade. I can appreciate that, although I can still see a very great many difficulties in the practical working out of what the minister suggests, but I confess that I cannot see very much advantage to our export trade by merely placing upon our statute-book a provision requiring the inspection of goods unless there is some intimation to the consumer upon the can itself that the inspection has taken place in regard to that particular can which he has purchased and unless upon that can he sees stamped a certificate on behalf of the government of this country that there has been that inspection. I do not think that without that it can be of very much advantage to us in the trade although, of course, the minister has considered the question and apparently has arrived at a different conclusion. In respect to the export trade to which the minister alludes of what is it principally composed? What percentage, for example, of that export with which this measure is designed to deal is canned meats, what proportion vegetables,

what proportion fruits? Can the hon. minister give us some idea of that? Perhaps it would assist us a little in regard to the lines upon which we should proceed.

Mr. FISHER. I said a few moments ago, in reply to my hon. friend from Toronto, that last year our exportation of meats was $1,300,000. Fruits and vegetables came to $700,000. I have not the exact figures. It would probably be about $2,000,000 altogether of canned goods. Then, the Bill applies to bacon and ham products which go to the British market, and also to our other dead meat trade which amounted last year to about $16,000,000. It also applies to fish, the export of which amounts to $5,000,000 or $6,000,000. The whole thing would amount to considerably over $20,000,000.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I understand that the bacons and hams which are exported are not marked by the government.

Mr. FISHER. Under this Bill they will be.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Each ham and each piece of bacon will have a government stamp on it.

Mr. FISHER. It will be marked.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But not the fish?

Mr. FISHER. I explained, I think, before several times that the Bill provides that fish comes in the same category with vegetables and fruit in that respect. There was a question as to whether it should be classed with meats instead of with fruit and vegetables. In framing the Bill I did not see my way clear to do that because of the very large number of establishments in which fish is put up which would make it very difficult, if not quite impossible, to carry out the provisions which we apply to meats. Therefore, the Bill as it is framed and printed here places fish in the same category as fruits and vegetables.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Has there been any complaint in regard to Canadian bacon and ham? I have always understood that the character of the meats we are shipping abroad is the highest in the world and that these products bring the highest prices. I would like to know if there has been any complaint to the contrary that requires the country to go to the enormous expense of having an inspector at every place where bacon and ham are produced and having each one stamped with a government stamp.

Mr. FISHER. It is a matter that I do not like to make very much of; but recently, within a couple of months, there was some Canadian bacon condemned in London and it has occasioned a very considerable feeling there, which this Bill would largely meet and obviate, but which undoubtedly will spread if some such legislation as this is not passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Was it condemned for reasons that might have been prevented by inspection on this side?

Mr. FISHER. Undoubtedly.

Section 2 allowed to stand.

On section 3,

The minister may order the inspection of all animals intended for slaughter in any establishment.

2. No animal shall be allowed to enter the parts of an establishment where slaughtering is carried on, unless it has undergone such inspection and been found to be healthy and fit for food.

3. Every animal affected, or suspected of being affected, with contagious or other disease, shall be slaughtered under the supervision of the inspector and be disposed of as provided by the regulations.

Mr. FISHER. This is intended to cover the inspection of the animals before slaughter and practically before entering the slaughtering part of the establishment. They would no doubt be in the yards of the establishment but not in the buildings of the establishment. Cases of evident disease would here be weeded out. The intention is to make the regulations so that such animals will be destroyed under the direct supervision of the inspector, and, if found diseased, as they probably would be, they would be disposed of in some way that would prevent their being used as food.

Mr. STOCKTON. Under this section I take it the minister would take authority, if the intention were apparent that the animals were to be slaughtered. Even if they were in a pasture away from the establishment, he would send an inspector to inspect them.

Mr. FISHER. If the animals were intended to be slaughtered in the establishment, yes. If a drover had a herd of fifty or one hundred animals in an adjoining pasture, the inspector-general could order an inspector to inspect them.

Mr. STOCKTON. The moment it appears they are intended for slaughter, then the law applies?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Section 4 allowed to stand.

On section 5—slaughtering by farmers and retail butchers——

Mr. FISHER. This clause is to provide for what we may call local sales which does not come under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. This clause seems to me to conflict with the general scope of the Act, which is to control the export trade and the trade between provinces. Under this section the minister takes power to direct an inspection of the premises of any farmer or local butcher. I call the minister's attention to the fact, which has already been re-

ferred to, that there is a great deal of indefinite power left by this Act in the control of the Governor in Council and the minister. This is a class of legislation which I think is undesirable. If this is done by an affirmative provision giving the minister actual powers, it will probably conflict with the British North America Act. It is a matter of purely domestic concern. This is an exception, but it is an exception subject to qualification. It is an exception unless the minister decides otherwise, and we give him power to decide otherwise and to bring into force a range of provisions which extend to every domestic concern in every province of the Dominion. We enable him to invade the premises of any farmer or to send his inspectors into any retail butcher shop in any part of the Dominion to inspect meat without reference to whether it is for export or not. I submit that it is undesirable to give the minister power of this indefinite character.

Mr. FISHER. That clause was framed with the idea of meeting cases that we did not think could be met in any other way. I have no desire that the minister should have responsibilities thrust upon him which are not necessary to the convenient working out of the Act. This clause was drawn in consequence of our knowledge of certain cases. I will give an instance. In Hull, the Matthews Packing Company have a packing house where they slaughter for local purposes as well as for export. Sometimes they buy from the farmers around carcases which have not been slaughtered there at all. We do not know at first sight whether these carcases are used for the export trade or the local trade. This clause would enable the minister to bring such cases under the operation of the Act. If that could be done by any other means I would be glad, because I do not wish to assume any responsibility that is not necessary to the working of the Act.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Derbyshire.

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—Mr. L. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Dominion Central Railway Company.—Mr. Hall.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Arthabaska Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dugas.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Central Counties Railway.—Mr. J. T. Schell.

WAYS AND MEANS—DISTRIBUTION OF BILL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into a committee to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I wish to ask a question with reference to the Bill introduced by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) about a month ago entitled:

An Act to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lock-outs in Coal Mines, and industries connected with public utilities.

That Bill so far as I know has not been printed; it stands for second reading on the Orders of the Day. I tried to get a copy of the Bill to look at it, but could not, and I notice that the provisions of the Bill are stated in the public press. I think it is very unfair to the members of this House that we have to go to the public press to get the provisions of a public Bill of that nature when we cannot get it on the table of the House. I think that the members of the House should have Bills of that kind certainly before others, even those connected with the press, and I feel that it is not treating the members of the House fairly, nor treating the country fairly, that a Bill of so great importance should be delayed.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret the absence of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) so I can only promise to call his attention to the matter. I quite agree that the printing of Bills should be expedited. The clerk informs me there was some little delay in the correction of the proof, but that the Bill will be ready for distribution probably to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that that does not quite meet the case. It is not a simple question of expediting the printing of the Bill but it is the other portion of the complaint that seems to me from what my

hon. friend has said to be the most reprehensible. Here is a Bill introduced by a minister which was not supposed, when he introduced it, to be in blank. That was done in the case of another Bill not long ago. When a minister introduced a Bill it ought really to be one and not merely a blank sheet of paper. Here we have a measure introduced in blank, yet the proposed provisions of which were explicitly stated in the press. Yet although the press have had the Bill, members of parliament cannot get it. It is not to-day printed. I am not sure whether the clerk of the House has a copy or not or whether there is within the four walls of this House a Bill which was reported as presented to this House some time ago. Surely hon. members should be treated with as much courtesy as members of the press. Their position is just as good, and it is difficult to understand why a Bill should be introduced in this House in blank by a minister and then have its provisions spread broadcast throughout the press while members of the House cannot get the Bill itself and it does not appear in our records.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend any explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The only information which the press received was that given by the minister a few evenings ago during the debate on the resolution proposed by the leader of the opposition. In the course of his remarks on the labour question, he found it necessary to refer, in some considerable detail, to the Bill which he proposed submitting to the House dealing with that same question. That was, as far as I am aware, the only information received with regard to the measure.

Mr. STOCKTON. My hon. friend is entirely wrong because the information I got from the press is from the press of yesterday and to-day. I cannot get even a copy of the Bill from the clerk. It is not here.

Mr. BERGERON. I am under a different impression from that of the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). I think the Bill is printed, because when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Fisher) was explaining the measure he had the Bill in his hand and read from it. I asked if it was distributed, and he said it would be in a day or two. It therefore must be printed, and the fact that it is not yet distributed makes the matter still worse.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that at that time the minister was reading from a proof sheet in his hand. Some corrections were made and the Bill was not printed in the ordinary sense. All he had was a proof sheet.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Cape Breton came to the rescue but evidently without any knowledge of the facts. What was printed in the newspapers appeared long before the explanations of the minister in the debate on the resolution of the leader of the opposition. The press seem to have had the provisions of the Bill in a very extended form. Therefore we have a right to an explanation but the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says he is not responsible.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that. What I say is that I have not the information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The same information which the press received some considerable time ago was within the reach of every member of the House. The press got their information from the report of the deputy Minister of Railways.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

15. Beeswax—British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the American duty ?

Mr. PATERSON. Five cents, I think.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. What would be the objection to making the duty as high as the American duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. The American tariff is generally very high we do not want to adopt it.

Mr. LENNOX. Why make this 17½ per cent in the intermediate tariff, when in the next two items, cheese and butter, you make the intermediate tariff the same as the general tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are not likely to import eggs either under the British or the intermediate tariff.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If you make the intermediate tariff apply to the United States, the hens there begin to lay much earlier when the market is on here, and the Kansas eggs can flood out Canadian eggs at this time of the year.

Mr. FIELDING. I have more faith in the Canadian hen.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. She does not start business at this time of the year.

Mr. PATERSON. She does business all the year round.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. To give the Canadian hen a fair show against the Kansas hen, you will have to make this higher.

Mr. LENNOX. In the case of items 17 and 18, cheese and butter, the intermediate is made the same as the general tariff. Is

there any principle upon which the change in the case of eggs is made ?

Mr. PATERSON. Cheese would come from Europe, but eggs would not.

Mr. LENNOX. Cheese as rule does not come from Europe.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has never come within a quarter of a mile of the Limburger.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, it would not apply to butter.

Mr. FIELDING. The greatest butter producing country in the world, and our greatest competitor, is Denmark.

Mr. LENNOX. But we do not bring in butter from Denmark.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not ?

Mr. LENNOX. We are exporters of butter. However, if that is the only reason the government have, I am satisfied to hear it :

17. Cheese — British preferential tariff, 2 cents; intermediate tariff, 3 cents; general tariff, 3 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, really, is there any good reason why we should permit American cheese to come into our market at three cents per pound ? No doubt the Americans have many rejections in their dairy cheese that cannot be exported to the old country. It would pay the Americans to send that cheese into Canada and slaughter it, and a duty of 3 cents a pound would not prevent this. I do not know the views of the dairymen on this subject, and I do not see the ex-president of the Eastern Dairymens' Association, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) in his place. If he were here, he could enlighten us on this subject. But there are others here whose views should be heard. In the case of this item I would favour an increase. We do not want American rejections on our market ; we shall have trouble enough to consume our own. I would urge the minister to make the duty either 4 cents or 5 cents. The duty charged by the Americans on cheese going into that country is 6 cents. I see no reason why we should be 50 per cent below them. We are not afraid of their best quality, because, I think our cheese is equal to their best. The danger is from the invasion by their seconds and rejections.

Mr. FIELDING. If the making of our duty equal to that of the American is a good argument in the case of cheese, it is a good argument in the case of other things, which would lead us to a discussion of the question put by the hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. W. Wright), why we do not put on the same duty as the United States does ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not say that it should apply to everything. Cheese is a special case.

Mr. FIELDING. I think everybody interested in a given article would say that article was a special case ; so we could hardly escape the general argument in that way. Narrowing the discussion to the subject of cheese, I think that the high quantity of the Canadian product is our protection. Last year, the cheese imports into Canada from the United States amounted to $28,000. Probably some of this was passing through for re-exportation—

Mr. HENDERSON. Trade and navigation returns would show.

Mr. FIELDING. But, without going into that, let us assume that all of this was consumed in Canada. Think what a terrible invasion of our market that is—$28,000 worth brought in, against $24,000,000 that we exported. Surely, the hon. gentleman must see that our cheese industry commands the position in the Canadian market.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) is getting away from his own argument. He told us, when he was upholding the British preference, that the reduction of the duty on British goods fixes the price no matter from what country the goods come—for instance the American must meet the price of the British producer, even though the British producer has an advantage in our market. Surely, the same argument applies to cheese. If a grocer in Canada brings in some inferior American cheese, it will have the effect of reducing the price of Canadian cheese in our own market.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not discussing the question of price but of quantity. I do not think that anybody would say that the importation of $28,000 worth of cheese into Canada would control the price of $24,000,000 worth that we export. Sometimes we meet a manufacturing interest which asks special consideration, but when we find that it commands the position and pretty well supplies the market we do not feel that its situation is a bad one. This is a case of that kind. I think that the cheese producers of Canada realize this. I will not say that no representations were made in favour of an increase, though I have no recollection of any. But I think that the cheese industry is one of the most prosperous we have and does not need further consideration than the liberality of this government has already given it.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. It has been held by the Minister of Finance and his friends, that to put a high duty on manufactured goods might enhance the price to consumers in this country. But that does not apply to the products of the farm. I know of no reason why we should not put as high a

duty on American farm products as the United States put on ours. While American cheese may not be imported to any great extent into Canada, still it is inevitable that certain farm products should find their way into our market in large quantities, interfering with the prices that our farmers are receiving. Even if the duties on these were made prohibitive, it will not be contended by the minister that the farmers are likely to combine to put up prices on consumers.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not able to speak with certainty, not having before me the figures showing imports by provinces or ports—a return of that kind has been moved for and will take time to prepare—but I should not be surprised to find that the greater part of this small quantity of cheese imported was brought in at some place where, by reason of freight or some other conditions, it was cheaper to import from the United States than to bring the goods in from Canadian factories. If that be the case, would it be well to make those who are thus under obligation to import their cheese pay a higher duty than 3 cents per pound, especially when it is obvious that the higher duty could not affect favourably our great cheese industry with its enormous exports ?

Mr. BLAIN. Can the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) state, in a general way, what changes have been made in the tariff on agricultural products compared with the tariff in 1896 or with the tariff as changed by the hon. gentleman himself in 1897 ?

Mr. FIELDING. As a rule, there have been no changes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the minister to say that this government adopted the policy of their predecessors.

Mr. FIELDING. We need not debate that again. We have fought that out before the constituencies and we won.

Mr. HENDERSON. So far as that is concerned, you won on your good policy.

Mr. FIELDING. We have won twice since that.

Mr. BLAIN. I can well believe that the minister does not wish to debate that point much further.

The only question from my standpoint was with reference to what my hon. friend in his closing remarks said, namely, that they were quite satisfied with what they had done for the farmers. What I want to bring out is the fact that the minister has done very little for the farmer except to import the old tariff that was put on the statute-book by the Liberal-Conservative party into his well known tariff of 1897. When my hon. friend states that in the principal articles of farm products there had been no changes made, surely he will not say that the farmers are quite satisfied with what this government has done for them. Speaking for myself, I wish to say that I am in favour of a more uniform tariff between the United States and Canada. I do not suggest that my hon. friend's government, with all their influence can induce the United States to change their tariff ; but I do say that in face of the general development of Canada, when we are prepared to ship goods from one section of the country to another, from a section where the crop is good to a section where the crop is poor, the United States should not be permitted to send any of their farm products into Canada ; particularly when we have so much land, and so fine a lot of farmers who are producing this class of articles. The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) speaking a little while ago promised that if we would only wait a little longer until the tariff was changed by this government, the market gardeners would be taken care of, my hon. friend shakes his head. I do not wonder at it, because they have not taken care of the market gardeners according to the promise made by the hon. gentleman to his electors.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have taken a great deal better care of them than you did.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I appeal to the Minister of Finance who states in the House that these articles are left nearly the same as they were when he and the member for Centre York were condemning the Liberal-Conservative government, that is the point.

Mr. FIELDING. No that was not the question.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Customs says, not in every particular. Take the three items of butter, cheese and eggs—the hon. gentleman will not venture to say that they are very nearly the same as in 1897 when the Minister of Customs was going up and down the country telling the farmers, vote for our party and we will abolish these customs.

Mr. BENNETT. He did not mean it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend shakes his head at that. Well, the public understood that the party of my hon. friends when, they were in opposition, was a party in favour of the abolition of all duties except those for revenue purposes. I have never heard the hon. Minister of Finance, in his splendid style of debating these things, explain to us where the difference was between what is called a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. That is the point at issue. For myself I wish to say, without entering into a discussion of all these items, that in my opinion, now, when there is a general revision of the tariff, and these items are being taken up one by one, there is a golden opportunity for this government to do something for the interest of the farmers. I am free to admit that the farmers, as the hon.

member for North Wellington stated, in a general way are not in favour of increased protection on manufactured articles. But I have never heard any man in this House say what my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) said last night, that he was prepared to vote for the abolition of these duties, that in his opinion they were of no advantage to the farmers of Canada. For myself, I am in favour of increased duties upon farm products. I think so far as possible that the duties exacted in the United States upon our farm products should be adopted by this government and put upon the farm products of the United States coming into Canada. We must keep in mind this fact, that while we may turn over the Trade and Navigation Returns and not find much in them to object to, still a time will come when our tariff will not so well protect us as it does at the present moment. It is not fair for the hon. gentleman to say that they are doing something for the farmers when the fact is that, with the exception of doing a little here and there for the farmer's vote, and then a little for the manufacturer's vote, they have made scarcely any changes. In the main, my hon. friends opposite have imported into their tariff that which they condemned when they were sitting on this side of the House. However, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of a question that has been so well threshed out. My chief point is to say to the Minister of Finance that I think he should listen to the voice of the farmers now, and give them a fair measure of protection, a protection upon all these articles which they are producing upon the farm, so that the Canadian farmers may have the advantage at least of their own Canadian market, and not be interfered with in some points, as they are now, by the importation of large quantities of goods from the United States and other countries.

Mr. PATERSON. According to my recollection, before the national policy was introduced that the hon. gentleman says we are following, there was a duty upon cheese, butter and eggs in the old Cartwright tariff.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend will not say that the duties that were imposed at that time were the same as the duties that were imposed by the Liberal-Conservative government.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not said that, but I said my impression was that those articles were dutiable and the government that succeeded the Mackenzie government continued those duties; and the hon. gentleman states, and we are not contradicting him, that we have somewhat increased them. There is no difficulty in stating the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. The present tariff is a revenue tariff.

Mr. HENDERSON. If this is a tariff for revenue, why do you put a duty on cheese?

Mr. PATERSON. I say that is a revenue tariff because it provided $45,000,000 of revenue last year, while the protective tariff provided a revenue of $17,000,000. There is the difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) anticipated what I intended saying when I heard the Finance Minister say that cheese producers ought to be satisfied with what this government had done for them. I was going to ask him what they had done in that matter. In respect to cheese they simply adopted the national policy tariff. But my hon. friend from Simcoe drew the attention of the minister to the fact that the preferential tariff was 2 cents, the intermediate tariff 3, and the general tariff 3. Now I would move to change the figure in the general tariff from 3 cents to 4 cents on cheese.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course my hon. friend wants that to go on record, and it will; but he knows as well as I do that we can do nothing of the sort. May I be permitted to say a word in answer to the question. What have we done for the farmer? I think my hon. friend's contention is that we have left the farmer all the protection that he had under the national policy. If in some respects we have increased that protection, while at the same time we have largely reduced the duties on manufactured articles that he consumes, I think we have done a great deal for the farmer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Largely reduced! I venture to say that the average tariff is higher than we have had it for a long time. The average duty on goods dutiable and free, the average of taxation to-day is one cent—fully one cent—higher than the highest point it has reached within the last twelve or fifteen years.

Mr. PATERSON. You have that all wrong.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not it all wrong.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes you have.

Mr. HENDERSON. I challenge the hon. minister to show that it is wrong.

Mr. PATERSON. It is all wrong.

Mr. HENDERSON. I challenge him to give his figures.

Mr. PATERSON. The trade and navigation returns figure it all out for you.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have them here, but I have sat in this House long enough to know that we should not take the trade and navigation tables as evidence of the statement that taxation has been reduced. The hon. gentleman well knows that there is a large amount of taxation which is not included in the trade and navigation returns, and that if he includes the entire taxation he will find that the rate to-day

is very much higher that it has been at any time in the last twelve or thirteen years.

Mr. PATERSON. You have it all wrong.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, but I have got the figures right before me. I am not going to admit that I am all wrong when I know that I am not wrong. The hon. gentleman boasts about the large amount of revenue that he is receiving. How does he get that large amount of revenue? It is largely because of the increase in values. That is one great source of revenue. I will undertake to say that the general increase in the value of goods since hon. gentlemen came into power has been fully ten per cent, perhaps fifteen per cent, and possibly twenty per cent in many things. That is one reason why this tariff is such a large revenue producing tariff. If we had retained the old specific duties then the hon. gentleman's revenue would not have increased so rapidly, because it would have been a fixed thing, but it is large because the value of the goods has increased. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a fair comparison, and he has challenged the correctness of my figures, he must deduct from the imports as given in the trade and navigation returns the percentage that would be equivalent to the increase in the value of goods. I submit that the increase is anywhere from 10 to 20 per cent. Any merchant or business man will tell you that that is the fact. Every time a request is made to add something to the salary of an officer of this government the plea is made that the cost of living has increased—yes 40 and 50 per cent. Now, I will give the hon. gentleman the figures and I will place myself right before the committee, because I do not intend to submit to being told that I am wrong in regard to a matter that I am familiar with :

Total imports, dutiable and free, 1906.		$294,286,015
Less corn re-exported..		2,611,807
		291,674,205
Increase in prices, 10 per cent... ..		29,167,420
		262,506,788
Total duty paid..		46,671,101
Bounties paid..		2,400,771
		49,071,872
Increased duty on tobacco..		1,500,000
		50,511,872

The total imports dutiable and free in 1906 were $294,286,015. The total of the imports was increased by the large amount of corn that came into the country, and was entered for home consumption, but that never entered into home consumption, but was re-exported to England and Germany, passing right through the country. That amounted to $2,611,807. That ought to be excluded in a comparison with the rate of duties under the old government, as an article like that was always treated as being in transit, simply passing through the country. I believe that the hon. Minister of Finance some two or three years ago admitted that this item of corn should not be taken into consideration. I think the hon. minister will remember that he made that admission before the House. That would reduce the total amount of goods imported to $291,674,205. Now, I say that if we are going to make a fair comparison with ten years ago we ought to take off at least 10 per cent in order to reach the same level of prices that we had ten or twelve years ago. Twenty per cent would be nearer the mark, perhaps, but I am satisfied to take 10 per cent off. That amounts to $29,167,420, reducing the total imports, dutiable and free, to $262,506,788. Now, what duties were paid? The total customs duty paid amounted to $46,671,101. The Finance Minister collected that amount of money from the people under the customs law. But there were other sources of taxation beside that. We have heard a good deal about bounties on iron and steel, and they are just as much taxation as if they were customs duties, and the peoole to-day are crying to have that taxation removed. They have found it burdensome. That amounted to $2,400,771 last year. There are two items of taxation—the customs duty and the bounties that were paid.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman add that to the taxation collected?

Mr. HENDERSON. Most assuredly for the purpose of ascertaining the amount of taxation.

Mr. FIELDING. But it was out of the taxation collected from the people that we paid that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, I admit it, but it is charged to the people and it becomes taxation.

Mr. FIELDING. It does not affect taxation.

Mr. HENDERSON. The farmers of this country have to put their hands in their pockets to pay that money.

Mr. FIELDING. When they put their hands in their pockets they find the money there, too.

Mr. HENDERSON. And they put their hands in their pockets to pay the customs duties also.

Mr. FIELDING. And they have the money there.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and I am delighted they have. That is an admission that they pay it. When the hon. gentleman came into power they attacked another item and added about $1,500,000 to the duty on tobacco and collected it in

a way that the previous government had never done. We must take into consideration $1,500,000, which although collected as excise is just as much a tax on the people as if it were collected as a customs duty. Raw leaf tobacco comes into this country free and when ex-warehoused it is charged an excise duty which amounts to $1,500,000. I have not the exact figures for last year, but I know I am not very far astray. That would make a total of taxation of $50.511,872. Let us take the ordinary plan of finding out what the fair rate of taxation is; that is, divide the taxation by the amount of imports dutiable and free and the result is 19·26 per cent. I believe that the hon. gentleman's returns will show that within twelve years at any rate there has not been a rate higher than about 18·28 per cent. Eighteen decimal twenty-eight per cent was the figure in 1896, the highest point it reached under the Conservative regime in several years. For some special reason it reached that point in 1896.

Mr. PATERSON. Last year it was 15·73 per cent.

Mr. HENDERSON. 15·73 per cent according to the table specially prepared by the hon. gentleman, leaving out the two items that I have referred to. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman could go to work, if his conscience would allow him, and work it down to about 12 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I could not.

Mr. FIELDING. It would not be true.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not what is in the trade and navigation returns. What we want to get at are the facts. Let us be fair to the House and the country. Do not tell the country that all the taxation they are paying is a simple matter of 15·73 per cent when as a matter of fact it is 19·26 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, I say let us be fair to the country. This is a strong government—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, this is a strong government; we are not doubting that at all and they can do anything they please, but the people of this country are investigating these matters, they are looking into these things and they know that the rate of taxation which they are paying is higher than it has been indicated in the hon. gentleman's trade and navigation returns. Now, I think I have been perfectly fair. I have included in taxation nothing but what the people actually pay—the customs duties, the bounties, which are only another form of protection, the increased excise duty on tobacco, which is taxation, no matter what you call it.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the amount my hon. friend gave for tobacco ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I stated that I was not positive, but that last year it was in the neighbourhood of a million and a half.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend comes to the conclusion that there should be $1,500,000 added.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under the legislation of 1897.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the legislation of 1897 there was 10 per cent duty added, and there was imported last year only $2,269,000 worth of tobacco, according to the trade and navigation returns.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not speaking about what is in the trade and navigation returns. The figures I am giving are not in the trade and navigation returns at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the trade and navigation returns we find not only the quantity of goods imported which pay duty, but the quantity imported on which no duty is paid. All the tobacco imported from foreign countries is included in the trade and navigation returns, and the total quantity imported last year was $2,269,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I say that for years past the increased duty on tobacco by reason of the legislation of 1897 has been on the average $1,500,000, and the hon. gentleman, when he refers to the Department of Inland Revenue, will find that my figures are not very much astray.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the quantity, the number of pounds imported ?

Mr. FIELDING. The main point is this. We put a duty of 10 cents a pound on raw leaf tobacco; other duties were adjusted. I would like my hon. friend to say whether he is opposing that.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am neither opposing nor supporting it.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the real question. If it is wrong, we should be condemned.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not the question at issue at all. If it will please the hon. minister I will tell him that I have no objection to that, though I smoke as much tobacco as the average man. It is a good article to get revenue from; but what I do say is that $1,500,000 is about the exact amount added last year and for several years past by the legislation of 1897.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is all right, why does my hon. friend complain ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not complaining. I am simply making a statement of what the taxation of the country was in 1906. I am neither approving nor disapproving of it. I am taking the total taxation, $50,571,872, and dividing it by

the total importations, dutiable and free, allowing 10 per cent for increase in value in order to make a fair comparison with ten years ago, and I say that the rate of taxation is now 19.26 instead of 18.28, as it was then; and when the hon. gentleman tells the people that the present government is reducing taxation, I want to tell him that he is mistaken, that the actual taxation of the country has been increased instead of reduced. An hon. gentleman last night accused us of asking for increased protection. I make no such request—God forbid that I should. Taxation is high enough now. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have gone too far in many things.

Mr. FIELDING. In what?

Mr. HENDERSON. Take Scotch tweed, if the hon. gentleman likes. I venture to say that on that article they have increased the duty beyond what it was in 1896. A piece of Scotch tweed which cost $1 a yard ten years ago, costs about $1.20 to-day. On that the duty of 32½ per cent ten years ago would amount to 32½ per cent, whereas to-day the duty of 30 per cent on $1.20 would amount to 36 cents; so that on that article the taxation is increased 3½ cents a yard.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me? His argument is based on the idea that goods having gone up in value, 30 per cent now would be a heavier tax than 32½ per cent was before. Has he forgotten that one of the fundamental principles of the old tariff was that it had specific duties which held the revenue steady even when goods went down in value; so that with the specific duties they would collect as much on goods at $1 as would be collected on goods at 25 per cent higer value? Has he forgotten that?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I have not. I have that in mind, and I only wish the hon. gentleman would remember it as well as I do. The time may come when hon. gentlemen will find that values will decrease and with their heavy expenditure they might find themselves very much short of revenue. I believe the principle of the specific duty was a fairer principle than the principle of the ad valorem duty. At any rate if I had to choose I would be perfectly satisfied to take a partly specific and partly ad valorem duty; I think that is the safest tariff you can adopt.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be a higher rate.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not necessarily so; when goods were lower it would be higher in proportion but when goods were high the amount that you would collect from the people would not be so excessive. It is excessive at the present time by reason of the abnormal advance in values, an undue amount of taxation is being taken out of the pockets of the people simply to get money, and I think the government are getting too much and that practically we are paying a higher rate of taxation now than we paid at any time during the last ten years. Is it any wonder that the revenue is $46,000,000? Not at all, under existing circumstances. Increased values give increased revenue from customs duties. The Minister of Customs knows this as well as I do and yet he throws out the insinuation, perhaps not the Minister of Customs, I think he has too much good sense, but other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House last night, charged us with demanding a higher protection. Well we were asking for a higher protection on agricultural products. The question of general protection was not under consideration, that was to be left for future consideration although we are now discussing it, perhaps slightly out of order. I wish to give the answer to that; whilst hon. gentlemen were charging us with advocating higher protection because they thought they were making a point against us, I turn the point against the hon. gentlemen and tell them they are the men who are supporting the high protection, supporting the high duty, because they are going to vote for every one of the items in these schedules. Let them reflect and perhaps the government will have a little trouble after I have exploded this bombshell. I do not wish to do the government any harm but at the same time I think they should call a halt. I am willing to add something to the duty on agricultural products and give the farmers all the market we have for them to sell their products in, but I am not going to stand here and advocate a higher protective tariff than we have had for the last eight or ten years. I do not owe these men anything, I have done all I had a right to do, and I do not propose to do anything more; they have a higher protective tariff now than before.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) and I have occasionally been over the question of the rate of taxation and I shall not follow him now through his argument but I want to again thank him for the very valuable help he has given me; sometimes he gives that help willingly but perhaps sometimes he is building better than he knows. He has said: God forbid that he should be charged with advocating any higher duties—except of course on agricultural products. He testified last night that already the farming classes are the highest protected in Canada so we have him on record on that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thanks to the Conservative party.

Mr. FIELDING. No, but he is now under this tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the same as before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FIELDING. Under this tariff the highest protected class in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. So they were under the Conservative government.

Mr. FIELDING. No, this is not exactly the same as the Conservative tariff. If this government give the farmers all the protection they had under the national policy and a little more and reduce the duties on a great many articles that the farmer uses in the way of manufactures, then according to their own admission the farmer is faring very well.

But that is not the most serious point; my hon. friend has helped me in another way. I have had a series of deputations as always occurs when the tariff is revised; gentlemen interested come to me and I will be frank when I say that one of the lines of industry that has most strongly represented the need of higher protection is that which produces the very article which my hon. friend selected for illustration, tweeds.

Mr. HENDERSON. Like cream separators, that was incidental. I would give the hon. minister any number, I can take another.

Mr. FIELDING. This one serves a good purpose, my hon. friend could not have given a better illustration to suit me. He is helping me magnificently to meet the complaint of the woollen people. I have had serious and anxious moments with these gentlemen of the woollen industry. They are enterprising men, honourable men, many of them have been very successful in their work, but they complain that the duty we have levied on tweeds and woollen goods is not enough to enable them to prosper. They have asked for adequate protection. My hon. friend, a member of the Conservative party, the party of adequate protection, flings them over to-night and says, that they have got too much protection already.

'I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.'

But that is not all. My hon. friend has been most unhappy in his selection of tweeds. Why, he says in the days of the Conservative party under the national policy the duty on tweeds was 32½ per cent and now it is somewhat higher. It is not, it is 30 per cent to-day on tweeds from Great Britain, the Scotch tweed which he particularly emphasizes and says was 32 per cent under the national policy. Assuming that is correct—I do not admit it—then the duty to-day is 30 per cent. How does he make out then according to his own contention that we have increased the duty? When he says it was 32½ per cent under the national policy, my hon. friend is mistaken. My hon. friend will find if he looks back to the national policy tariff that the duty was a mixed duty, part specific, and part ad valorem and that the consequence was that the duties on the common articles of wool clothing such as the farmer and the fishermen and the mechanic of Canada use, were not 32½ per cent but ran all the way from 30 to 40 or 50 or 60 per cent, aye, and more than 60 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do not cheer too soon.

Mr. FIELDING. And my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) comes forth to-night and says that the duty in the days of the national policy was only 32½ per cent and that we have increased it. My hon. friend is mistaken. The duty was not 32½ per cent, it was a mixed duty, running up as high as 60 per cent. Does my hon. friend want a copy of the tariff of 1894? I can send it to him if he does.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish you would give me a copy.

Mr. FIELDING. They are a little scarce now, they are like some documents which my hon. friend produces, they are getting scarce. The rate was 25 per cent, with a specific duty of 5 cents per pound. Now I remember distinctly in the consideration of the tariff of that day that I had exhibits—I remember I was called a carpet bagger, I remember having these exhibits in a carpet bag in a little campaign work we all had to do, and I remember complaining that the duties on wools were high, and I was able to take the samples of the goods, taken from the shelves of the merchants who imported them with the prices paid and the duty levied, and I could give an assurance that they ran 40, 50 and 60 per cent, so when my hon. friend says to-day that the duty on woollen goods, and he particularly mentioned tweeds, was only 32½ per cent under the national policy and that we have increased it, I can assure my hon. friend he is mistaken; it was not so.

Mr. BLAIN. The item under discussion is a farmer's item and I wish to attract the attention of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to an important fact that is within his memory. A deputation of farmers in 1901, and again in 1902 waited upon the minister and presented their case specifically to the government, asking for some remedy or some increased protection. My hon. friend was very careful in these years when he was introducing his budget to say in effect that at some future time when there was a general revision of the tariff the farmers would be taken care of. I

wish now to state to the House the specific request that was made by the farmers and market gardeners from the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. These requests were endorsed by resolutions passed by the Farmers' Association of Ontario and Quebec at that time.

I would ask my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) how far, in this new revision of the tariff, he has met the wishes of the farmers who presented their case so admirably at that time? They asked that the duty be placed :

On asparagus at 3 cents a pound.
On cabbages at 3 cents each.
On cauliflowers at 3 cents each.
On celery 25 cents a dozen.
On beans 45 cents a bushel.
On green cucumbers 20 cents a dozen.
On onions 40 cents a bushel.
On tomatoes 5 cents a pound.
On water melons 5 cents each.
On musk melons 3 cents each.
Spinach 25 cents per bushel.

I shall not go further with the list, but merely point out that this was a specific request made by the farmers at that time, and that the government gave a general promise that in the revision of the tariff the farmers would be taken care of. Would the hon. the minister say how far he has met in this revision that request of the farmers? There is another point. Our hon. friends opposite are very anxious to state what they are doing for the farmers. Well, flax seed was free under the old tariff that we heard so much about, and I notice in the new tariff that flax seed imported into Canada is still free. Turn up the Trade and Navigation return and you will find that $1,647,194 worth of flax seed was imported last year, out of which $1,646,178 worth or practically the total amount came from the United States. Surely here was an opportunity for the government to do something for our farmers. There is plenty land in some parts of Canada particularly adapted for the production of flax seed. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) says that in his district all the land is very suitable for the production of flax. Surely here was an opportunity for the government to do something for the farmers especially considering the enormous quantity imported into Canada within the last twelve months. If the hon. minister would put a duty on flax seed, he would give a great impetus to the cultivation of that article in this country where we have so much land suitable for it. When our farmers want to send flax seed to the United States, they are confronted with a tariff of 25 cents per bushel. Does the hon. minister think that is fair play to our farmers? He generally boasts of what this government has been doing for the farmers by raising on the one hand the tariff a little on their products and on the other hand cutting down the duties on the articles they use. Such for instance as the reducing of the duty on agricultural implements from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent, and in another part of the tariff giving special legislation in the interests of their manufacturers of agricultural implements. On the one hand, they make a bid to the farmers of western Canada and on the other they satisfy the manufacturers. It is the old story of the government playing to the farmers on the one hand and the manufacturers on the other. How long they will be able to do this, time alone will tell, but so far they have been pretty successful.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend and several others who spoke to-night have made allusion to the alleged boasts on this side of what we are doing for the farmers. I must confess that I have not heard these boasts. What must worry my hon. friends is this, that they have discovered that we have been doing a good many things for the farmers and the farmers appreciate them, and these hon. gentlemen seem to feel it necessary for them to explain to the farmers that nothing of the kind has been done. It is not a matter of boasting on this side but of troubled conscience of hon. gentlemen on the other side, who are afraid the farmers show too much appreciation of the government policy. As regards flax seed, one would suppose, from what my hon. friend has said, that this land has grown in Canada within the last few years.

Mr. BLAIN. It was bought by the Conservative government.

Mr. FIELDING. I would admit that rather than argue it although there are two sides to that question.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. The item of flax seed is not before the House. There will be a discussion on it in a few moments and I would suggest that we should not discuss it now.

Mr. BLAIN. I should rather think we could afford to wait for the answer from the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and that there was no need for my hon. friend to interrupt.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Then I rise to a point of order. The item of flax seed is not before the House and is not open for discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. We are discussing item 17 relating to cheese which has nothing to do with flax seed. I have allowed a wide latitude because nobody took exception, but once the point is raised I have to maintain it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume you will give me an opportunity of answering the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)?

Mr. FIELDING. I was refused an opportunity to reply to my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. HENDERSON. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will say this. The minister is perfectly right in saying that under the tariff of 1894, the rate of duty on tweeds was 25 per cent and 5 cents per pound, but how far was I out?

Mr. FIELDING. I said the duty on that class of goods was 32½ cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister suppose that a yard of ordinary Scotch tweed weighs more than a pound and a half?

Mr. FIELDING. Scotch tweeds vary in quality and weight and the duty would vary according to the weight.

Mr. HENDERSON. We will take the average at one and a half pounds to the yard, making the duty 25 plus 7½ cents equal to 32½.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Take the case of tweeds that go into ready-made clothing. At 35 cents a yard, the duty of 25 per cent and 5 cents a pound would amount to about 60 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. How much closer is the item of tweed to cheese than the item of flax seed?

Mr. HENDERSON. I was taking tweed at $1 a yard and not 35 cents.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the figure 3 be changed to 4. I understood the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to say that I could not move that amendment. I do not know whether his object was to shut me out or see whether we would test the sense of the House. I want to know under what rule I cannot move it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has no power to introduce a motion to increase taxation, but he has the right to move to reduce the duty if he wishes.

Mr. STOCKTON. He would have no power to move to increase the estimates, but taxation is a different thing. I refer my hon. friend to a ruling of the Speaker of the English House of Commons.—

> A member who seeks to increase taxation ought, if he intends to conclude with a motion, to move for a committee of the whole House——

This is a committee of the whole House.

> —but it is not necessary that he should have the consent of the Crown. If his object is to increase the estimates, such consent is necessary.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) is absolutely mistaken. No taxation can be imposed in this country without the consent of the Crown.

Mr. STOCKTON. I have stated the rule that if a motion is to increase the estimates it can only be done by consent of the Crown, but, in the case of increased taxation, it is not necessary.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman will find that, according to the British North America Act, no tax can be imposed without the consent and recommendation of the Crown.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Brodeur's) authority for that?

Mr. BRODEUR. The British North America Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) has read the ruling in the British House of Commons.

Mr. STOCKTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) is entirely mistaken. He is referring to section 54 of the British North America Act, which says that there can be no expenditure of public money except by consent of the Crown. But increase of taxation is not expenditure of public money.

Mr. FIELDING. I am confident that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stockton) is not correct as to the practice in this country. He will find that there are means whereby an expression of opinion can be taken on an abstract motion, but the effect of the passing of such a motion is not to increase taxation but to declare the view of the House. I think he will find that increase of taxation has never been allowed to be made except through the minister. I think I would accept the judgment of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. We shall have to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule on that point. What we want is to get an expression of the opinion of the House on the proposal to show whether the majority are or are not in favour of granting the farmers the protection of this increased duty on cheese.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will have another opportunity to do that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point is dealt with at page 594 of Bourinot:

> It is now a fixed principle of constitutional government that all propositions for the imposition of taxes should emanate from the minister.

Mr. MACLAREN. As to the duty on cheese, I am sorry that I was not in my place to hear the whole discussion. My own very strong opinion is that the duty on cheese coming in from the United States should be the same as that which they charge against us—6 cents per pound. I believe I am the cause of having the American duty raised to the present rate. I was doing a large business in exporting the cheese across the line, paying a duty of 3 cents per pound. But as soon as my business grew to large proportions, they raised the duty, and they told me that if I wanted to make money in the American market, I would have to employ labour on that side and spend my money where I made it. Another reason

why our duty should be raised is this : They make a skim-milk cheese there and ship it into places along our border, paying the duty of 3 cents per pound, and this cheese comes into unfair competition with our full cream cheese. I find, for instance, in Windsor, where I used to do business to a considerable amount in large cheese, the Americans send in their skim-milk cheese and pay the duty. And the same in other places. I do not think that is fair to the Canadian cheee producer or beneficial to the public. I would like to see the duty raised so as to make it the same on both sides.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated that Canada exported $24,000,000 worth of cheese last year. Can he tell us what proportion of that went to the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. I believe about $15.000 worth. And, as I have stated—speaking from memory—we imported from the United States about $28,000 worth. I think I am correct in stating that no representations have been made to us that the cheese men were dissatisfied with this duty. I suppose that like other people they would like to have more if they could get it, but the lowness of the duty has not been presented to us as a grievance.

Mr. BARR. One reason, no doubt, is that they feared such a reception as the farmers got. When the farmers sent a large deputation desiring an increase of duty on some things, and reductions on others, they did not find any response. I think there are other reasons why we should now protect our cheese producers and farmers more than at any former period in the history of the country. We know that a large number of Americans are coming over to our northern country in connection with the lumber business, and they are not only bringing over their money, but very often they bring over their own men and also the products which they require in their lumber operations, these products meeting a want which might be filled by the products of our own farms. We have also certain portions of our northern country flooded with Americans who have come over in connection with our mines. They also employ Americans in large numbers and bring in the product of American farms to supply those men intead of buying from our farmers. This being so, I think, the time has come when we should put on prohibitory duties equal to those which the United States impose upon our products, thus keeping the home market for our own farmers. In this connection, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, who, no doubt, has had occasion to give the matter careful consideration, whether, on the whole, the duties on farm products have been increased under this tariff or not? While in other lines there have been increases for the protection of the home product, I think it will be found, that in the farm schedules there have been decreases in direct opposition to the demands of our farmers.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as there have been changes in the agricultural schedules, they have been in the direction of increase. In some cases the increase has been very small, in the endeavour to reach a proper unit. But, so far as changes have been made they have been in the direction of what my hon. friend (Mr. Barr) would call helping the farmer.

18. Butter—British preferential tariff, 3 cents; intermediate tariff, 4 cents; general tariff, 4 cents.

Mr. ELSON. Inasmuch as the discussion on the tariff in the House was not lengthy and as we are now discussing schedule 'A' which contains a large number of items affecting the agricultural interest, and as I am a practical farmer, I desire to make some remarks upon the tariff in relation to subjects of general interest to the farmers of Canada. I know there are many questions calling for the earnest attention of the government, but, if there is one question more than another which requires deep and careful and thorough consideration by the government and by the House, it is the question known as the fiscal policy, the policy by which sufficient money is raised to meet the working expenses of the country and to make those public improvements which are necessary to be made in order to keep the country well to the front with other nations of the globe, thereby bringing immigration and wealth into the Dominion.

The two great spokes in the fiscal policy wheel are the customs tariff and the excise duty. It is true, we have other sources of revenue. We have some that are natural sources, for instances, such as the timber wealth of the country, the mining wealth of the country, the fishing wealth of the country, and the Crown lands. In addition we have fees and charges too numerous to mention, all of which go to assist in repleting the public chest. Yet there is not one of these sources of income which at all equals the customs tariff. Even setting aside the excise duties along with the other sources of revenue, the customs tariff outweighs them all, and brings more gold into the treasury than all the other sources combined. Therefore it seems to me a matter of great consequence as to how much duties are levied upon articles which are imported for home consumption. Because, Sir, the customs tariff affects everybody, almost, living in this country. It affects the labouring man, it affects the business man, it affects the manufacturer, and it affects the farmer more than any other. I contend that the farmers of this land contribute a great deal more to the revenue of the country under the customs tariff than any other class, not only because they are greater in numbers, but because the customs tariff touches them on both sides. They have to

pay the duty the same as other persons upon the goods they purchase and consume, and in addition, on account of a very low tariff which the government of the day places upon the agricultural products of other countries, the farmers of Canada are forced in many cases to accept a lower price for their produce than they would obtain in case there was a higher tariff against imported agricultural products.

Now, when we take up the schedule we see there is a preferential tariff, an intermediate tariff and a general tariff. Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking of the preferential tariff, I wish to say that I have no fault to find with it. I feel that it is right. I feel that it is the duty of this government to do all in their power to encourage the volume of trade flowing between the Dominion of Canada and the mother country. And, Sir, until it can be shown that some injury is being done under the preferential tariff, I would say: Let it remain as it is. It is true, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) stated here before recess that whilst he was in England last year he noticed large quantities of goods coming in from Germany, from Russia, from France, from Belgium and other countries, and that these were exported from England to Canada under the preferential tariff, giving a benefit to those countries which discriminated against Canada. If that be so, of course it is up to the government to correct things of that kind. But on the whole, I believe in a preferential tariff; I believe in encouraging trade between England and Canada. England is our great customer; England is our great market; England buys our wheat, which is our great staple, and which is giving the Dominion of Canada such a famous name abroad; England buys our fat cattle; England buys our cheese; England buys our bacon, and so on. Just as soon as the cold storage system is made comprehensive enough to take perishable products from the farm, over the railways, through the storage rooms over the ocean, into the cellars and on to the tables of the English consumers, then we will certainly sell to England under the preferential tariff a great deal more of our perishable products than we are selling at the present time. Therefore, I say I believe in a preferential tariff, and desire it to remain as it is unless some necessity might develop of making certain changes in it.

Now, speaking for a moment on the intermediate tariff, I wish to say that I think but little business will be done under it. The Finance Minister himself said, I think, that he did not expect much business would be done under that; in fact, I think he said the United States would hardly take hold of that intermediate tariff, although it might be something of a bid to the United States to open a reciprocity deal with the Dominion of Canada. Yet I believe they are not likely to take hold of that. It seems to me on the whole that the intermediate tariff will do about as much harm as good. In other words, supposing the good was placed on one side of the balance and the harm upon the other. I believe the harm side would go down and force the good side away up out of sight. So I feel that the intermediate tariff is something like a chip in the porridge, it does no good and not a great deal of harm. I feel that it would create something of an uncertainty in the minds of dealers. For instance, one merchant might purchase under the general tariff certain goods, another might purchase goods under the intermediate tariff through an arrangement which might easily be made, and the result would be that one merchant could undersell the other. Consequently there would not be that stability or safety in the tariff which there ought to be.

With regard to the general tariff, that is of course the tariff under which the chief business of the country will be done. Now, we have a great neighbour to the south of us, the United States of America, with 80,000,000 of people, whom we call our American cousins. We desire to live with them on the most social and friendly terms possible. They are a people blest with a great deal of intelligence, and they have great ability and facility for manufacturing upon a very extensive scale. Then they have a broad country; they have many acres, and they can produce almost anything in the line of agricultural products suitable for man or beast. But, Mr. Chairman, every one acquainted with their situation knows that the very life blood of that American nation depends upon the protection given to the agriculturists, the tillers of the soil of that country. Hence we see the high tariff wall which they have on their side of the line against agricultural products, a wall so high that the farmers of Canada can hardly see over it, can hardly shoot over it, and unless the wind blows in the right direction, they can hardly fly a kite over that high American tariff wall. And, Sir, just as the great Niagara Falls pours her immense volume of water over the high portion of that cataract to the lower portion, just so do the American people pour their vast volume of produce into our country over that high tariff wall of theirs down over our low tariff wall. Their produce spreads out in our country and crowds out our home grown produce, and the farmers of Canada are forced to seek a market in foreign countries for their produce. Sir, that means a great deal taken off the profits of the farmer. He must pay the middleman's profit; he must pay the railway freights, he must pay the ocean freights, and other charges on the other side, which reduce the profits of the farmer to a great extent in comparison to what he would receive if he had the home market, in other words Canada for Canadians. Now, I feel it my

duty to make a little comparison in regard to the duties imposed by the Canadian and American governments on agricultural products. It is as follows:

	Canadian tariff.	American tariff.
Wheat, per bush..	12c.	25c.
Oats, per bush.. ..	10c.	15c.
Barley, per bush ..	15c.	30c.
Pease, per bush ..	15c.	30c.
Hay, per ton	$2.00	$4.00
Potatoes, per bush..	15c.	25c.
Apples, per barrel ..	40c.	25c. per bush —about 70c per barrel.
Beans, per bush ..	25c.	45c.
Cheese, per lb	3c.	6c.
Butter, per lb	4c.	6c.
Eggs, per doz	3c.	5c.
Onions	25 p.c. ad val; equal on valuation of 80c. to 20c. per bush.	40c. per bush.
Wool, per lb	3c.	12c.

I will give the government credit for putting even that 3 cents a pound on wool. Previously it was free but it is 3 cents a pound under the new tariff. The American duty is 12 cents a pound. I am sure that the Minister of Finance strictly conscientious as he is, will hardly rise in his seat and say that this is fair play to the Canadian farmer. I am sure he will not say that without a blush coming to his face. It is certainly unfair to the Canadian farmer. I feel that the duties imposed by these two countries on agricultural products should be equal. If these tariff walls were walls in reality they should be so equal in fact that if it could be possible that a spirit level could be placed, one end on the American wall and the other end on the Canadian wall, the vacuum of the spirit level should rest right in the centre. I wish to say a few words in reference to wire fencing.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, what item is before the committee ? I rise to a point of order.

Mr. ELSON. Wire fencing is a very expensive affair to the farmers of Canada. We can get nothing else for our fences except wire. We must have wire fences in Ontario, in the Northwest and in nearly all portions of the country and yet the government have put five per cent duty upon the numbers of wire, numbers 9, 11 and 13, which go into the manufacture of the fences which the farmers of Canada have to use.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken. Under the preferential tariff it is free.

Mr. ELSON. I am aware of that, but under the general tariff it is not.

Mr. FIELDING. But, then my hon. friend does not want American goods to come in. He has just been asking to have them shut out.

Mr. ELSON. You do not get wire from England anyway. It comes from the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. No, the wire is made in England.

Mr. ELSON. I sincerely hope that the minister will see that the farmers of the Dominion of Canada are relieved of that 5 per cent upon wire which goes into their fences.

Mr. FIELDING. That will be in favour of the Americans and we do not want to do that.

Mr. ELSON. Now, in regard to the duty on binders and mowing machines, that has been reduced by 2½ per cent, but that reduction will not benefit the farmers to any extent worth speaking of. It will cost, say, $50 to purchase a mowing machine and that machine will last for ten years; suppose you can buy it for ten shillings less you only save a shilling a year in the whole ten years. That does not amount to much. The same thing will apply to binders only on a little larger scale. The saving is a mere nothing ; in fact it is no saving to the farmer worth speaking of. There is still another thing I wish to speak of and it is the duty upon raw sugar. As the cost of raw sugar is increased so must the price of the finished article be increased. I feel that sugar is something that should be purchased at the lowest possible cost by the people of the country and that the tariff should be so arranged that it could be bought cheaply. It is a necessity of the household and it seems to cost about as many dollars to pay for the sugar that is used by our farmers as it would cost to buy wheat flour for the bread of the farmer's family where they do their own baking. Therefore I hold that it was wrong to place a duty upon raw sugar; in fact, the duty on the refined article should have been reduced. What is it that causes the price of wheat to be so low at the present time ? Is it not the competition of the great wheat producing portions of the world which takes place in Great Britain ? Supply and demand regulate that. Not so in the case of sugars. The profit seems to go into the hands of the millionaires and combines and they have their own way of obtaining whatever price they fix for their sugar. The people have to pay it and the manufacturers in some cases pay 20 per cent upon their stock and then have a bonus to give away besides.

Now, there is one other question that I desire to bring before the committee and I hope that hon. gentlemen will not think that I am travelling too far from the question before the chair. I hold in my hand a clipping from the 'Farmer's Advocate,' an

excellent farmer's paper, published in the city of London. The 'Advocate' contains a letter written by a gentleman who resides not far from the city of Ottawa where we are now. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is not in his place just now because I would like him to hear what we have to say on behalf of the farmers. The letter is as follows:

I have just read an article in the 'Farmers' Advocate,' of the 13th instant, re sheep, wherein you state, on page 1442, 'This is a question which requires serious thought, and nobody seems to have given it as yet to the matter.' I waited on the tariff commission last March, in Ottawa city, and proved to the commissioners that an average of over 48,000,000 pounds of rags were imported annually, urging upon them the advisability of prohibiting the manufacture of rags into any commercial article whatever, because it interferes with the farmers obtaining a price for their wool, and, besides, imports all kinds of contagious diseases, more especially consumption. I quoted Dr. Osler as my authority, and also proved by him that they (the rags), contained what is called rag pickers' disease. I am credibly informed by a local M.D. that Dr. Osler prescribes identically the same treatment for this disease as for consumption. I proved by the blue-books that there were only 2,100,000 sheep in Canada, according to the census just completed; and if this material were shut out Canada would require at least 10,000,000 more ewes to supply the wool market. The farmers want a price for their wool sufficient to pay all other expenses and profit.

Now, Mr. Chairman that relates to two things. First, to a sanitary question affecting the health of the people, and second, to a question affecting the prosperity of the farmers. As I thought this gentleman might be mistaken when he said that 48,000,000 lbs. of rags had been imported into this country, I looked up the blue-book to see the amount imported last year and I find it was 85,000 tons of rags, woollen, jute, waste paper and so on. There is no doubt that these rags came in. According to eminent authorities these rags may spread tuberculosis throughout our country. I know, and I am glad to know, that some of the members of the government belong to a society in this city known as the Anti-Tuberculosis Society and they do all they can, by means of their influence and no doubt their money, to prevent the spread of tuberculosis throughout the country. On the other hand, they allow the importation of 85,000 tons of rags, which may spread disease throughout the country; and they come in free. If there was a duty of ten cents per hundred on these rags it would produce a revenue of nearly $170,000. But it would be better if the whole of this refuse were cremated and sent up in smoke and the germs and microbes contained therein destroyed by fire than to be scattered throughout the Dominion, to poison its pure atmosphere and to be inhaled into the lungs of our people. Again, suppose that this refuse were kept out of the country, consider how greatly the farmers would be benefited. What a vast market there would be for the wool of those splendid sheep, the Lincolns, the Leicesters and Shropshires of the Canadian farmers, which took many prizes at Chicago. Canada is justly celebrated for her sheep, and that is an industry which should be encouraged. Now, I have spoken as a practical farmer, and as I believe in the interest of the farming community. If the government will foster the agricultural interests of this Dominion by means of their tariff, they will be laying a foundation solid as the earth itself on which a great nation can be built in the Dominion of Canada. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for the kind attention they have given me.

Mr. PERLEY. Before this item passes, I would like to say a few words regarding the duties which this tariff proposes to impose on agricultural products. It seems to me that we all ought to be willing to assist the farmers in keeping agricultural products out of the country. We have a tariff on manufactured goods which the present government has taken very largely from the Conservative government which preceded it; but I do not think we ought to have a tariff which will allow the Americans to send into Canada any quantity of agricultural products, which are our main staple. While the tariff may in some cases bear somewhat heavily on the farmers, at the same time I have always held, wherever I have spoken about it, that the tariff is for the benefit of the farmers as well as all other people in this country. There is no doubt that the farmers receive more for their agricultural products because we have manufactures in this country. But I find that the duties on eggs, butter and cheese have not been increased at all by this tariff. During last year there were imported into this country 462,000 dozen of eggs, all of which came, I presume, from the United States; none came in under the preferential tariff. We also imported a very large quantity of cheese and butter. Now, I am one of those who advocate a national policy for this country, although it is on the face of it against my business interests. In this respect I stand exactly in the same position as the farmer; that is to say, I manufacture lumber, which is nearly all exported from the country. I notice that item 10 imposes a duty on barrelled meats, including pork, of which we use a great quantity. I have never raised any objection to this. I simply call attention to it. The duty is 2 cents a pound, or $4 a barrel. This heavy mess pork is something which cannot be manufactured in this country in sufficient quantities for the lumber trade, and the duty on it varies from 20 per cent to 50 per cent, according to the price of pork in the Chicago market.

The price varies so much that I have known it to be as low as $8 a barrel and as high as $20. The duties on eggs, butter and cheese are a smaller percentage of the value than the duty on pork. I would ask the Finance Minister why he imposes a heavier duty on pork, which is not manufactured in this country in sufficient quantities for the use of the people, when he puts a lower duty on eggs, butter and cheese, which are certainly produced in this country in far vaster quantities than we can possibly use. I consider it a necessity that we should have a general tariff in this or any other young country; it is the only way by which we can become a great nation, but the farmer is entitled to protection against importations from the United States on all the articles he raises.

Item 19. Cocoa shells and nibs—British preferential tariff, 7½ per cent; intermediate tariff 10 per cent. general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask why it is that the British preference is reduced in this case?

Mr. FIELDING. This has been reduced generally and the preferential rate is lower than it was before.

Mr. LAKE. The greater part of the importation of this class of item comes from Great Britain and therefore the change is in the direction of giving a greater advantage to the exports from the United States and other countries than to exports from Great Britain. It is against the British preference.

Mr. FIELDING. It might be classed almost as a raw material. It is a first process of manufacture which passes into other manufactures and the duty has to be considered from that point of view.

Mr. LAKE. Would it not be preferable in this particular case to increase the British preference to some extent?

Mr. FIELDING. The British preference is 7½ per cent; it is pretty low.

Mr. LAKE. But not as compared with the general tariff. This is an item in which the largest part of the importation comes from Great Britain, and it seems to me it would be desirable to encourage still further that importation.

Mr. FIELDING. That is pretty low as it is.

20. Cocoa paste or 'liquor' and chocolate paste or 'liquor' not sweetened, in blocks or cakes, and cocoa butter, 2½ cents; 3 cents and 3 cents.

Mr. LAKE. This comes under the same category. Why should the old preferential rate of ⅓ be reduced and a smaller amount of preference given to Great Britain? Is it not advisable in this case to carry out the declared policy of the Liberal party and encourage the importations from Great Britain?

Mr. FIELDING. The same reasoning applies. This is an article which enters into other manufactures and we have to make it a reasonable rate. We have reduced the general rate from 4 cents to 3 cents and the other rate is proportionate.

21. Cocoa paste, &c., sweetened.

Mr. LAKE. Again in this item there is discrimination against Great Britain as compared with the old tariff.

24. Chicory, raw or green, per pound, 2 cents; 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would tell the committee when there are any changes in tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case there is a reduction. Chicory was 3 cents before.

25. Chicory, kiln dried, roasted or ground extract of coffee, n.o.p., or substitutes therefor, of all kinds, per pound, 2 cents, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the point in the reduction?

Mr. PATERSON. It goes into the coffee.

Mr. FIELDING. The item is brought into a class including substitutes; there was difficulty in the department and they thought they should be rated together in the interest of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not supposed to be in the interests of any one; I suppose that it would go into coffee if there was no duty at all on it.

26. Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof, and substitutes therefor, including acorn nuts, n.o.p., per pound, 1½ cents, 1¾ cents, 2 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister think 2 cents a pound a sufficient duty to impose on imitations of coffee? I think it should go on the prohibited list.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no change in that respect, there are a number of things that are substitutes for coffee, not necessarily unwholesome and for convenience of classification they are classified together and have been for a number of years.

28. Tea and green coffee, n.o.p., 10 per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. HENDERSON. I see again here, that the British preference has been completely taken off, the same in the case of coffee. What is the reason for that?

Mr. FIELDING. If it is purchased in bond in the United Kingdom it is free anyhow.

55. Hops, per pound, 4 cents, 6 cents, 7 cents.

Mr. PATERSON. That is an increase; 7 cents instead of 6 cents.

Mr. LAKE. How did the importation from the mother country compare with those from foreign countries last year?

Mr. FIELDING. $112,000 from the United States and $45,000 from Great Britain.

39. Starch (of various kinds), per pound, 1 cent, 1½ cents, 1½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. I would ask this item to stand.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there large quantities of starch imported from the United States last year?

Mr. FIELDING. $21,000 from the United States last year.

Mr. BLAIN. And what total imports?

Mr. FIELDING. $40,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that this is becoming a very important industry in Canada at the present time. I rather think it should receive some special consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. The item is to stand.

Mr. BLAIN. In that case I shall reserve what I have to say.

Item allowed to stand.

43. Condensed milk, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty—British preferential tariff, 2 cents per pound; intermediate tariff, 3 cents per pound; general tariff, 3½ cents per pound.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a slight reduction.

Mr. BARR. Why should it be reduced? Can we not manufacture condensed milk?

Mr. FIELDING. The rate before was 2 1-16th of a cent and we have made it 2 cents so as to avoid the fraction.

44. Condensed coffee with milk, 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

45. Milk foods, n.o.p., prepared cereal foods, in packages not exceeding 25 pounds weight each, 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That item was withdrawn from the previous class. It was formerly 35 per cent.

46. Prepared cereal foods, n.o.p., 15 per cent, 17½ per cent, 20 per cent.

47. Beans, n.o.p., 15 cents per bushel, 22½ cents, 25 cents.

Mr. PATERSON. That is an increase of 10 cents per bushel.

48. Peas, n.o.p., 10 cents per bushel, 12½ cents, 15 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an increase from 10 cents to 15 cents.

Mr. BLAIN. What special request was made by the farmers for that increase and what is it supposed to serve?

Mr. FIELDING. When we came to apply the existing duty to the value of the goods we found it quite low. The duty is now a moderate one at the present rates.

Mr. MARSHALL. Peas coming in for seed are free?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

49. Buckwheat, 10 cents per bushel, 12½ cents, 15 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an increase from 10 cents to 15 cents.

50. Buckwheat, meal or flour, 35 cents per hundred pounds, 45 cents, 50 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an increase from 25 cents to 50 cents.

51. Pot, pearl, rolled, roasted or ground barley, 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

52. Barley, n.o.p., 10 cents per bushel, 12½ cents, 15 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a change from an ad valorem to a specific duty, but the duty is about the same. If there be any difference, it is a little increase.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister should give a further increase. We had a very large barley trade in Ontario in years past which has to a considerable extent fallen off. Its decline is due to the fact that the United States apply a specific duty of 30 cents a bushel against our Canadian barley. In view of the surtax which the hon. minister has put on German goods in retaliation for their charging ours the highest tariff, should not we, on the same principle, charge the United States a higher duty in the case of barley? Would not this be a case where an increase in the rate might cause the United States to reduce their duty so that our farmers would have as free access to the American market as they had formerly and thus bring about a better reciprocal trade?

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt it would be desirable, from some points of view, to have the American market, but apart from that consideration there is very little to complain of in the present position of the trade. We only imported $1,500 worth last year, so that our farmers are not suffering from American competition. On the other hand we exported last year $460,000 worth.

53. Corn meal, 20 cents per barrel, 22½ cents, 25 cents.

54. Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, 7½ cents per bushel, 7½ cents, 7½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. Formerly there was a 5 cent preference.

55. Indian corn, not for purposes of distillation and under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, free, free, free.

Mr. LANCASTER. What are the regulations?

Mr. FIELDING. Indian corn for general purposes is free but for distillation it is dutiable, and the object is to give the Customs Department sufficient authority to

make whatever regulations may be found necessary to guard against abuses. This matter is largely dealt with by the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then our farmers are to have American corn brought into competition with their barley and other products on which they are given a duty. On what principle does the hon. minister allow corn to come in free from the United States? What is the duty on Indian corn imposed by the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. 15 cents.

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot undertand why we should not have some protection on Indian corn. Several farmers have complained to me frequently about this and have said that they understood that in the revision of the tariff this grievance would be removed. This imported Indian corn takes the place of barley, peas and oats on which we have protection. In my opinion there should be the same duty on Indian corn from the United States as is imposed by the United States government on Indian corn from Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. On behalf of the farmers of Canada, so far as I have a right to speak for them, I must dissent from the views expressed by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster). This freeing of corn from duty is especially for the benefit of our farmers who are consumers of corn to a much larger extent than they are producers. Corn is produced in one section of our Dominion—a very important section, and we are glad to know that it is producing corn as well as many other things. But the great majority of the farmers of Canada do not grow corn, and yet they want corn for feeding purposes and for the encouraging of the dairying interests, which are of so much importance to the country. I am persuaded that, while, no doubt, one section of our country contains many farmers who would be pleased to see a duty on corn, the farmers of Canada generally take the other view, so that free corn is regarded by them as a boon.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister says he thinks he speaks in the interest of the farmers when he favours free corn. I am sorry we have to join issue with him. But I am satisfied that the farmers who speak to me about the matter know what they are talking about. They tell me that while it is true that free corn appeals to a certain selfish interest in some farmers, thereby dividing the farmers and encouraging them to try to gain advantage at the expense of their brother farmers, it is not a benefit to our agriculture at large. The hon. minister has overlooked what I said a few minutes ago that this free corn comes into competition with other produce of the farm —barley, oats, peas, &c., and that to the extent that free corn is imported it is an injury to the farming community. The minister says there is only one part of our country in which corn is grown. But there are very few parts of Canada in which farmers are numerous and regularly established in business where Indian corn cannot be grown. There are many kinds of Indian corn, some of them much more hardy than others. I think it is a sheer fallacy to say that the farmers of Canada generally desire to have Indian corn come in free, particularly when that free importation is an attack upon the industry of their fellow farmers. The argument of the minister I protest against, for such arguments if listened to must have the effect of causing some of the people to throw the burden of competition upon the shoulders of others, instead of working for the common good of the country and for the whole business of agriculture.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I think the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) does not represent the opinion of the farmers generally. There is no doubt that in certain sections there is a strong feeling that they can grow corn to advantage. But that portion of the country is limited. It could not readily supply the full demand, and especially it would not always be able to supply it at prices that would be profitable to the purchaser. In other portions of the country corn is not grown, but cattle feeding is an extensive industry. It is only reasonable that the larger industry should have the greater attention. The shipments of cattle that we have heard spoken of by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Elson) in such glowing terms would be seriously injured if the farmers were not able to get cheap American corn and turn it into beef.

Mr. BARR. I fear that the hon. gentleman (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) does not understand the farming community as well as he would if he were a farmer, or represented a farming constituency. I venture to say that, though deputations that came down to interview the government about the tariff, there was no request from any farming deputation or put forth by any agricultural newspaper, in favour of having corn remain on the free list. On the other hand, it has been recognized that a very large section of our country, particularly one part of the province of Ontario, can grow corn about as well as any section of the United States. If the price was kept up, if the growers of corn were protected, they would produce all the corn required in the Dominion. It is well known that both climate and soil are favourable to this crop. Then, again, it has been stated—and I wish only to emphasize it—that every bushel of corn that comes into this country and is fed here comes into direct competition with the coarse grain grown in Canada, such as oats and barley. This class of grain must

be sold a a cheap rate. And why? Because of the heavy competition of free American corn. Therefore, I submit that the free importation of corn is diametrically opposed to the interest of our farmers. I think that if the farmers had not been deceived they would have protested against this arrangement. Those who have been out in political contests know that this was a burning question in many parts of the country and one in which the farmer took a great interest. It is well known that they were promised relief from the burdens placed upon them by placing corn on the free list to compete with their oats and other coarse grain. In many parts of the province, and even throughout the Dominion, coarse grains are the most profitable crop that can be grown, so long as a fair price can be secured. It is certainly not in the interest of our farming community that the Americans should be allowed to dump their corn in this country. Sometimes they have a very large crop, and the result is that the corn is dumped on this side in very large quantities. We can produce in the Dominion all the grain required for feeding purposes, and it is not in the best interests of the country to leave the door wide open to the Americans to send in their products here. I think that after due consideration the Minister of Finance must see that he will best serve the interests of the farmers by levying a duty on corn.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. I entirely disagree with the statement of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) when he says that a large proportion of the province of Ontario can grow corn successfully for grain purposes. A large proportion of our farmers can grow corn, but not for grain purposes. In our section we grow corn largely for fodder, and we require the grain to help to fatten the stock. In our section we go largely into grazing cattle, but we do not grow enough grain to keep the cattle over the winter months and we require the corn for this purpose. We should find it very much to our disadvantage if corn were put on the dutiable list and made more expensive than it is. In fact, we consider it a very great boon to be able to get American corn at certain times at the cheap rates we do. To say that free corn competes with our coarse grain does not put the case fairly. We grow pease, where the absence of insects allows us to do so, and we are able to sell them at a higher price than we have to pay for the same weight of corn, and thus we can buy corn at a profit, which answers the same purpose in feeding as pease. Consequently we can sell our beef and make a good profit on it by buying American corn to feed. We are pleased that we can continue to follow that line, and I hope the government will not recede from the position they have taken, but continue to retain corn on the free list.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. McKenzie) who represents an agricultural district as I do, if the farmers of his district could not buy this American corn cheap, if they had to pay a duty on it, what would they do to feed their cattle? They would simply have to go to their brother farmers in this country and purchase both oats, pease and barley for this purpose. I say that every bushel of free corn that is brought into this country is brought in simply for the purpose of making beef. And I know who got this put on the free list; a few of the manufacturers of beef got corn brought in free for the purpose of feeding their cattle, to the great injury of other farmers. Every bushel of that corn when it comes in displaces a bushel of corn that we grow in this country, reduces it in price to the level of American corn, and forces our farmers to export to England, or to some other foreign country, our oats, pease and barley. If that corn was not allowed to come in, our farmers would get a better price, and the oats, pease and barley that we are now exporting to the old country would be sold at a better price for the purpose of feeding cattle, and would do it as well. We have in western Ontario several counties that can grow corn, but the farmers there cannot grow it, it pays them better to grow white beans instead of growing corn at 30 cents to compete with the American corn. I represent as large an agricultural district as there is in Ontario, and you might poll the farmers of that country, both Grit and Tory, and they will all hold up their hands and say that they don't want a bushel of free corn brought into this country because of the effect it has on our own coarse grain.

Mr. T. MARTIN. I do not agree with the last speaker (Mr. Taylor) on the question of corn, perhaps it is because we live in different parts of the country. I have no doubt that the way we look at the corn question depends very much on the locality we live in. But in the locality I live in, free corn is certainly a great advantage to the farmers, and nothing has been brought out here to-night that proves that free corn has lowered the price of our coarse grains. Corn was put on the free list in 1897, since that time the price of oats has never been below 25 cents. Previous to that the price of oats went down as low as 18 cents when corn was not on the free list. Since then, we have never seen oats as low as 25 cents. Also pease. To-day they are worth 80 cents for sixty pounds. Some years ago they were down as low as 39 cents, before corn was put on the free list. Therefore there is no evidence to prove that the member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) or the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) are correct when they say that free corn has lowered the price of coarse grain. To-day it is an ad-

vantage for the farmer if he can sell a hundred bushels of oats, or five tons of oats, at a cent a pound, or $1 per hundred, and turn round and buy corn, a very much better class of feed and for the same money, or perhaps a little less. It is certainly an advantage to the cattle and hog feeders of this country that corn should be on the free list. I can tell these gentlemen who have spoken against corn being on the free list that the farmers in my constituency, no matter what side of politics they are on, agree with me that it is a splendid thing that corn should be on the free list.

Mr. LANCASTER. I can well understand the hon. gentleman who has just spoken if he refers to the feeders of cattle as distinguished from farmers who are tilling the soil. I would point out to him that the articles which he says have not gone down in value have always been protected. There is a duty on them now, and the Finance Minister proposes to keep that duty on for the protection of the farmers. These very grains are protected. The hon. gentleman (Mr. T. Martin) loses sight of the fact that the vast majority of the farmers are tillers of the soil, but a few of them who get some capital, still calling themselves farmers, and want to grow at the expense of their fellow farmers and export cattle to Great Britain, feed their cattle as cheaply as they can at the expense of other farmers. These are the people whom my hon. friend wishes to benefit by this legislation; and as between farmers who are rich and those who are poor, I, as I generally do, want to be on the side of the poor man and help him to become more able to feed cattle.

Mr. T. MARTIN. In reply to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), let me say that there is not a farmer in the county of Wellington, and I believe that is a fair example of other counties, who is not a feeder of cattle and hogs. They cannot grow corn, and that is why they want corn to come in free. It is wrong to say that we are legislating for the rich against the poor farmer. Every farmer in my county feeds cattle, and therefore free corn is a benefit to every farmer in the county.

Mr. FIELDING. The desire of the farmers to become capitalists is a very laudable one. A few years ago circumstances did not permit them to indulge in that ambition, and if we can better the condition at present so as to enable them to become capitalists, they ought to rejoice in the change. I want to say that the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) is quite mistaken as to the nature of the representations made before the Tariff Commission on this subject. I do not like to speak positively in a matter covering so wide a range of inquiry, but to the best of my recollection, confirmed by the Minister of Customs, I will say that no farmer appeared before us asking for a change in this respect.

Mr. BARR. Did any farmer or any deputation of farmers ask for it to be put on?

Mr. FIELDING. I am coming to that. Nine years ago when the duty was put on, it was somewhat of a burning question, and the argument advanced then was precisely that which my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) advances to-night, that it was going to reduce the price of coarse grains. Experience seems to have shown that the anticipation was not justified, and that coarse grains have not been reduced in price. I want to say that although it was a burning question ten years ago, it has ceased to be a burning question, and the farmers of the country generally have accepted this as a sound policy. Speaking again from recollection, and confirmed by that of the officials who are present, I think no farmer who appeared before us asked for a duty to be put on corn. Now coming to the other question, Did anybody ask that it be kept off? Yes, one of the representations that were made to us by the farmers of Canada on that question was that they did not desire any change, they wanted corn to be free.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister state what is the amount of the importation of corn?

Mr. FIELDING. The importations last year were nearly 10,000,000 bushels.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister will pardon me if I say that is scarcely a fair answer to the hon. gentleman. A very large amount of that corn simply passed through this country en route to the old country and Germany.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. HENDERSON. So that you have to reduce it by the quantity of goods not consumed in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The quantity which came in to crush out the farmers of Canada is not as great as I have said.

Mr. BARR. The argument of the hon. gentleman will not hold good when we consider the change which he speaks of or when he says that the farmers are wealthier than they were ten years ago. Is it not a fact that in the United States where they are highly protected they have advanced in wealth just as much as they have in the Dominion of Canada where we have free trade and probably this is one reason why our farmers have been held back. Have they not advanced in England and in every other country ? If hon gentlemen desire to take credit to themselves on the ground that the country has become wealthier they should remember that all countries, owing to the great advancement in prosperity and to affluent times, are also becoming wealthy. But they must remember that whilst we are now passing through fat years we may at any time have lean years.

Mr. FIELDING. That is after the change comes,—but it will not.

Mr. BARR. When these hard times come they will find that their arguments will not hold good and that other nations which are well protected will be in a more prosperous condition and will be driving better prices for their products.

Mr. MILLER. The American farmers are getting rich feeding cheap corn.

Mr. BARR. They raise it themselves; they do not get it in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not going to discuss the question of whether free corn should come in or not. I presume this is something like the coal duties in Nova Scotia. People further west have to submit to a coal duty in the interest of the Nova Scotia, people, but the Nova Scotia people have to submit to some other duty being imposed on something they consume. What I want to ask the minister is this: Has putting corn in the free list reduced the price? Do the farmers of this country get corn to-day any cheaper by reason of the fact that it is on the free list?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are you quite sure about that?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not say that the price is reduced. It may be higher but it is certainly less than if there were a duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. The year before the duty was removed the farmers were buying corn at 39 cents, with 7½ cents duty added, making 46½ cents.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is the time when they were buying tweed at a dollar a yard.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, but everything has increased in value. I will have a little more to say about the hon. gentleman's tweed at a dollar a yard before the House rises.

Mr. PATERSON. Not to-night.?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, to-night before the committee rises. Last year the price of corn—corn being on the free list—was 55 cents. The year previous to its being placed on the free list it was imported for 39 cents. It cost the farmer 39 cents plus the duty while it cost the farmer 55 cents last year. Are we sure that the shrewd American who watches our tariff and knows that this country is open to him to invade with everything he can send in does not impose an additional 7½ cents on the farmers of this country? I apprehend that the American does not do business for the fun of it. He keeps a close watch on the tariff, he knows that our people want this corn and he is going to ask for a price that would be about the same as the old price plus the duty. I apprehend that. I do not state that as a fact but I rise to ask the Department of Trade and Commerce or the Department of Customs if they have any information on that question, and if our farmers are unfairly treated I think it would be the proper thing to make some remonstrance. I have not said one word as to whether the duty should be imposed or not. I am not going to discuss that because I know it is a controversial question. In my part of the country they do not raise corn and I fancy there are some people who want free corn and others who do not. If you divide them up you might almost split them in two—those who want free corn and those who do not.

Mr. FIELDING. It puts my hon. friend in a difficult position.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, not at all, I can put myself in a proper position by leaving that matter alone. It is a question on which opinion is divided and I am not going to find fault with either party. The man who wants free corn has the right to say so and the man who wants dutiable corn has the right to say so.

Mr. BARR. He cannot get it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, he may say that he wants it. I am not going to discuss that question. I am going to keep clear of it.

Mr. PATTERSON. But you must say whether you want free corn or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am going to leave it to the government to say that. I am not making this tariff. The government are responsible alone for this tariff. It is understood that we oppose everything on general principles.

Mr. PATERSON. You are for a duty then?

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all; not necessarily so. The resolution is there. The government are responsible for it. We were not consulted when the tariff is made up.

Mr. PATERSON. You are now.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman admit it?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think he is consulting us. I think he comes down with a tariff that says corn is going on free list and he does not intend that it shall be any other way.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Finance is more candid than the Minister of Customs. I have said all that I am going to say, but if the hon. gentleman can give me any information on that question I will be very glad to have it. Do the Americans

take advantage of the fact that we give them a free market for corn ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs that if they will allow us to express an opinion on this side of the House I will move to strike out the word 'free' and put in 'ten cents a bushel' and test the opinion of the House. The hon. Minister of Customs asks my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to express an opinion. But they do not give us a chance to express an opinion because they say that we are out of order if we attempt to move anything of the kind. What is the good of a committee to discuss these items if you will not allow us to express our opinion ?

Mr. PATERSON. Everything that is dutiable you can move to reduce.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are going to discuss that question further on another day although we have been ruled out to-day at the request of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister referred to the chairman who gave his opinion, but I think we will prove to him or to the minister that he will have to change the opinion after he reads the rules a little further.

Mr. FIELDING. We are getting valuable information all the time and we are only anxious to note it and emphasize it. Now we have it stated by hon. gentlemen that they do not want to have a reduction made on anything. Well, let it go on record ; it is important.

Mr. BARR. We are not through yet. You will change your mind on that.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we have the statement now that they do not want the duty on anything reduced. It is a good thing. It is a vote of confidence in this tariff. I cannot give my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) the information on the point to which he refers. The 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 bushels of corn that we use in Canada is not a drop in the bucket. The idea that what is sold in Canada has the slightest effect on the general price of corn in the United States is not reasonable.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. minister does not touch my point.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's idea is that the Americans, who produce vast quantities of corn, are going to devise some scheme to get an extra price for the trifling quantity they sell in Canada. If that is true, the price must be higher in Montreal than it is in London. If my hon. friend finds that it is so, he will have some ground for his opinion.

Mr. HENDERSON

56. Oats, per bushel—British preferential tariff, 7 cents; intermediate tariff, 9 cents; general tariff, 10 cents.

Mr. STAPLES. This is an article in which I think we should try to retain the entire market for the western country. We all know that this is a period of railway construction, that conditions in the west among the farmers are so changing that they are introducing the rotation of crops, and that oats are becoming a very important crop. Therefore we should endeavour to retain the entire market, especially during the years when so many railroads are under construction. I think it would not be out of place for us to increase the duty to what the American duty is, namely, 15 cents a bushel.

Mr. FIELDING. Last year we imported from the United States 46,000 bushels of oats of the value of $22,000, and at same time we exported to the United States 60,000 bushels. We practically control the market of Canada. Once in a while, when in some sections of the country the crop is short, we have to import a large quantity ; but it is only under such circumstances that we are obliged to import any large quantity.

Mr. LAKE. On page 20 of the trade and navigation returns the imports from the United States are put at 2,613,847 bushels.

Mr. FIELDING. That includes the oats passing through in transit.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will find what we consumed in the column headed 'Entered for home consumption.'

57. Oatmeal and rolled oats, per 100 lbs—British preferential tariff, 40 cents; intermediate tariff, 50 cents; general, 60 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. When the matter of oatmeal was under discussion last night, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Thos. Martin) asked me how much the difference was between the old duty and the new. I confessed at the moment that I was not very sure of the price of oatmeal. I was under the impression that it was $1.90 per 100 pounds. The hon. member, in conversation with me after the House rose, agreed with me that that was a fair price, and mentioned $1.85 by the carload. Assuming $1.90 to be a fair price, let us see what the difference in the duty is ; because the hon. member wanted the committee to infer that the increase was very slight. The old duty on oatmeal was 20 per cent. In this item we are increasing it to 60 cents per 100 pounds, the same as the duty put on rolled oats some two years ago. I apprehend that prior to that time rolled oats were in the unenumerated list, on which the duty was 20 per cent. The increase of duty, therefore, would be the difference between an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent and a specific duty of 60 cents per 100 pounds, equivalent to 31½ per cent. So that the increase in the duty on rolled oats and

oatmeal is practically about 50 per cent of the duty, an increase from 20 per cent to a little over 30 per cent. I simply make this statement to make plain what I was not prepared to state last night, although I understood that the duty was materially increased. I am not complaining of this. I hope it will enable the hon. gentleman, who is engaged in that business, to pay the farmers a better price for oats. If it does that, the government will be justified in making the change. What I did criticise last night was that the hon. gentleman was finding fault with other people for seeking, as he said, to get protection along certain lines, and trying to convey the impression that he was a man who did not believe in any kind of increased duties. I simply make this statement to show that he also sometimes favours an increase of duty.

Mr. THOMAS MARTIN. I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) misunderstood me last night. I stated that the price of rolled oats was $1.85 per 90 pounds. It is sold in 180 pound barrels or 90 pound bags, which he will find will make a difference in the statement he made. In the statement I made last night I was quite correct. The member for Halton is figuring on the price of oats to-day. I stated that at the time the duty went on, there was no difference in the duty, at least if there was a difference it was against us rather than for us. The price of oatmeal at that time was somewhere about $5.50 or $6 a barrel, therefore with 20 per cent of duty it was quite different from what it would be to-day at $4 a barrel, and if the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) takes the average for the past ten years he will find I am correct. He cannot figure on the low price of oats, nor yet on the high price of oats, we ought to figure on the average price of oats and I figured on the average price when I made the statement. Therefore the member for Halton is entirely wrong so far as the duty on oats in concerned. So far as oatmeal is concerned, the millers do not care whether it is put on the free list or not. There is no oatmeal sold in Canada, all of what we call oatmeal is shipped to the old country, it is rolled oats that is sold here, and when the member for Halton says that it was no mistake to increase the duty on oatmeal as it was in the interest of the farmers of this country that there should be a higher duty on oatmeal, he is right. In 1897 when the tariff was revised the duty on oatmeal was not changed. Under the late government it was 20 per cent ad valorem. At that time it was 15 per cent in the United States, and therefore we believed we could work along and have the United States market as well as our own, and we did not ask that the duty should be changed. Since that time United States duty has been raised to $2 per barrel, but wou will notice that the duty on oats was 10 cents per bushel and the duty on oatmeal 20 per cent ad valorem, which made it about 60 cents on oatmeal and $1.20 on oats. We asked that the raw material and the manufactured material should be made the same. If you look at the tariff you will see that that has been followed out in all food stuffs and it was an anomaly so far as rolled oats was concerned, and therefore we asked that it be made the same, either that oats should be lowered or oatmeal raised. The government saw fit to raise oatmeal and I believe it was in the interest of the farmer to do so. While I am on my feet I might say that I believe we should raise the duty on malt and give the farmer the advantage of that in the way of raising the price of barley, if it is possible to do so. There is no doubt that at the present time the barley market is a maltster's market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not wish to delay the House, I think my hon. frend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) may have left a wrong impression as far as the opinion of the people of Manitoba is concerned. I am quite satisfied he did so, when he said that the farmers asked for an increased duty on oats. He is not acquainted with the feeling in Manitoba with respect to the tariff, not only on grain but on everything else. I have before me the statement of the president of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, in presenting their case to the commission when they were on their western tour, and I might say that this president of the Grain Growers' Association is not a particular friend of the Liberal party, in fact he is a supporter of the Conservative party. In presenting his case before the commission he stated:

> The farmers of Manitoba are unitedly in favour of a tariff for revenue only, from which all protection has been removed, believing that the time has fully come when this step is advisable. We are, however, not unreasonable and if a single case can be cited where a manufacturer who is proficient in his business and having adequate capital to meet the requirements of the concern, cannot make a clear yearly gain of say 8 per cent on the actual amount of cash invested, then the farmers will not oppose a higher tariff to assist him.

In making these remarks the president of the association appeared to take the position that he represented quite a few farmers, he appeared to be speaking for about 500,000 farmers, I think a few more than possibly our friend from Halton represents. I am quite safe, I feel, in saying that in the expressions he used in presenting that case, he was speaking for practically all the farmers of Manitoba, and that in so far as their products are concerned, he took the position that they did not ask for any protection in connection with their products. They were prepared to go into the open markets of the world, in open competition with the world, and did not expect to receive any favour or

any protection that might be tendered to them or that might be asked for.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) say that 20 per cent or 17½ per cent on agricultural implements is only a tariff for revenue?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I might quote a resolution passed by the Grain Growers' Association.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the executive of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, and the Stock Breeders' Association, the present tariff on dutiable goods should be reduced to a revenue tariff of an average of 17 per cent; that all goods on the free list be retained there and with the addition thereto of all kinds of lumber. We are willing to have agricultural products placed on the free list.

That is the resolution passed by the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the Stockbreeders Association.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman read on from the article he has in his hands? Is there not a proviso in the resolution on condition that other articles are put on the free list?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have no objection.

It was further resolved, that the tariff on British goods be amended by restoring the full 33⅓ per cent preference on all woollen goods; that the preference thus amended be maintained.

Mr. LAKE. I am glad this particular point has been brought up. The Minister of Finance made the pretty general statement that the farming community were the highest protected community of any.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I quoted that from the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg pardon, the quotation should have been taken from the speech delivered by the member for Toronto (Mr. Osler).

Mr. FIELDING. He is your desk mate; he is just as good.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not going to shirk it.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman's sarcasm is so fine that sometimes it passes for the expression of his actual opinion. I would ask him what way the farmers of the northwest are protected in their great staple products. They believe that they are receiving no protection from the present tariff and would prefer having the duties on agricultural products taken off altogether rather than have to pay the present high protective tariff on what they consume. At the same time, recognizing that there are other farmers in the Dominion who have to live, they do not make such a demand as that, but are willing to pay their share of the tariff. But they insist that there shall be no increase in the protective duties, and to my mind this tariff does increase them very considerably. I entirely agree with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) regarding the general increases which have taken place. I arrived at the same conclusion, working quite independently from him and not knowing that he was working along those lines. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said that members on this side were not prepared to ask for any reduction.

Mr. FIELDING. I was referring to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. LAKE. I am sorry that sometimes the fine sarcasm of the hon. gentleman leaves a different impression from what he intended. I would like to see an increase to the preference given Great Britain and a decrease of the rates in the new tariff on many of the articles which formerly came from Great Britain at lower rates.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. Martin) said I was entirely wrong. Let me take up the argument a little and perhaps we shall arrive at a basis on which we can all agree. I have here before me the 'Canadian Groer,' of date January 4 last, which no doubt he will accept as an authority. I find in it that the price of rolled oats, per 90 pound bag, was $2.25. I am not sure whether that is in Toronto or Winnipeg.

Mr. THOMAS MARTIN. That is the Toronto market.

Mr. HENDERSON. If $2.25 is the market price per ninety pound bag, $2.50 is the price for 100 pounds, and the duty at 60 cents per 100 pounds would be equivalent to a duty of 24 per cent ad valorem, which is an increase of 4 per cent. So that I was substantially correct when I said there was an increase. I was not finding fault with the increase because I think it is in the interest of the farmer. I want further to correct a statement I made last night. I said hurriedly that possibly I would have to pay more for the meal in my porridge. I do not think I have. I do not think the price of meal at retail has been increased by reason of that increase in the duty, nor could it possibly be in a country where there is such an immense output of that article. But the object gained by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Martin) and others in that business is that they get a broader market. They get better control of the whole Canadian market and have not to give up a part of it to the American shippers. They get a larger market even though they do not get an increased price.

Mr. PATERSON. He should accept your apology.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. members for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) and the

hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Martin) have endeavoured to leave the impression on the committee that the farmers have asked this government to remove the protection on agricultural products. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) quoted a part of the Grangers' representations to the government and also a part of the memorial of the Manitoba Grain Growers Association. I wish to say that in the quotation made he has not been quite fair to these bodies or the committee. I have here their memorials to the government, and what they point out is that they are not in favour of the protective principles of the tariff and go so far as to say that if the government will take away that principle in so far as it applies to manufactured goods, they will be prepared to ask the government to eliminate altogether the protective tariff in so far as it applies to farm products. It is not the bald statement that they want the protective policy removed in so far as it applies to their own products. I only quote this to show that what they are asking is that the government should eliminate altogether the protective principle of the whole tariff applied to manufactured goods, and should that be done they are prepared to ask the government to abolish the protective tariff on farm products. The memorial from the farmers and grangers of Ontario and Manitoba make that statement very clear.

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) rather challenged the correctness of a certain statement which I made during the evening with regard to the duty on woollen goods prior to the advent to power of the present government. I made that statement entirely from memory. I do not know that I have looked up the tariff for perhaps five years, but this evening I have looked up the matter. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is entirely correct when he says the duty on tweeds was 25 per cent and five cents a pound. My impression was that that was equivalent to 32½ per cent. Since then I have taken the amount of tweeds imported in 1896 and the duty collected and have converted this mixed duty into an ad valorem duty, and I find it was not quite 32½ per cent, but only 32 1-10 per cent. I am sure, therefore, the minister will give me the credit, at any rate, for not having endeavoured to misrepresent the case.

Mr. FIELDING. Even without my hon. friend's (Mr. Henderson's) statement, I should know that he had no intention of stating anything except what he believed to be correct. I was speaking from recollection and of the woollen duties generally. In regard to the cheaper articles of clothing, such as the ordinary farmer's overcoat would be made of, the duties being specific and ad valorem mixed, ran up as high as 40 per cent, 50 per cent and I am sure, 60 per cent. I have no doubt of the hon. gentleman's calculation on the particular kind of cloth he mentions. He gives the figures and I accept them as correct.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—PREVENTION AND SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS—EXPLANATION.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the leave of the House, I would like to make a statement in answer to a complaint, which, I understand was made at the beginning of the meeting this evening, by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Stockton). If I am well informed the hon. gentleman complained that the Bill referring to strikes and lockouts which I introduced in this House some days ago, has been distributed to the press and had not been distributed to members of the House. My hon. friend would be quite right in stating that such a case, under ordinary circumstances, would involve a discourtesy to hon. members of this House. I beg to state that, if there is any fault, the fault is mine. But I believe that there is no fault. This House re-assembled on Wednesday last. On Tuesday evening, I received from the Printing Bureau two copies of the Bill referred to. I immediately sent one to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) keeping the other for myself. At the same time I was apprised of the fact that the Bill would be distributed on Wednesday to members of the House. So completely was I assured of this that when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition made his speech on his motion relating to labour troubles, not only did he refer to the Bill which I had introduced, but I myself, had the Bill in my hands and spoke of it and mentioned what seemed to me its principal features. I quite believed, from what I had heard from the Printing Bureau that the Bill had been distributed to members of the House. I am surprised to learn that it has not been distributed. Immediately after, meeting a member of the press, I handed to him my copy of the Bill. Had I not believed that the Bill was distributed, I certainly would not have referred to it in the House. I regret that the Bill was made public in the press when hon. members had not received their copies, but I trust that the explanation which I have given will be satisfactory.

POSTAL FACILITIES IN THE HOUSE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I desire to make a statement on another point. This afternoon my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean)

made an application on behalf of the members that in the post office in the House of Commons special delivery stamps should be provided for sale and also that a money order and postal note branch should be established. I have very much pleasure in informing the House that on Monday, or on Tuesday at latest, the post office here will be provided with special delivery stamps and with an office for the sale of money orders and postal notes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Postmaster of the House of Commons then come under the regulations of the Post Office Department ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) is aware, the postmaster of the House of Commons does not come under my jurisdiction as Postmaster General, but is under the jurisdiction of the House and of yourself, Mr. Speaker. As regards the new money order branch, the postal notes, and special delivery stamps, the postmaster of the Commons will be subject to the inspection of the officers of our department. Otherwise, there will be no change in the regulation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not very sure that the change to be made by the Postmaster General is going to be of advantage to the members of this House. We have a great deal of freedom under our present arrangement. The postmaster in the House is our officer and not the officer of the Postmaster General. If he is to come under the regulations of the Post Office Department and to be restricted by the rules that govern that department, I am afraid that some of the privileges that we enjoy will be taken away from us. I, for one, will not freely surrender any of the privileges that we have as members of the House of Commons. I hope the Postmaster General will reconsider his resolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to restrict the privileges of the members of the House of Commons, but to enlarge them. But, as regards the postal notes, the money orders and the special delivery stamps, my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will admit that the postmaster here must be accountable to the Postmaster General.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly—he will have to be.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As to the rest, of course, that is another question.

THE MODUS VIVENDI.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Before the House adjourns I desire to give notice that on a future day, and during the latter part of next week if possible, I shall ask the permission of the House to discuss a matter of importance—the concessions granted to American fishermen to fish in Canadian waters, whether under statute or under regulation, and having special reference to the Canadian statute popularly known as the Modus Vivendi.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 14, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificate of the election and return of Charles Devlin, Esq., for the electoral district of Nicolet.

JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 61) to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts. He said : I need not go into a lengthy explanation of this Bill. It is, in effect, the same Bill as I introduced last session. Its main object is to prevent judges of provincial courts from engaging in work beyond their judicial duties. There is a further clause to secure certain returns which we require from time to time, for the guidance of the House, but which, according to the return made to the House during last session, there is not information on file to enable the department to furnish. As regards the main section, that restraining the judges from extra judicial work, the object is the same as in the section of the Bill of last session. But, during the discussion in committee last session, it was urged that the wording of the section I sought to introduce would not have the effect of carrying out the object I have in view. And, although I still think that it would have had that effect, I have changed the wording to some extent, so that it may be perfectly clear that the section of the present Bill will have the effect of restraining the judges from going outside their judicial duties.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903 — AMENDMENT— FIRES STARTED BY LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 62) to further amend the Railway Act of 1903. He said: Subsection 2 of section 239 reads as follows:

> Whenever damage is caused to crops, lands, fences, plantations, or buildings and their contents, by fire started by a railway loco-

motive, the company making use of such locomotive shall be liable for such damage and may be sued for the recovery of the amount of such damage in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The amendment is merely to strike out the words 'crops, lands, fences, plantations, or buildings and their contents' so that this section may be applicable to any sort of a yard, or any property whatever through which the railway runs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW SENATORS.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N. B.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister if the report in the press to-day is true which states that the Hon. John Costigan and Mr. Daniel Gilmore have been appointed to the vacant New Brunswick seats in the Senate?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If my hon. friend will renew his question to-morrow I will be able to give him an answer then.

CANADIAN SEALERS IMPRISONED AT MONTEVIDEO.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the government whether any representations have been made to them on behalf of the four men belonging to the schooner 'Alice Gertrude,' who have been imprisoned by the Uruguay authorities. I have a letter dated November 22, 1906, from these four men complaining of their treatment. The substance of the letter is this: That while on the sea, on the South Atlantic ocean, they got astray from their vessel, and when they were trying to make land they were picked up by a Uruguay cutter, put in prison, and treated cruelly; that they have been over a month in that place and have not been granted a trial; that they cannot get any satisfaction from the government, and do not know what is going to be done with them. They say that the British legation has apparently done all in its power for them, but that the legation cannot help them without assistance from the Canadian government. The request is that the matter be looked into, and the attention of the government called to it. They say that they cannot get any compensation for the false imprisonment to which they have been subjected; that they are losing all their season; that their families are dependent on them, and that one of them has a wife and seven children who are probably starving, or at least in very distressed circumstances. Possibly the government has already received some communication on the subject. The names of the men, so far as I can make them out, are John McAtasney, Wm. Ryan, Jas. Keating and Harry Shrider.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). We are informed by the imperial government that these men have been released. I understand, however, that some claim is to be made against the government of Uruguay in connection with this case.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I received a similar letter with regard to this vessel some days ago, and the day after I received the letter I understood that they had been set at liberty, otherwise I would have made mention of the matter. I think probably they were released since the date of the letter the leader of the opposition has just read. I have not my letter with me, but the next day after receiving it I saw in the paper that they had been released.

THE REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the government whether a copy of the Revised Statutes is to be placed on the table of the House seeing that a Bill is now before the House to confirm them?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are being printed now. The Bill will come up to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand some copies have been printed and are available. I am not asking that each member should be supplied with a copy of the statutes in advance, but merely that a copy should be laid upon the table of the House before we consider the legislation for confirming that revision.

QUESTIONS.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. What was the total number of immigrants who entered Canada from the 31st March, 1901, to the 30th June, 1903?

2. What were the numbers destined for each of the provinces of the Dominion during the above-mentioned period?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The total number was 224,697.

2. Distributed as follows:

Maritime provinces	$ 8,941
Quebec	29,547
Ontario	27,158
Manitoba	66,829
Northwest Territories	75,842
British Columbia	11,097
Yukon	97
Destination not shown	5,186
Total	$224,697

MOTOR CARS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the Department of Railways decided to use motor cars on any part of the Prince Edward Island Railway?

2. If so, is it on the main line, or on any or all of the branches?

3. Has the department any reliable data as to the cheapening of the train, by adopting this system? If so, what is the cost compared with the present system?

4. When and where is the first experiment to be made, (a) where are the cars manufactured; and, (b) what is the cost of each car?

5. If train service is to be considerably reduced and satisfactory, does the government propose to proceed with the building of branch lines in Prince Edward Island, notably branch lines to New London and Rustico and branch from North Wiltshire to Victoria?

6. Does the government intend to take any action in reference to the building of those lines during the present session of parliament?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The department hopes to be able to utilize motor cars on the branch lines of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

2. Answered by number one.

3. There is a great deal of information bearing upon the question, in general terms, the cost per mile is about half of regular trains.

4. On the Intercolonial Railway at St. John, Halifax and Moncton. (a) Amherst; (b) The cost of the car without machinery is $11,300.

5. The determination of this question is dependent upon the issue of the experiment on lines already established.

6. The government has the matter under consideration.

WRECK OF STEAMER 'STRATHMORE.'

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government directed any investigation to be made into the circumstances attending the wreck of the steamer 'Strathmore' on or near Michipicoten island, in Lake Superior, in November last? If so, when was such investigation ordered, what officer was appointed to take the same, and has any report been made to the department?

2. Did any loss of life occur as a result of the wreck?

3. Is the 'Strathmore' a Canadian boat? If so, when and where was she registered, and who was her master?

4. When and where was her hull last inspected, prior to the wreck, and by whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. A report was received at the Department of Marine and Fisheries from the collector of customs at Cobourg in accordance with general instructions under section 22 of the Act respecting the registration and classification of ships. As there was no loss of life the department did not consider it necessary to hold a formal investigation.

2. The department has been advised that there was no loss of life.

3. Yes. She was registered at Cobourg, Ont., April 9, 1906. P. Sullivan is mentioned in wreck return as master.

4. At Cobourg, Ont., April 9, 1906. By M. R. Davis, of Kingston, government hull inspector.

STEAMER 'OSCEOLA'—'GOLSPIE.'

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. When and at what port was the steamer 'Osceola' (afterwards called the 'Golspie') imported into Canada, and by whom?

2. When and where was the steamer 'Golspie' registered as a Canadian vessel?

3. Where and when was the hull and machinery, respectively, of the steamer 'Golspie' last inspected, previous to her wreck, and by whom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. On July 17, 1905, at Hamilton by William Magee, of that city.

2. On July 17, 1905, at Hamilton, Ontario.

3. On August 29, 1906, at Port Dalhousie, Ontario, by William Evans, government hull inspector of Toronto.

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS ON GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Are there any life-saving stations established or maintained on Lake Huron and Lake Superior by the government of Canada? If so, when and where were they established, and at what cost are they maintained?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). On Lake Huron there are three life-saving stations, viz.:

Goderich established in 1885. Maintained at an average cost of $275 per annum.

Collingwood established in 1885. Maintained at an average cost of $300 per annum.

Kincardine established in 1903. Maintained at an average cost of $294 per annum.

There are no life-saving stations established or maintained on Lake Superior.

WRECK ON SS. 'MONARCH.'

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has any report been made to the government concerning the wreck of the steamer 'Monarch,' off Isle Royale, in Lake Superior, in November last? If so, when, and by whom was such report made?

2. Was there any loss of life in connection with the wreck?

3. Did the government furnish any tugs to go to the assistance of the wreck? If so, what tugs were furnished; under whose directions and at what cost?

4. Has any investigation into the cause of the disaster been directed by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? If so, when was such investigation ordered, and who is the officer conducting the same; and has his report been filed?

5. When, and by whom was the hull of the 'Monarch' last inspected before the wreck?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes, on the 9th December, 1906, by W. H. Brunell, an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, who was stationed at Port Arthur at the time. A report has also been forwarded to the department by the Collector of Customs at Port Arthur in accordance with general instructions under section 22 of the Act respecting the registration and classification of ships.

2. Yes, one of the deck hands was drowned.

3. Two tugs went out to the assistance of passengers and crew; the tug 'James Whalen' brought crew and passengers to port, but the owners would not take remuneration for work, owing to the fact that the tug was already in the employ of the government as an ice-breaker. The owners of the 'Monarch' paid the other tug, by name the 'Laura Grace,' for its services in accompanying the tug 'James Whalen.' The items of cost have not been received in the deparement.

4. An investigation was ordered by the minister as soon as the matter was brought to his attention. The matter is now being investigated ?

5. The hull was inspected on June 4, 1906, by William Evans, hull inspector.

KENTVILLE RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How many acres of land were taken by the government for the Kentville rifle range?

2. From whom was it purchased, and what price was asked by the vendors, and how much did this land cost the vendors ?

3. What sum was offered by the government for these lands ?

4. What value was claimed by the vendors for these lands before Referee Crawley, and what was allowed by the referee ?

5. What was the amount of the award made by Judge Burbidge, of the Exchequer Court, in the matter ?

6. Has an appeal been taken from Judge Burbidge's award ? If so, what has been the result ?

7. What were the costs in the case, and who pays them ?

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

1. 623 acres including Aldershot camp grounds and rifle range.

2. (a) Acquired by expropriation from B. H. Dodge.

(b) Price claimed was as follows :—493 acres at $20, $9,860 ; 100 acres at $25, $2,500 ; 30 acres at $30, $900. Buildings, including several houses and outhouses, $1,850. Trotting park improvements, grading, buildings, &c., $4,000. Total, $19,110.

(c) According to evidence given before the Exchequer Court, the vendors paid $7,000.

3. $20 per acre, amounting to $12,460 for the 623 acres. Two valuators, T. P. Calkin of Kentville and W. R. L. Foster of North Kingston, valued the property as follows :—623 acres at $25, $15,575. Timber on land, $2,275. Buildings, &c., $2,740. Total, $20,590.

4. (a) $45,000.

(b) $38,125.

5. $22,649.

6. Appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada by the claimant and a cross appeal by the Crown. The appeal was dismissed with costs in the Supreme Court, and the cross appeal was allowed with costs in the Supreme Court. As a result the judgment was reduced to the amount tendered by the Crown, viz :—$12,460 and interest, and no costs to the Crown in the Exchequer Court.

7. The costs have not yet been taxed. The claimant pays them.

CONTRACTORS' DEPOSITS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amounts were paid into the office of the Receiver General during the fiscal year 1905-1906 on account of contractors' deposits for security, and by what contractors were these sums paid ?

2. Were any deposits forfeited to the government during the said fiscal year ? If so, who were the contractors, and what were the amounts ?

3. What cheques were received as security from contractors during the said fiscal year, and held by the departments which received them, and from whom were they received ?

4. What is the total amount now in the hands of the Receiver General and of the several departments, respectively, belonging to this account ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). It would be more convenient to produce this information in the form of a return, and I would be pleased if my hon. friend would move accordingly. In the meantime I have given instructions to have it prepared so that there would be no delay.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

NICOLET AND ST. GREGOIRE MAILS.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Is there a mail service between Nicolet and St. Gregoire, in the county of Nicolet ?

2. What is the distance between the two places ?

3. Is it daily ?

4. Who has the contract for the carrying of such mails ?

5. What is the price paid by the government to the contractors for the year ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.

2. 8 miles.

3. Semi-daily.

4. Joseph Page.

5. 99 cents per annum.

NICOLET POST OFFICE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Is the government building a post office at Nicolet, P.Q. ?

2. Were tenders asked for such a building ?
3. How many tendered, and what was the amount of each tender, and the name of all those who tendered ?
4. To whom was the contract awarded, and for what price ?
5. When was the building commenced ?
6. How much has been paid already on such building ?
7. When will the building be completed ?
8. Who was appointed to supervise the work ?
9. What were his qualifications ?
10. How much is he paid ?
11. How much has he received already ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Two tenders received : Joseph Bourque & Cie for $14,500 ; Ls. Caron & Cie, for $16,700.
4. To Joseph Bourque & Cie for $14,500.
5. Contract signed June 26, 1906.
6. $4,370.
7. Contract to be finished by the 30th October, 1907.
8. Mr. P. Rivard.
9. Mr. Rivard was recommended to this department as a very competent man to supervise the work.
10. $3 per day.
11. $501.

COST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. What is the total cost of each public building built by this government in the following towns and cities :—Guelph, Bowmanville, Alexandria, Wingham, Clinton, Sarnia, Strathroy, London ?
2. What is the total revenue from each building per annum, and what is the total expense in running each building per annum ?

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

1. Guelph, public building built 1877-8—addition now being constructed at a cost of $46,989. Total cost, $89,408. Bowmanville, $36,401.66. Alexandria $18,766.83, plus $10,800 the estimated cost of making good damages by fire. Total estimated cost, $29,566.83. Wingham, estimated cost. $31,000 not yet completed. Cilnton, $20,645. Sarnia, $92,219.20. Strathroy, $29,514.50. London, public building built in 1858-9 and 60. In 1905 a contract was awarded for alterations to the amount of $27,290 ; work is not yet completed. Total estimated cost of building, including heavy repairs, $119,236.54.

2. (a) No actual revenue is derived from public buildings, they are built to house the various branches of the service.

(b) Cost of maintenance for 1905-6 :

Guelph	$1,695 75
Bowmanville	794 13
Alexandria	717 12
Wingham (not yet completed).	
Clinton	476 01
Sarnia	$1,180 47
Strathroy	859 28
London, public building	3,527 77

LEASE OF SWAMP LANDS.

Mr. SHAFFNER asked :

1. Have any swamp lands or other lands adjacent to Lake Manitoba been leased to any person or persons during the past eighteen months for sporting or other purposes ?
2. If so, to whom ?
3. What were the prices paid ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. None.
2. Answered by answer to 1st question.
3. Answered by answer to 1st question.

CARRIAGE OF COAL.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked :

What amount of coal from Canadian mines was brought to the port of Montreal in the year 1906 : (a) in British vessels ; (b) in foreign vessels ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The quantity of coal from Canadian mines brought to the port of Montreal in the calendar year 1906, was as follows :

(a) In British vessels, 404,102 tons.
(b) In foreign vessels, 1,085,340 tons.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL WATER-POWER.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has the government taken any action in regard to the Beauharnois canal since the delegation of Montreal aldermen and citizens interviewed the Prime Minister and his colleagues upon the subject of said canal ?
2. Has the water-power in question been disposed of ? If so at what date, in favour of whom, and upon what terms ?
3. Have any new tenders or offers for said water-power been received since the date of said Montreal delegation ? If so, from whom ?
4. How many proposals has the government received in regard to said water-powers, and from whom ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.
2. Order in council has been passed authorizing the lease of said water-power to Messrs. McIntyre and Robert, or such other company as may be formed by them upon certain terms and conditions. The lease is now in course of preparation by the Department of Justice.
3. No.
4. No other proposals have been received.

MAILS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What are the terms of the Post Office Department's contract with the Prince Edward Island Railway for the carriage of mails over its system ?

2. Must such mails go through continuously to destination, as elsewhere ?

3 Have they gone through in the past continuously ?

4. Were there any complaints ?

5. Was there any redress ?

6. Has the Post Office Department debited the Railway Department for failure or damage ? If so, how much ?

7. In view of the winter time-table of the Prince Edward Island Railway, as published, does the Post Office Department intend to provide a more suitable and expeditious way of carrying the mails by train service or otherwise ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The Prince Edward Island Railway is paid for the carriage of mails $76 per track mile per annum, which entitles the department to use any and all trains operated, and 50 cents per running mile for special trains required during the winter.

2. Mails are placed on the trains and sent through to destination on the same conditions as on the railway trains throughout every other province in the Dominion.

3. Mails have been carried in the past on the same conditions as now, namely on the time table prepared by the railway company. This has always been the condition and is now the condition in all the provinces in the Dominion.

4. No complaint has been made to the Post Office Department.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. No.

7. Mails are now being carried on all trains provided by the railway company.

THE BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Was an investigation held on the Beauharnois canal in the year 1906 ?

2. What was the cause of the investigation ?

3. What are the names of the persons implied ?

4. Who was appointed commissioner, and by whom ?

5. Was he sworn, and by whom ?

6. What is the remuneration of the commissioner ?

7. Has he been paid anything yet as fees or other expenses ? If so, how much ?

8. Has a report been made, and has it been or will it be acted upon ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.

2. Alleged friction between superintendent and his employees.

3. J. M. Dechene, superintendent, William Charrette and William Bellec.

4. F. X. Dupuis, of Valleyfield, by order in council dated July 4, 1906.

5. A commission was sent authorizing him to hold an investigation under oath.

6. The amount not yet fixed.

7. No.

8. Yes, and the action to be taken is under consideration.

THE LEGAL BARREL.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

Is it the intention of the government to bring in legislation to carry out the resolution passed at the Dominion Horticultural Council last March, with regard to the legal barrel ? If so, when and how ? If not, why not ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). It is not the present intention of the government to give effect by legislation to the resolution, as the government has found that those engaged in the fruit industry have diverse opinions on the subject.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FRUIT IMPORTS.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What does the Minister of Agriculture intend doing in the matter of a successor to the late Richard Burge, D. F. inspector ?

2. Are there any applications for the place ? If so, who are the applicants ?

3. What are their qualifications ?

4. Is it not essential that the fruit imported into Prince Edward Island be properly inspected ?

5. Has the minister heard of any infringements of the Marks Act on the island ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The matter is under consideration.

2. It is not usual to give such information as is asked for by this question. Several names have been suggested and will be considered when an appointment is made.

3. It is not usual to give such information as is asked for by this question.

4. As regards the inspection of fruit going into Prince Edward Island, that province should be treated as the other provinces of the Dominion. In the administration of the Fruit Marks Act no discrimination is made against that province.

5. With the exception of a few minor violations of the Act, due to negligence rather than wilfulness, and of such a nature as to cause no injury to the purchaser of the fruit, there has been but one violation of the Fruit Marks Act reported on fruit grown in Prince Edward Island. There have been a number of cases of violation discovered in that province on fruit grown in other provinces.

TUBERCULOUS CATTLE FROM NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

What progress, if any, is being made by the tuberculous cattle brought up here from the Experimental Farm at Nappan, N.S., and now taking the open air cure ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The tuberculous cattle brought from the experimental farm at Nappan, N. S., and now being kept in the open air in the vicinity of Ottawa, are showing very

satisfactory results from this method of treatment. None of them have died of the disease, nor have any developed clinical symptoms since the commencement of the experiment. One cow, palpably affected, shows marked improvement, while a number of animals which reacted distinctly to tuberculin on previous occasions, failed to react when tested in September last. Last year's calves proved to be free from disease and it is hoped that a majority of the present year's crop will also be raised without becoming infected. The animals are adapting themselves in a remarkable manner to changed conditions under which they are now being kept.

EXPERIMENTAL STATION IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What negotiations have so far taken place with regard to the establishment of experimental staions in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere ?
2. Where are they to be located ?
3. What will they cost for site, buildings, &c.
4. What to maintain yearly ?
5. What are they to be devoted to especially ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Negotiations are in progress for the establishment of an experimental station in Prince Edward Island, the site to be provided by the local government, but the location has not yet been definitely fixed.

A site has been obtained for an experimental station at Lethbridge, in Southern Alberta. Several sites have been examined for an experimental station in Northern Alberta, but as yet the selection of one has not been made.

It is also intended to establish a station in Northern Saskatchewan, but so far a site has not been obtained.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The land for the station at Lethbridge has been donated. The plans of the buildings, &c., are not yet all prepared. When completed they will probably cost from $10,000 to $12,000.

The cost of the buildings, &c., for the other stations cannot be determined until the sites are obtained and the plans prepared.

4. On the average about $5,000 per year.

5. Crop growing and treatment of the soil.

The experimental farm at Lethbridge consists of 400 acres, 100 acres of which can be irrigated. This will be devoted to experiments with various crops grown under irrigation, the idea being to determine how water can be used to the best advantage with different crops, especially bearing in mind economy in the use of water. The remaining 300 acres consists of land that is too high to admit of irrigation, and it is proposed to devote this to dry farming, including the testing of many important farm crops and the adopting of special methods of treatment of the soil to economize moisture.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What changes have taken place in the personnel of the Department of Agriculture, or its divisions, during the past year ?
2. Who has gone out, and why ?
3. Who have come in, and why ?
4. How many full-fledged commissioners are now recognized
5. How many more have been asked for, and by whom ?
6. Is it the intention of the minister to create these as demanded by the agricultural interests of Canada ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. P. E. Ritchie, B.A., B.C.L., a 1st class clerk in the department, made chief clerk and registrar of copyrights and trade marks, vice J. B. Jackson, deceased.

F. W. Hodson, live stock commissioner, resigned.

Dr. J. G. Rutherford, the veterinary director general, in addition to that office, was appointed live stock commissioner, vice F. W. Hodson.

Geo. Johnson, D.C.L., the statistician, resigned.

S. A. Bedford, superintendent of the experimental farm, Brandon, resigned.

N. Woolverton, appointed superintendent of the experimental farm, Brandon, vice S. A. Bedford.

G. H. Hutton, appointed superintendent of experimental farm for Northern Alberta.

W. H. Fairfield, appointed superintendent of experimental farm, Lethbridge.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Dairy commissioner, seed commissioner, live stock commissioner, exhibition commissioner.

5. None during the time mentioned in the question. Previously there were requests from several of the fruit associations of the Dominion for the appointment of a fruit commissioner.

6. It is the intention of the Minister to meet the needs of the agricultural interests of Canada as they may arise.

MARITIME WINTER FAIR.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What amount yearly, directly or indirectly, is contributed by the Department of Agriculture to the winter fair at Amherst, N.S.?
2. To whom is the money paid ?
3. To what is it devoted ?
4. Has the department an official responsible to it, with powers to verify expenditures and audit accounts ?
5. Is Mr. E. B. Elderkin an official of the department ? If so, what salary does he receive ?

6. What moneys have been paid in by the department since 1900, and have they been accounted for ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The Department of Agriculture contributes to the Maritime Winter Fair directly, $1,000 per year ; indirectly, the wages at the rate of $4 per day and expenses of the judges of live stock and of one or two additional speakers, and the wages and travelling expenses of the superintendent of the fair during the time engaged in preparing for and carrying out the fair. The department also contributes $200 per year towards the expenses of holding an annual sale of pure bred live stock as well as the wages and expenses of the superintendent of the sale during the period engaged in carrying out the sale.

2. To E. B. Elderkin, President of the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association.

3. The $1,000 is devoted to the paying of prizes and other expenses incidental to the holding of the fair. The $200 is devoted to the collection and inspection of the animals for the sale, also the advertising, and fees and expenses of the auctioneer.

4. Not as regards moneys granted directly towards the holding of the Maritime Winter Fair and auction sale of pure bred live stock. All other expenditures are verified and accounts audited by the accountant of the Department of Agriculture, and by the Auditor General.

5. E. B. Elderkin is not deemed an official of the department, as his employment is only temporary and intermittent. He is paid at the rate of $3 per day when employed by the department.

6. Since 1900, $5,885.60 has been contributed by the department towards the Maritime Winter Fair, and $400 towards the holding of auction sales of pure bred stock, the latter being started in 1905. As stated in reply to question No. 4, an audit of the expenditure of these grants has not been requested from the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association.

CHARLOTTETOWN EXHIBITION.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. What amount was contributed to the Charlottetown Exhibition Company, for a show last fall ?

2. To whom was it paid, and on what conditions ?

3. Have the conditions, if any, been complied with ?

4. What is the statement account ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. $10,000.

2. To the association unconditionally to assist it in extending and improving the exhibition generally.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. No statement of account has been received.

FISHING PRIVILEGES, NORTH SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has a concession been granted to Captain Coffey, and Frank Merritt, of Winnipegosis, for an exclusive privilege to fish Moose lake, Clearwater lake, Sturgeon lake, Cedar lake and Cumberland lake, lying north of the Saskatchewan river?

2. If so, when was this lease granted ?

3. For how long are the privileges to run?

4. What is the annual fee per year ?

5. Through whom were these privileges obtained?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No. They have a license, renewable for five years, conveying the privileges of fishing in Cedar, Moose, Cormorant and Clearwater Lakes, with a limited amount of nets, which license does not prohibit fishing by actual settlers, to whom licenses for such fishing are granted. The fee on this license is $100 per annum.

They also have a five years' lease of the exclusive right of fishing pound-nets, for Sturgeon only, embracing Cumberland lake, The fee on this lease is $200 annually.

2. The license mentioned above was granted on the 1st April, 1905, and the lease on the 26th November, 1903.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

5. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC SURVEYS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What has been the total cost to the government in connection with the purchase of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway surveys east of Winnipeg?

2. In what amounts and upon what dates were the several payments, comprised in this sum, made by or on behalf of the government?

3. Will the government be required to make any further payments in connection with this purchase?

4. Have any other surveys been purchased from the Grand Trunk Railway on account of the National Transcontinental road? If so, at what cost and on what date?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $352,794.78.

2. August 10, 1905 ... .. $352,191 73
February 9, 1906. .. .. 603 05

$352,794 78

3. No.

4. No.

COAL TO BURFORD ARMOURIES.

Mr. COCKSHUTT asked :

1. Who has the contract for the supply of coal to the Burford armouries?

2. What quantity of coal has been supplied up to January 1?

3. What price per ton is being paid for said coal?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia) :

1. T. S. Rutherford.

2. Total quantity for whole season, 15 tons.

3. $7.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Are any parts of the Ross rifle manufactured by Messrs. Billings & Spencer, of Hartford, Connecticut? If so, what parts?

2. Are these parts dutiable? If so, under what clause do they come?

3. Is it the intention of this company to establish a branch factory in this country? If so, at what place?

4. Is this company incorporated in the Dominion of Canada? If so, under what statute or Act?

5. Who are the members of the company?

6. What contracts, if any, exist between this firm and the Ross Rifle Company?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). We have no information in the Department of Militia with regard to any of these questions. I have made inquiries at the Customs Department and find that nothing is known about the matter there.

IMMIGRATION TO EASTERN TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Had any action been taken by the present government prior to 1906 regarding immigration to the eastern townships of the province of Quebec ?

2. If so, how many agents were appointed since 1906, and what are their names ?

3. Are any statistics available regarding immigrants entering the eastern townships since 1906 ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to adopt a more active immigration policy in the eastern townships and other portions of the province of Quebec ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The Dominion Immigration Agent at Quebec was requested in 1903 to do what he could to send farm labourers to the eastern townships.

2. In 1906, one, E. W. Brewster.

3. In 1906,—624 immigrants were reported to have been received and placed by Mr. Brewster.

4. Yes.

NEW CARLISLE WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked .

Is it true that the wharf or extension of wharf at New Carlisle, constructed last season at a cost of $12,000, has been upset and broken in two and virtually destroyed ? If so, what is the damage ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). The wharf at New Carlisle was damaged, by recent storms, to the extent of about $4,000.

PASPEBIAC WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

Is it true that the wharf built at Paspebiac last season at a cost of $40,000, has been totally destroyed by the effect of the storms? If not, to what extent is the damage, and are there any papers on file with reference to this damage? If so, will they be produced?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). The wharf built at Paspebiac last season, at a total cost of $18,626.24, was seriously damaged by recent storms, and it is estimated that the sum of $5,000 will be required to make good the damages. Papers will be produced if asked for.

NOUVELLE WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

Has the wharf at Nouvelle, constructed during the last two years, been damaged by the force of the storms ? If so, to what extent ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Yes. Damages estimated at $500.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONTRACT.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Has the government given contracts for railway ties for any of the sections of the Transcontinental Railway, west from Quebec, and east from Winnipeg ? If so, to whom granted, and at what prices ?

2. How many tenders were received, from whom, and at what prices ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The government does not give contracts with respect to Transcontinental Railway supplies. The information respecting any contract entered into by the Transcontinental Commissioners will be furnished the department in a few days.

Mr. BERGERON. Will I let the question stand?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but I think you had better amend it.

CROSS POINT WHARF .

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Has the government bought any lumber at Cross Point, P.Q., or anywhere else, for the extension of the Cross Point wharf ? If so, from whom, and at what prices ?

2. Has the contract been awarded for this work ? If so, to whom and at what price ?

3. Has the contractor to take off the hands of the government the timber so bought by the government ? If so, at what price ?

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

1. Yes. Bought from following parties: Fred. Fraser, Pacifique Galland, Jos. Kean, Chs. Roy, Vincent Galland, Albert Ratty, Angus Ratty, John Doyle, Joseph Boudreau, Peter Sewell, Peter Galland, Jas. Dunaher,

Louis Ratty, John Ghearity, Peter Arseneau, Isidore Day, John Barthe, Percy Jellet, Jos. Galland, Peter Ghearity, Thos. Metallic, Fred. Quinn. Prices: 9 cents for round spruce timber; 12 cents for square timber; 3 cents for ballast flooring.

2. Yes, to Thos. P. Charleson, for $10,975.

3. Yes, at prices paid by department.

BELLEVILLE DRILL HALL.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. With what object did the government acquire land in Bridge and Pinacle streets in Belleville?

2. What, if anything, has been done, other than acquiring such land, towards carrying out such object?

3. Why has the object not been proceeded with more speedily?

4. Is the Department of Militia aware, that in Belleville there is an old established city battalion, and part of another, both of which have served their country in active service with marked distinction, that have been for some years without quarters in the matter of a drill hall?

5. What reason can be given for thus treating these militiamen?

6. Has the government since the destruction of the drill hall of the 15th Battalion Argyle Light Infantry, built any drill halls in other cities where there was no organized city battalion then in existence?

7. Has a drill hall been built in Woodstock? If so, when, at what cost, and for what purpose?

8. Is there a battalion of militia there?

9. If there has been discrimination between Woodstock and Belleville in this matter of accommodation for the militia, what is the reason for it?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I am informed by the Department of Public Works in reply to questions 1, 2 and 3:

1. For the purpose of erecting thereon a drill shed.

2. Specifications are in the hands of printers, and plans will be completed in a couple of weeks.

3. Delay was mostly due to the securing of land titles; to the lateness of last session, and to the large number of plans for buildings which had to be put in hand at the same time.

4. No. The officers' quarters of the old armoury are still being used as such. Accommodation for clothing is being provided in another building, also for arms in a third building.

5. Answered by reply to question No. 3.

6. A drill hall has recently been constructed at Woodstock, the headquarters of the 22nd Regiment—a rural regiment. This regiment, through the inefficiency of its senior officers, became disorganized in 1904, but recently its reorganization, as a city corps, has been decided upon.

The reply to question No. 7 furnished by Public Works Department:—

7. Yes. In 1904-5-6, cost to date, $71,721.20.

8. A city corps is in progress of formation and the headquarters of two cavalry squadrons may, also be located there.

9. Circumstances have prevented the erection of an armoury at Belleville, as expeditiously as at Woodstock.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. Was the dredging done in Bellevile harbour during the year 1906 done under the direction of the government or of the harbour commissioners of Belleville?

2. Who has the contract for such dredging, and at what prices?

3. What amount of dredging was done, and what the total cost?

4. What disposal as made of the material dredged?

5. Is the work of dredging and disposal of the material being carried on with a view to any particular plan of improvement of the harbour? If so, what is the particular plan?

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

1. Under government direction.

2. Done by departmental dredge.

3. 90,400 cubic yards. Cost $5,579.06.

4. Some was taken away in scows, some cast over as filling behind revetment wall.

5. The work consisted in deepening the channel along the south wall, near the bay bridge.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR REVETMENT WALL.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. Under what control was the revetment wall built along the east side of the River Moira and Belleville harbour?

2. Was the work done under contract and under plan and specification?

3. Who had the contract?

4. What has been the cost?

5. Was there an inspector or other officer employed to see that the work was performed according to plan and specification?

6. Has the work been passed by such inspector or other person?

7. Was any claim made for extras? If so, what? Was such claim or any part thereof, and if so, what part allowed?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Work under control of Harbour Commissioners.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke) moved for

A return showing: Reports of commissions, boards of inquiry, inspections, reports of individual officers, to the government, or any member thereof, including reports from the comptroller, commissioner, or any officer or member of the Northwest Mounted Police, the Dominion Rifle Association, or any member thereof, or the commandant, or any member of the Bisley team, regarding the efficiency of the Ross rifle?

He said:—In moving for the return called for by my motion, I am not actuated by any desire to embarrass the hon. the Minister of Militia or his department or injure the company of which Sir Charles Ross is the head. I think that in matters of a national character where the defences of our country are concerned, more especially the arming and equipment of our militia, the opposition should be willing to support the government to the utmost, provided, of course, that the measures proposed are of a straightforward nature and in the best interests of the country. The opposition is just as anxious as the government that the militia of this country should be armed with the best rifle that money and modern methods can produce. The Ross rifle certainly fulfils the first requirement, costing as it does as much as, if not more than any other small arm in the world's market to-day, and all we wish to know now Mr. Speaker is whether it is the best most up-to-date and withal the most serviceable arm that can be produced by modern methods. If it is we will hold up both hands for the Ross rifle. If it is not, we will at least have the satisfaction of putting ourselves right with the man behind the gun, the citizen-soldier whose loyalty is commensurate with his ability to shoot straight. Last year I asked a number of questions with regard to the Ross Rifle Company. They will be found in Volume 1 of the 'Hansard' of 1906, page 1372. I shall read the answers:

1. Under what statute is the Ross Rifle Company incorporated ?
2. Where is its head office situated ?
3. Who are the directors of the said company ?
4. Who are its shareholders ?

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

1. It is not incorporated under any statute. The name is a declaration of partnership by Sir Charles Ross, Bart., as sole proprietor.
2. Quebec.
3. Not known.
4. Not known.

I simply mention this in order to give the minister an opportunity of explaining, because I had in my hand at the time of asking the statute of 2 Edward VII., chapter 96, which says :

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, of the city of Montreal, Sir Charles Henry Augustus Frederick Lockhart Ross, the Hon. William Gibson of Beamsville, the Hon. Frederick L. Béique of the city of Montreal, Donald D. Mann, Frederick Nicholls, Wallace Nesbill, all of the city of Toronto, are incorporated under the name of The Ross Rifle Company, Limited, hereinafter called the company.

It goes on to say that the head office of the company shall be in the city of Ottawa in the province of Ontario, and furthermore that the capital stock of the company shall be $1,000,000 divided into shares of $100 each.

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. May I interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Worthington) to say that I was assured by Sir Charles Ross, who was in the city at the time I gave that answer, that the company was never organized ; that he could not organize the company and proceeded to carry on the manufacture himself.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I simply quoted this knowing that a satisfactory explanation would be forthcoming. I thought possibly that the minister was withholding the names, fearing that to divulge them would endanger the lives of the shareholders by suicide.

Some years ago a number of Ross rifles were manufactured and distributed and some of them found their way on to the Rockliffe ranges there to be tested by the men who would be called upon to use them. These men who were from all parts of the Dominion were engaged in a competition for prizes and would know more about a gun in five minutes than a headquarters' commission could know in six months. This test by these men seems to have been a casual afterthought on the part of the Militia Department, but it presumably prevented the militia from being armed with the Ross rifle at that time. Now we are told that the rifle has been improved.

I might say that at that time it was also found that in bringing the rifle sharply to the order the bolt dropped out, but this defect was believed to have been remedied and many other changes to have taken place in the Ross rifle, and we are told that it has been perfected and that a commission composed of some of the highest militia officers in the land have passed upon and approved of this rifle. The report of this commission does not seem to me entirely satisfactory. They approve of it to a certain point, but suggest a number of improvements which they hope will take place. For instance they say:

The chief objection or difficulty which was found in connection with the tests to which the Ross rifle was subjected was brought out in the endurance test. It was found that after heating, the breech of the Ross rifle closed with more or less difficulty, the action being very stiff, with occasional jamming, besides which a possibility of double loading exists.

Were this an inherent objection to this rifle, independent of details of mechanism, the board would regard it as a very serious matter, but Sir Charles Ross states that any difficulty in this respect can be effectually obviated, and the board submit herewith a memorandum from him in reference to this point.

Now it appears that the commission accepted the rifle subject to further improvements by Sir Charles Ross, and I would like to ask the minister if any further test has been made of the rifle since that time, otherwise I think that the acceptance of the rifle officially known as Mark II., or any other rifle, is decidedly premature, having in view the record of the Mark I rifle. This, I think,

is shown by the continued adverse criticism of the press and the public and the militia. I shall read a short paragraph from the Ottawa 'Journal,' an independent paper, commenting on the Ross rifle. This paper says, on April 27 of last year :

TRE ROSS RIFLE.

A pretty weapon ; a handy weapon at short ranges, a doubtful arm at long ranges, and costing the country several dollars more per rifle than it ought to.

Such were the words an expert rifle shot used to the Journal recently in regard to the Ross rifle, which the Dominion government is under contract to pay a quarter of a million dollars a year for during several years, until in short the whole defensive force of Canada is armed with it. A considerable number of riflemen, including many volunteer officers, have given opinions regarding this rifle to 'The Journal.' None has been very favourable.

That taken all in all it is superior to the present weapon with which the volunteers are equipped, no one has asserted ; while it is a comparatively expensive article.

The Dominion Senate, in which reference has been made to the contract, might do useful service to the country by instituting an examination of the question, and taking expert evidence as to the worth of the rifle. The matter is one of great importance to Canada.

That is from an independent journal, and I think it well voices the opinions which one hears from the 'man in the street' concerning this rifle. I do not wish to disparage the rifle in any way, but I have yet to hear of any one who is enthusiastic about the Ross rifle. A short time ago, we read that the Royal Northwest Mounted Police had given up the Ross rifle and gone back to their old arm. Moreover I have heard it repeatedly stated that the Royal Canadian Dragoons who ride with the rifle pounding in the saddle bucket are troubled with the bolts falling from the gun. And it is still stated that the difficulty of clogging from overheating still exists. Another important feature is the inability of the Ross rifle to take the gallery ammunition. I think that is a rather serious drawback, as was shown in the Buckingham and Hamilton riots, when gallery ammunition could not be issued for use in the Ross rifle. Another drawback is the cost of this arm. I do not go into that further than to say that I do not think the rifle is equal to the new Springfield rifle, the American arm, which cost, bayonet and all complete, at least one-third less than the Ross rifle. Concerning another point I may just preface what I have to say by reading a brief selection from the columns of the 'Daily Telegraph,' in relation to the supplying of the Ross rifle to the members of last year's Bisley team :

The latest announcement in connection with the Bisley team is that Sir Charles Ross, the inventor of the Ross rifle, has offered to supply each of the Canadian representatives at Bisley with a rifle of his own make. What has previously prevented the use of the Ross rifle was the ruling of the National Rifle Association that wind gauges should not be used in the matches. This year, however, the rule has been stricken out, so the Ross rifle, which is equipped with a wind gauge or vernier, may be legitimately used.

The generosity of Sir Charles Ross will be greatly appreciated. It is an immense advantage to a rifleman to have a couple of rifles along with him in case of emergency. The general utility and effectiveness of the Ross rifle make it doubly welcome. The members of the team will, no doubt, fully appreciate the kindness of Sir Charles.

Now, as the minister, no doubt, has heard since the return of the Bisley team, the generosity of Sir Charles Ross led him even further than that, if what is currently reported be true. We are told that he offered to duplicate any prize won by the team during the Bisley meet. But, I believe, not many prizes were won with the Ross rifle ; and, it is reported that they discarded the Ross rifle and used their old Lee-Enfields exclusively.

Yet, this is the rifle we have taken up in place of the rifle we discarded, a rifle in every way most satisfactory and desirable. Mr. Haldane, Secretary of State for War, speaking in May last said that the rifle in use by the British army had been subjected to the severest tests in South Africa and northern parts of India and had proven eminently satisfactory.

Now, one word as to the terms of the contract which the government has made. As I understand it, though I may not understand the matter aright, the government has made a contract with Sir Charles Ross under which he is to supply a certain number of rifles—I believe 10,000—a year, for a number of years. At this rate of supply, and with the advance that is going on in the manufacture of modern small arms, by the time this contract is completed, the Ross rifle will probably be obsolete. I would urge the minister to subject this rifle to a still severer test, a popular test which, if the rifle proved successful, would silence the adverse criticisms of press and public. In this connection let me read an article from the 'Citizen,' which I commend to the minister as outlining a very simple method of subjecting this rifle to a very proper test. I think the editor of the 'Citizen' takes a very impartial view of the case :

It would be manifestly unfair to reproduce the rumours that have leaked out concerning the weapon or to do anything to prejudice the force against it in advance. It may be the best small arm possessed by any country in the world. But the point is this, that no rifle should be adopted committing the country to an expenditure of two or three millions of dollars until it has been tried by the men who have to use it. We do not mean by a selected committee, but let a hundred or a couple of hundred of the rifles be distributed among the chief shooting regiments and rifle associations of the Dominion, so that they may try it even

for one day on the ranges, and report. There will not be any necessity for waiting for a formal report. If the rifle is not good there will be a howl from every pot-hunter from Halifax to Vancouver. The pot-hunter has his uses and this is one of them. He handles the regulation arm more than anybody else in peace time; he is an expert and he has direct pecuniary interest in seeing that he is armed with the best possible weapon. He may be inclined to be hypercritical, but the people of Canada want that rifle examined hypercritically before they pry themselves loose from two or three million dollars, for a weapon for their defenders, which, on a price basis, should be at least equal to the very best in the world.

Mr. Speaker, with these remarks I move the motion which has been placed in your hands.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I have no objection to offer to the tone in which my hon. friend (Mr Worthington) has approached the discussion of this question,—although, notwithstanding his assurance that he did not wish to do anything to injure either the department or the contractor, Sir Charles Ross, I do not think that a more useful and satisfactory discussion could have been had after the papers which he is asking for had been brought down and were accessible to himself and other members of the House. For, I think that if he had seen some of these papers, he probably would not have been satisfied to read the very unfair criticism which appeared in one of the newspapers in this city, designed—evidently designed—to injure the contractor, if not the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to begin at the beginning: I do not infer from anything which my hon. friend has said that he objects to the adoption by this country of the policy of making its own rifles. So far as I know, the whole country has approved of that policy, assuming of course that the rifle to be manufactured is a satisfactory rifle and is worth the money paid. I believed that that was sound policy. I knew that it was necessary to purchase 50,000 or 60,000 rifles during the next few years. We had only between 30,000 and 40,000 rifles available, and if we were to have an effective militia of 100,000, which is the number we have been talking about a good many years, it was absolutely necessary to have somewhere arms with which to arm these men in the event of trouble, and in any case, to give them an opportunity of learning the use of the rifle.

Now, I may say here without any hesitation that I would have been very glad if we could have secured the manufacture in Canada of the Lee-Enfield rifle. There are many reasons why it would have been desirable. It is a good rifle, and as my hon. friend has said, has stood the test of many years. It was the rifle which was in the hands of the militia, and it was the service rifle of the British army. In that view I took the trouble to approach some of the Birmingham people to see whether they would not establish a factory in Canada. As long ago as 1898 or 1899 I had some conversation with leading proprietors of the Birmingham Small Arms Co. They took the matter up but after giving it consideration they said they could not and would not do it, and I received an answer in the negative. Shortly after that, Sir Charles Ross, who I believe had been living in British Columbia some time previously, came to this city and saw me, as well as other members of the government. He said he was the inventor and the possessor of a rifle which had been proved to be very good, and if the government would adopt his rifle as its service arm he would be prepared to construct a factory in Canada and manufacture that rifle. I may say here that the rifle which Sir Charles Ross produced at that time, and which he is manufacturing now, uses precisely the same cartridge as the Lee-Enfield rifle, so there was no difficulty in that regard. That was a most important point, as my hon. friend or any other military man will understand and appreciate. Well, Sir Charles Ross was manufacturing rifles of the kind which he proposed we should adopt, he was manufacturing them in the United States, I believe, as sporting rifles.

Mr. FOSTER. Was at that time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Manufacturing at that time, largely by hand of course, but the same mechanism.

Mr. BERGERON. Where?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think at or near Hartford, in the United States. He manufactured a rifle, two or more, I forget how many, and brought them here as samples; and I forthwith, or very shortly afterwards, convened a committee composed of a number of the military men in this country to examine this rifle and advise me whether it was a good rifle, and would be a satisfactory arm to adopt. That board was convened in June, 1901, by the direction of the Minister of Militia. It was composed of then Colonel, now Brigadier General, W. D. Otter, president; Lieutenant Col. Anderson, who I may say is the engineer of the Marine and Fisheries Department; Lieut. Col. Sam. Hughes, of the 45th regiment, and Major Gaudet, of the Royal Canadian Artillery, superintendent of the cartridge factory at Quebec; and Col. J. M. Gibson, for many years and still president of the Dominion Rifle Association. That board was convened and sat from day to day at Ottawa, and subjected the rifle to many tests. The meeting was adjourned to Quebec where more severe tests could be applied at the Dominion Cartridge Factory there, under the direct supervision of this committee, and particularly of Major Gaudet. The tests ordered by the department were then begun, and at the same time the

Lee-Enfield rifle was subjected to the same ordeal as the Ross rifle. These tests continued on the 15th and 16th of August before the committee I have named; and Col. Gibson, having to leave Quebec on the 17th, the tests were continued on the 17th and 19th in the presence of Col. Otter and Major Gaudet, representatives of the committee. Now I need not trouble the House with reading these reports because they will be laid on the table of the House in answer to the return which my hon. friend is now moving for; but I will read one or two paragraphs of the report:

Speaking generally, the board believes that the Ross rifle has features which are of positive advantage over the Lee-Enfield, while it is contended by Sir Charles Ross that he can easily remedy any of the drawbacks which have been pointed out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What were the drawbacks?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was no serious drawback. I think one of the difficulties was that they called jamming in course of rapid firing, when the rifle became overheated. There is a long letter in this report from Sir Charles Ross pointing out how this difficulty could be overcome, and that was accepted as satisfactory by the committee. Col. Anderson was not present during the whole of the tests, but he wrote this letter:

I regret very much that I could not stay over to meet the other members of our commission to-day, but my work is imperatively urgent. I did, however, a good deal of useful work on Tuesday and Wednesday, as Major Gaudet will tell you. On Wednesday I took the sample rifles out to the range and fired and saw them fired.

Now I think this is a very good answer to my hon. friend who says that nobody in Canada who has tried this rifle, who has seen it and used it on the rifle range, did not condemn it. Here is the statement of one of the ablest engineers in Canada, a first-class rifle shot, and a man who would not put his name to anything which he did not believe to be true: He says:

I consider the rifle as a whole handier and more convenient to carry than the existing type.

I consider the Ross rifle as a whole handier and more convenient to carry than the existing type. I consider the breach mechanism superior both for quickness of firing and safety. I consider the changed sights an improvement. The insertable block for the foresight and insertable bead are both advantageous. The back sight on the samples will have to be modified as it now slips. I approve of Sir Charles Ross' suggestion to supply marksmen with half back sights and to allow marksmen to choose their own sights within prescribed limits.

Showing approval almost in its entirety of the Ross rifle. Then there is a letter here written by another member of the Commission, Colonel Sam. Hughes, approving also of the Ross rifle in quite as strong terms as did Colonel Anderson. I have here side by side the results of the tests applied to the Ross rifle and the Lee Enfield. I shall not detain the House by reading them, but may say generally that the Ross rifle came out of these severe tests quite as well, if not better than did the Lee-Enfield rifle.

On the strength of the reports of this Commission a contract was entered into with Sir Charles Ross; and perhaps I may here refer to certain provisions of that contract, as my hon. friend has referred to it in a manner which indicates that he has not taken the trouble to read it. He says that we are undertaking under that contract, to supply some 10,000 rifles a year, and it would take a great many years to arm the militia at that rate, which is quite true. And he says that by that time the rifle may become obsolete, which is equally true. But if he had read the contract, he would have observed that by notice at any time, the contractor is bound to stop the manufacture of this particular rifle. He is bound to make any changes the department may designate even to the extent of manufacturing an entirely new rifle. Those are the terms of the contract which has been laid on the table, so that there is no danger to the country such as my hon. friend anticipates.

After the Commission, to which I have just referred, had got through with its work, a contract was entered into and a factory built. Over $1,000,000 was spent by Sir Charles Ross and some 500 men have been employed there for the last two years at least. And I am told that the factory is one of the most complete of its kind in the world. Well, difficulties arose. Some defects were discovered, as I believe has been the lot of every rifle in every country in the world. The Commission was called together again and again, examined the rifle and made further reports upon it. After the experience of its use, certain changes were agreed to, and a third meeting of the commission was held. An imperial officer was brought out here as an inspector and is now in charge of the inspection work. There was an inspector in charge from the first. Lieut.-Colonel Cartwright had charge of that work with the assistance of Major Gaudet. Later on it was found desirable—because Lieut.-Colonel Cartwright had other duties to perform as head of the school of musketry—to bring an officer from England, Major Pim, who, I think, has been in charge six or eight months or perhaps longer. Some time last summer the commission to which I have just referred had a meeting at Quebec and all the defects—minor defects I should call them—were carefully considered by that board in the presence of the inspector. A satisfactory solution of all the difficulties, such as they were, was proposed and I had the assurance—and I be-

lieve it was sound—that the rifle could be turned out as nearly perfect as it is possible for any rifle to be.

My hon. friend has referred to the rifle issued to the Northwest Mounted Police but he has not referred to the rifles issued to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I think a few, to the Department of Justice. So far as I have heard, the rifles issued to the Department of Marine have been satisfactory. There are no reports to the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the Department of Marine use them for ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are used on our cruisers. The department has progressed since my hon. friend was there. The Northwest Mounted Police asked for 1,000 of these rifles. I find that tests were made of the rifle by officers of this corps before the rifles were ordered. Here are the proceedings of the board held at Regina on January 19, 1903, and subsequent days and its report on the working of the bolt action of the Ross rifle after exposure to extreme cold. This board consisted of the commissioner, A. Bowen Ferry ; assistant commissioner J. H. McIlree and inspectors A. C. Macdonell and E. Gilpin-Brown. The report reads as follows :

On Monday the 20th, the thermometer being at a minimum of 8 during the night. This rifle was exposed, and on Tuesday at 3 p.m. a few single shots were fired, and then the magazine emptied as rapidly as possible. The action worked perfectly, smoothly and well.

On the 14th February, intense cold having tant commissioner, J. H. McIllree and insing only to —16 during the day, the rifle was again exposed for forty-eight hours and on trial with rapid and single firing the bolt action again worked with entire satisfaction.

J. H. McILLREE,
Asst. Commsr.
A. C. MACDONELL,
Inspector.
E. GILPIN-BROWN,
Inspector.

Approved.
A. Bowen Perry,
Commissioner.

In this connection when the 1,000 rifles for the Northwest Mounted Police were completed, an inspector of the Northwest Mounted Police—the same gentleman whose name is mentioned here, but who, I believe, has since died—sent Inspector E. Gilpin-Brown to Quebec to inspect the rifles with our inspector, Lieut.-Colonel Cartwright. These rifles were inspected and delivered to the Northwest Mounted Police. I have here a memorandum which Colonel White, comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police handed me about the beginning of the present session.

Mr. TISDALE. When were the one thousand rifles delivered to the police ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot give the exact date.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. TISDALE. Was it before or after this memorandum ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Long before. This is dated November, 1906 :

Memorandum *re* Ross rifles.

I have already explained to at least half a dozen newspaper reporters and correspondents that the police have found the rifle deficient in some respects. We purchased one thousand Ross rifles which I think were the first lot turned out by the factory. They were tested in Quebec before being shipped to the west. They were received by the police with much appreciation but on being subjected to severe tests such as rapid firing and hard usage sundry defects were discovered. The manufacturers have shown their desire to remove all cause of criticism ; they have offered to send experienced armourers to the Northwest to replace the defective parts, or, to exchange the whole of the one thousand rifles for others which are now being manufactured. I do not know what more I can say on the lines of what you term the efficient state.

Mr. BERGERON. When did they begin to make these rifles in Quebec for the Canadian militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The work of constructing the factory began about the end of 1903 or the beginning of 1904.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be over two years ago ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. I think some of the rifles were delivered in 1905 but I do not think any were delivered prior to 1905.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the contract entered into between the Department of Militia and Sir Charles Ross ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. March the 28th, 1902. The contractor undertook to deliver to the government 12,000 rifles between 1st January, 1903 and 1st January, 1904, but as a matter of fact none were delivered in 1904 as far as I remember, for reasons which the contractor has set out in writing and which are that he was disappointed in getting his skilled labour and in getting the material.

Mr. BERGERON. Was any money advanced to him before the rifles were delivered ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The contract provides that an advance may be made of 75 per cent of the cost of the rifles, this advance being made upon progress estimates signed by the inspector and by a chartered accountant. All advances have been made on that basis.

Mr. TISDALE. Are the progress estimates for the factory or only for the weapons ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They include materials which are actually being worked up.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money was so paid before the delivery of the rifles ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not remember, but I think it has been stated in answer to questions.

Mr. FOSTER. The first delivery was in 1905.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it was.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister did not state whether the mounted police had since found the rifles satisfactory and were continuing them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the arrangement between Sir Charles Ross and the police authorities was that it would be better for him to take back all these rifles and make a new issue. He preferred that to sending out his armourer as at first suggested and attempting to make changes in the rifles. I am not able to say whether the rifles have been returned and a new issue made, but I think that was the arrangement. I have said already that there never was a rifle in the world submitted to the test of actual trial in which unexpected defects did not develop, and on that point I would say to my hon. friend who moved the resolution and who read certain advice from some authority as to how the government should proceed ; I would say to him that it would be pretty difficult to submit a rifle to the test of the man behind the gun without having the rifle, and you could not get the rifle until you had a factory to manufacture it.

Mr. BERGERON. There were some made in Hartford.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, two or three rifles, but these were largely made by hand and the cost of these rifles would be comparatively very great. What is always done in every country is that the expert advisers of the government examine a rifle thoroughly, subject it to all the tests that are necessary, make their report upon it, and then the manufacture begins. That is done in England, in the United States, in Germany, everywhere. After all care has been taken in this respect there never yet was a case where defects were not discovered when the arm was put into actual use. But the defects in this case—and I am backed up in this view by Colonel Cotton, M. G., of the ordnance, a man of wide experience, and in fact by all the officers who ought to know—I am assured by them that there is no serious defect in this rifle, no defect which cannot be remedied and which has not as a matter of fact been remedied at the present time. In addition to that, the rifle had been subjected to the severest tests by a committee of the War Office in England.

Mr. TISDALE. When?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Recently, and the report is most satisfactory from the point of view of the military experts here. They found the same defects which had been discovered here, though not all of them, and all the defects which they discovered had been remedied before this report reached us. Now, I do not wish to say a single word against the Lee-Enfield rifle ; but, in justice to the Ross rifle and to Sir Charles Ross, I think it is only fair for me to point out that since these defects were heralded abroad to the injury of the Ross rifle and for the purpose of criticising the department in some cases, I had an inquiry made as to the Lee-Enfield rifle. Nobody had ever before heard a word about any defect in that rifle; and yet I have a list here of cases that have happened within the last two years, and I will read some of them:

Barrel burst, one bullet telescoping, another remaining in barrel.
Barrel bulged; obstruction in barrel (two rifles).
Breech burst, either defective bullet or breech not properly closed.
Barrel bulged, endeavouring to blow out pull-through.
Muzzle of rifle expanded.
Rifle burst, probably due to defective bullet jamming in barrel and second shot being fired.
Rifle burst.
Rifle burst. Proceedings of board forwarded.
Barrel burst, defective cartridge.
Barrel burst, due to rifleite cartridge being fired.
Barrel burst, defective cartridge, in two cases.
Striker damaged.
Barrel bulged, bullet telescoped.
Barrel bulged, obstruction in barrel.
Spread barrel near muzzle.
Broken bolt.
Broken bolt, barrel twisted and piece blown out near breech.
Bolt broken and bulge in barrel near breech.
Breech bolt broken and kink in barrel.
Breech bolt broken.
Cocking piece broken.
Breech bolt broken.
Rifle barrel burst at side.

In all the tests of the Ross rifle there has never been a case of a burst barrel.

Mr. BERGERON. What do they use in the Mounted Police?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think they use the Winchester. I say that during the last year far more defects have been shown in the Lee-Enfield rifle, which has been the service rifle in England as well as in Canada, than have been found in the Ross rifle. I mention this merely to show the House that the discovery of defects in individual rifles of the Lee-Enfield class is a matter of every day occurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did these defects develop?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At the annual shooting, at different places in our

own country, and in rifles which have been regularly issued to the militia. I asked for a report from the quartermaster general in order that I might know whether there was anything like an absolutely perfect rifle.

Mr. DANIEL. What ammunition was used in these rifles?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The same in both—that manufactured at Quebec, which is precisely the same as the service ammunition in England. I merely mention that incidentally, in justice to the Ross Rifle Company and to myself. Now, I do not wish to detain the House, because I assume that this matter will be discussed later on, when there will be much better opportunities of discussing it intelligently after the papers have been brought down. Although the papers moved for are most voluminous, I will endeavour to have the return prepared and brought down, so that when the militia estimates out of which these rifles are paid for are reached, we shall be better prepared to discuss the matter than we are to-day, and when my hon. friends will be better prepared to criticise intelligently than they can possibly be to-day, when they must necessarily base their criticisms largely on rumours published in the newspapers and circulated throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister a few questions. First, what answer has he to the fact stated by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) that the rifles which were presented to the men who went to England were not used; and, secondly, how many have been delivered under Mark I, which have proved to be not so good as those under Mark II, and have they been paid for, and are they owned as being unserviceable by the Dominion?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very glad my hon. friend referred to both of these points. Rifle shooting on the occasion of a great match like that at Bisley is a very particular sort of business. The Ross rifle had only been issued to the men composing that team just before they left for England, and it was the most natural thing in the world that men who had been shooting all their lives with the Lee-Enfield, engaged in a competition of that kind, would not be prepared to swap horses while crossing a stream, and I am not surprised that they stuck to the Lee-Enfield, which they knew, instead of using the Ross rifle, which had been issued to them only a few days before the match came off. That was the real reason, though possibly other influences may have been made use of to bring about that result. I do not know whether the officers in command of the team were prejudiced against the Ross rifle or not, I am not going to say anything about it, but I think this is a good enough reason. I think that any man of us, having shot with the Lee-Enfield rifle all his life, having learned to shoot in that way, engaging in a serious competition such as that, would not leave the rifle which he knew and take up one which he did not know.

No, in regard to the 9,000, I think that is the number, of the Mark I, they were not issued, they were delivered subject to final inspection and subject to changing the sight, that is applying the Mark II sight to the Mark I rifle. I am not prepared to say at this moment that inspection has been completed or not, but I am inclined to think it has been.

Mr. FOSTER. The rifles have been paid for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I am inclined to think so. Now, those rifles are perfectly good for military use, there is no defect in them which would interfere with their being used, no serious defect. The Mark II rifle is an improvement on the Mark I, and in the British army we have Mark I, Mark II, Mark III, Mark IV, Mark V, and more in all the different weapons, ordnance and rifles as well. The same ammunition is used, the same mechanism, but some slight change which might be considered an improvement constitutes a new mark. So that the Mark I is, if it has passed, as I think it has, the final inspection, a perfectly good and satisfactory weapon.

Mr. BERGERON. At Bisley, did they use the Lee-Enfield nearly altogether?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Entirely. My hon. friend has referred to cost and he ventured to remark that the new United States rifle cost one-third less, including the bayonet, than this rifle. I am sure he believes that, but I would like to know his authority because my information is very different from that indeed.

Mr. TISDALE. What is your information?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That the American service rifle costs more.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the new Springfield?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. BERGERON. My information is it is $17.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, that is a question of fact. I am informed otherwise, and as to the cost of this rifle compared with the English rifle I have several times answered questions. I think only a day or two ago, I answered a question in that regard and my information is that the rifle, landed here, would cost about $24 free of duty. To-day there is a duty of 30 per cent, less 10 of course upon a rifle imported from England, so that the price

of $25 is really less than the imported rifle would be with the duty of 20 per cent including inspection and various charges, which the government would have to pay. Under the new tariff there is no longer any free importation of rifles,so that that amount of protection, whatever it may be, will hereafter pertain to rifles, guns, ordnance, everything of that kind of a military character which may be manufactured in Canada. I do not believe that the people would consider the question of price so important; I think the policy of establishing in Canada a factory of this kind, the policy of a self-contained militia, is one that appeals to the patriotism and national spirit of the people of this country. But at the same time I recognize that the people must get value for their money, and that we must have the very best rifle that can be made for the money. I am as strongly impressed with that idea as any of my hon. friends opposite can be, and I am making as strenuous efforts as I can to bring about that desirable end.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). My hon. friend is right, I think, in saying that later on we may be in a better position to discuss this question when the papers are brought down, but in case the papers might be delayed, I might say a few words. I wish my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to take what I am going to say in good part, it is not a personal affair at all, it is very important, and I want to tell my hon. friend that if there were so many questions put to his department or to himself in this House it is due to the fact that there were many contradictions before the public. My hon. friend has spoken of rumours; it was more than rumours, official answers were given in another place which were conflicting, and I may tell my hon. friend that I have learned more this afternoon about this Ross rifle establishment than ever before, and I have no doubt that what my hon. friend has said is the proper explanation of the whole history of that establishment. Now, as to the cost, the information that I have is that the cost of the Lee-Enfield, is a great deal less than that of the Ross rifle, it is £3 7s., which I think would make it a little more than $15 or $16.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would that be the cost in the War Office factory or would it be the trade cost?

Mr. BERGERON. The information is what the government of Canada could buy that for in England, and I take it that is from the War Office. If my memory serves me well, in 1895, the government of that day bought $300,000 worth of rifles, and I think they were bought from the War Office in England, or anyway, they were bought through the War Office in England. I have not in my mind how much they were apiece, but I know that the vote was $300,000. This is a matter that we ought to sift thoroughly before the question again comes before the House. Surely we ought to be able to find out whether we can buy the Lee-Enfield rifle in England and at what price, whether at $15 to $17, or, as my hon. friend said the other day in answer to a question, about $24.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, only for the sake of argument, in the United States they have a rifle which has been adopted by the military authorities of that country which costs them $17. My hon. friend says that the question of money is a very secondary one in speaking of that factory in Quebec. Of course my hon. friend, since he has become a protectionist looks at things in a different way. I cannot go very far in my criticism when he has established such an industry in this country, employing, as he has told us, five or six hundred men and putting a very great deal of money in circulation in Canada. At the same time, I do not believe that the people of this country would be willing to go so far as that. They may not all be converted to the system of protection quite so thoroughly as he has been. One of our difficulties in the discussion of these questions, is found in the answers given in this House and those given in another place by a colleague of the hon. gentleman. It was asked, in another place, under which statute the Ross Rifle Company was incorporated. The answer was that there was no statute. To-day we have had for the first time, and from my hon. friend (Sir Fred. Borden), an explanation. We understand now that the company is not organized. I take advantage of this discussion to ask the Minister of Militia to bring down, with the papers asked for, a copy of the contract, entered into between the Department of Militia and Defence, and Sir Charles Ross personally, or with the Ross Company. This question of the incorporation of the company is one of the apparent contradictions which arouses the curiosity of the public concerning this subject. The question was asked in another place who were the directors of the company. Of course, there are no directors. What is the capital stock of the company? The statute fixes it, at a million dollars. But then there is no company, and so there can be no capital stock. My hon. friend (Sir Fred. Borden) said, a moment ago, that Sir Charles Ross, had spent a million dollars on this enterprise. If he had a million dollars to spend, why should he come before parliament in 1902 and seek incorporation for the Ross Rifle Company, Limited, with great names given as those of provisional directors and a capital stock of no less than $1,000,000?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will allow me again: I think it is only fair to Sir Charles Ross to say

that I am absolutely satisfied that no steps were taken under that act of incorporation. I do not think it is a new thing in Canada to incorporate a company and not organize under it. I think that has happened many times. Sir Charles Ross, for sone reason or other, was unable to go on with the company, but raised the money himself. I received a letter, which I have sent over to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and which my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) can see afterwards, which, I think, will satisfy him that everything is straightforward in this matter. Though Sir Charles Ross calls it the Ross Company, he is the owner of it himself from beginning to end, and has put his own money into it.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, I accept the hon. minister's explanation. But these are points that will explain to him the public curiosity about this industry in Quebec. It has been frequently stated in the newspapers, that Sir Charles Ross—I am not blaming him for it—had the advantage of many concessions given him by the city of Quebec, given on the explanation that he had little or no money to establish the factory. Bonuses were given him ; if I am not mistaken, he is now before the city of Quebec asking for a further bonus. As I say, I am not saying this with the idea of casting any blame upon Sir Charles Ross, but it will explain to him the public anxiety to know whether we are dealing with one gentleman or with an incorporated company. Another contradiction which is perfectly clear is shown by the answers given in another place and those given here. On April 24, 1906, a number of questions relating to the Ross Rifle were asked. Among them was the following :—

What is the price given for each of these rifles, and how much has the government paid up to the 1st January last ?

And the answer given to that question is :—

$25 each, $631,052.51.

Now, on January 9 last, I asked the very same question, as follows :—

1. On January 1, 1906, how many rifles had the Ross Rifles Company delivered to the government of Canada ?
2. How much had the government paid for those rifles, at that date, inclusively ?

And the answers given to those questions by the Minister of Militia were as follows:—

1. 6,500. 20,500 were delivered prior to November, 1906.

Of course, this latter part had nothing to do with my question, but I read it in order that the whole thing may be before the House.

2. $162,500.

Now, here are two colleagues in the same government, one of whom tells us that $631,052.51 had been expended for a certain purpose up to a certain time, and another member of the same government tells us that the amount was $162,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Which is right ?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) does not want to present an unfair view of the case to the House. I can assure him that the same officials made up the answers to the two questions. I never looked into the matter—it would be impossible for me to do so. Apparently there has been some mistake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It looks as if the '2' and the '1' had been transposed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That may be the explanation.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not casting any imputation upon anybody ; I am simply explaining why there is a certain curiosity, if not anxiety, about this concern. Now, in the question and answer I have already read, there is the other point to which I referred to in passing. I asked how many rifles the Ross Rifle Company had delivered to the government up to January 1, 1906, and the answer given shows that the number was 6,500. But the answer did not stop there, but went on to show that 20,500 had been delivered prior to November, 1906. That means that all the rifles delivered to the government, including the Marine Department, the Mounted Police, and the Department of Militia, numbered 20,500. At $25 a piece, that would be $512,600. I asked also this question :—

1. How many Ross rifles did the government receive from January, 1906, to May, 1906, and how much was paid by the government to the Ross Rifle Company till then ?

And the answer to this question was :—

(a) 4,000. (b) The total amount paid the Ross Rifle Company, including payments for rifles delivered and all advances on progress estimates under terms of the contract on rifles made to May, 1906, is $736,817.40.

Now, if we paid $736,817 we have paid $224,317 too much.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, we paid on advance. There were 52,000 rifles under order, including those delivered; there have been 24,000 delivered now, and there are 28,000 in course of manufacture upon which a portion, I do not know whether it is 25 per cent, or 50 per cent, or 75 per cent, but some advance has been made, upon the report of the inspector and of a chartered accountant.

Mr. BERGERON. I am taking the answer as given by my hon. friend. Of course this $224,317 then would be money paid in advance of receiving the rifles.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend will find in that last question which

I answered that I say, So much has been paid upon estimates on rifles under construction—I think he will find that there. That includes all amounts paid for rifles and upon progress estimates. I was careful to put that in, because I knew my hon. friend would want it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know my hon. friend did so; I did not ask for it, but he gave it to me with the answer to No. 4, as I gave it a moment ago. I did not ask for it, because these answers are very complicated; they are not the same in the other House and that is what makes it hard to understand. The fourth question was:

How many Ross rifles did the government receive from January, 1906, to May, 1906, and how much was paid by the government to the Ross Rifle Company till then ?

The answer to the first part is (a) 4,000. That means that 4,000 rifles were received by the government from January, 1906, to May, 1906, if it means anything.

(b) The total amount paid the Ross Rifle Company, including payments for rifles delivered and all advances on progress estimates under terms of the contract on rifles made to May, 1906, is $736,817.40.

If I include the 20,500 which were delivered it would amount to $512,500, but we paid $736,817.40, and I come to the conclusion that we gave to the Ross Rifle Company $224,317 to help them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Under the progress estimates upon the rifles not completed, of which there were between 20,000 and 30,000 over and above the 24,000, a large sum was paid. I cannot tell the exact amount, but the department has the account, there is no difficulty about it at all. There were always more rifles actually under construction than were being delivered.

Mr. BERGERON. There was in another place another question put and answer given, which I do not think are correct. My hon. friend knows that there was a change made between rifle No. 1 and rifle No. 2. Now rifle No. 1 has been pretty well discarded; No. 1 is dangerous, it kills as much behind as in front sometimes, and it had to be modified. Now, it was asked:

Have the modifications brought about in the Ross rifle increased the price of that arm, and does the rifle of Mark No. 2 cost dearer than the rifle of Mark No. 1?

The answer is, No. I think we find in the Auditor General's Report that it cost $15,000 to make the change between the two to prevent that rifle from shooting in every direction. There were $11,351 paid to make a change in the sight, and $3,648.50 to make a model of that new sight. So when the colleague of my hon. friend in another place answered that, he could not be saying what was a fact; he should have said, Yes, there is a difference of $15,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I again call your attention to that, because that is the reason why there is a disposition among the public to believe that there is something mysterious with regard to this Ross rifle concern. It was asked :

How much has been paid, respectively, for the rifles marked No. 1 and marked No. 2—(a) up to the first of January, 1906 ; (b) from the 1st of January, 1906, to the 1st of May, 1906 ? (b) from the 1st of May to the 1st of June, 1906 ?

The answer was :

(a) For Mark 1 rifles, $12,500 by the Marine Department, $25,000 by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Department, $200,000 by the Militia Department ; for Mark No. 2 rifles, $446,052.51 advanced by the Militia Department.

You climb up here to an item of over half a million dollars.

(b) For Mark I. rifles, $6,250 paid ; for Mark II. rifles, $18,750 paid, and $80,764.89 advanced by the Militia Department, and $300 paid by Justice Department for Mark II rifles.
(c) For Mark II. rifles, $12,000 has been paid by the Militia Department.

If you add these amounts together you get a great deal more money both actually paid for the rifles delivered, and in advance. According to the contract that has been mentioned here all these amounts are incorrect. I would advise my hon. friend to come to an understanding with his colleagues elsewhere in order that the answers given may be alike. My hon. friend insisted a great deal upon the fact that there is no rifle perfect. In fact, he read a page of all the accidents that have happened to the Lee-Enfield. He was asked whether it was not still the rifle used at Bisley and he said yes, which shows that after all the Lee-Enfield is the rifle accepted to-day by the British authorities. I am not criticising expenditures on rifles if they are properly made. If you can give our riflemen a good weapon I would rather have it made in Canada than in the States, or in England, or anywhere else, but I am not ready to pay a great deal too much for it. My impression is that we are spending a great deal more money than we should on militia affairs.

Our system is not all what it should be. We are wavering between two policies. We have not got a regular army and we are spending too much for volunteers. However this is not a subject which I intend discussing to-day but shall reserve it for another discussion. But one thing which particularly disturbs public opinion is the fact that while we are spending a great deal of money on a rifle factory in Quebec, it is very doubtful whether we are getting value for that expenditure. We have passed a contract with the Ross Rifle Company for over $1,000,000 and have al-

ready spent under it three-quarters of a million dollars. No doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is actuated by the best motives and believes he is making this expenditure for a good purpose, but the alarming feature of the business is this, that we are spending all this money on a rifle which is not recognized to-day by militia men as a good weapon and which has been discarded by the Mounted Police under an order of the Department of Militia which I read in this House, and which was not used at the Bisley competition although it was sent over there. I asked what is going to become of our Canadian militia if they are to be armed with a rifle which is not a proper and suitable weapon ? Would it not be better for us to get our rifles from England, because if we go on manufacturing the Ross rifle and then have to discard it and use the Lee-Enfield, we shall be spending money for nothing ? My hon. friend, in answering an interruption of mine, spoke of the Winchester rifle in the Northwest. But he knows that the Winchester is a very cheap rifle compared with the Ross. And it appears that although we are spending a lot of money on this Ross rifle and factory in Quebec, we are still buying rifles of other make. For instance in the Auditor General's Report for 1906, vol. 3, page W—285, I find that we bought from Ketchum & Co., in Ottawa, six Winchester rifles at $13.35 each, one at $14.20, one at $21.31. Well, if we can get Winchester rifles for $13, and $14 a piece, and they are the arms used by the Northwest Mounted Police, we are squandering money when we are paying $24 and $25 each for an article in Quebec which our Mounted Police cannot use. I would also ask what becomes of the rifles which have to be discarded when we are supplying our militia with these Ross rifles made at Quebec ? Are the old rifles given away or sold ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They use the same cartridges.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend feel compelled to increase the militia of Canada in order to find a market for his supply of Ross rifles ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but we are increasing the number of rifles in order to supply our militia.

Mr. BERGERON. If you get 10,000 new rifles a year, either you must increase the number of militia or else you have the 10,000 rifles of the year before which cannot be put to use. What becomes of these ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We want a few extra ones in store.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a fact that a good many of those old rifles, and even some of the Ross rifles, are given to colleges and other such institutions for the use of their cadets ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think either the Ross rifle or the Lee-Enfield is given. The Lee-Metford and another rifle have been given to cadets of colleges and schools and no doubt a good many of those we do not require may be disposed of in that way later on when we shall be able to arm the whole militia with the Ross rifle.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend, who has promised to bring down the information called for by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), bring down this information in addition ? What has become of the old rifles which have been replaced by the Ross rifle? And also have any of the Ross rifles been given to any of the institutions which have cadets?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is not particularly germane to the motion we have passed, but I can give that information at any moment. My hon. friend can get it from the Quarter Master General's report. We can tell exactly where every rifle in the country is.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. minister to say that a discussion of this subject would take place later on and would then take place at greater advantage because we would have all the papers at our disposal. I would ask that he should bring down the information I have asked for with the papers covered by the motion we have just passed. I might be allowed to refer to past history in this connection and in doing so have no desire to say anything personal. But my hon. friend was in the House a few years ago—in 1895—when the late government was in office, and when a purchase was made, through the War Office in England, of some rifles for our militia at a very reasonable price. I think the amount was $300,000. My hon. friend will remember the speeches that were then made in this House by his party and subsequently out of it against the government of that day in connection with that expenditure. They even went so far in their strictures as to give evidence of disloyalty. They said for instance that it was a sheer waste of money to spend $300,000 on rifles for our militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is mistaken as to the amount. It was $750,000 for 40,000 standard rifles. The price was something like $20 apiece, about $800,000 altogether or a little less.

Mr. BERGERON. As far as my recollection goes, the amount was $300,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It may have been in two financial years.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of 1895 when the Hon, Mr. Desjardins was Minister of Militia. At that time we were dragged from stump to stump, throughout my province anyway, and we were told that the government of Canada was led by men who wanted to Anglicize everything in this country and who were spending the people's money for the purpose of sending our youth from the province of Quebec to fight the battles of Great Britain all over the world. No doubt some of my friends suffered a great deal from those attacks. I did not fall down completely but had to suffer a great deal from them. It is a sweet revenge for those who were hauled over the coals on this question to find the present government spending, not merely the paltry sum of $300,000, but over $1,000,000 on rifles. On every ship that comes to Quebec they are besides bringing out guns and are in fact spending five times more than ever did the previous government on arms and ammunition, and then boasting that in doing this they are giving evidence of great loyalty. But what is eminently loyal on the part of these hon. gentlemen when over $1,000,000 expenditure is involved and eminently praiseworthy, was subject for the severest censure by them when there was only question of an expenditure of $300,000 for the same purpose. We on this side however are too loyal to take the stand against hon. gentlemen to-day which they did against us. The remnants of the old Conservative party in the province of Quebec are too loyal to excite feeling of that kind——

Mr. TALBOT. The remnants.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, but in the matter of quality they compare very favourably with hon. gentlemen opposite. This is why I have taken so much interest in this matter. I want the whole thing to be put before the people in its true light and in the broadest way, and I trust that my hon. friend, when he brings down the papers called for, will be in a position to show that the money he is spending is a proper expenditure, although it is five times more than what was spent on the same purpose ten years ago. Although it may not be quite pertinent to the subject under discussion, I wish to tell the Minister of Militia that in my opinion the present Canadian militia system is defective. I say this with all respect to the militia of Canada, but I cannot help thinking that it is very costly for certain purposes and not costly enough if we are really desirous of having an effective defensive force. I trust the hon. gentleman will bring down all the papers asked for, and that he will confer with his colleague in the other House, so that the answers given by ministers to the representatives of the pepole will be the same in both Houses.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to say as a civilian that I am very glad the member for Sherbrooke has brought this matter up. The Minister of Militia expressed the hope that it was not done to prejudice the Ross rifle. I am quite sure it was not. I am quite sure also that nothing better could have been done than to bring this question up so that all the information may be brought down to the House, so that it may be thoroughly thrashed out, and so that we may know whether or not there is cause for dissatisfaction; whether there are defects that are vital, or whether we have a rifle which is really good and which can be obtained at a fairly reasonable price. There is no plea that a man believing in the doctrine of protection, as the Minister of Militia does, can put forth which ought to have the least weight in a discussion of this question or in the formation of a policy, if there is not put in the hand of the Canadian militiaman the very best possible rifle. You give our citizen soldiers a rifle to make them as safe as you possibly can and to make the country as safe as you possibly can. And while I sympathize with the idea of making these things in Canada—if we can make a safe rifle here and make it without too much cost over what we could import an efficient rifle for—while I sympathize with the idea of making these rifles in Canada, at the same time it is absolutely essential that we have a perfectly safe and efficient rifle. I hope that the Ross rifle will prove itself to be an excellent, safe rifle, and that when the information brought down is sifted we may be able to come to a definite conclusion in favour of it. We have spent a lot of money on it, we have a manufactory at work here, and it would be better all round if the rifle proved to be the right kind. But, if that be not clearly and definitely proven we should not for a moment longer spend our money on it, even for the sake of having an arm which is manufactured in this country. The Minister of Militia gave us a very clear statement from his point of view of the history of that rifle, which will be useful to us when we come to the real discussion on this question. I would not place very much weight however upon the statement of the minister as to the defects in individual rifles. You never will get ordnance which will not prove defective in individual cases; but the ground of criticism against the Ross rifle, as I understand it, is that it is fundamentally defective. I do not understand the mechanism, but it is said to be radically defective in the bolt, which of course is not the same thing at all as a defect in a single barrel, or in some other part of a rifle through a flaw in the iron, or because of faulty manufacture. I do not think the minister will meet the argument as to there being an organic defect in the Ross rifle by showing that in other rifles there have been defects in particular cases.

Another point is that while it is a good thing to have a rifle manufactured in this country, we only get the full benefit of that when we have all its parts manufactured here. I would like the minister to inform himself as to whether we are really manufacturing that rifle in Quebec or whether we are merely importing parts that are manufactured abroad and putting them together here. It may be quite possible that at first they will not be quite able to manufacture every part, but if we are going to be self-dependent we must immediately put on the screws so to speak, and make that factory absolutely complete in order that all of the rifle may be manufactured in Canada. Then, if trouble arises and we are cut off from the source of supply whence we got the parts, we will not be hampered. Another point of criticism is that the minister thought it sufficient to say, and the committees that reported thought it sufficient to say, that although there were defects and difficulties, Sir Charles Ross had promised to remedy them. I do not think he ought to be paid in full until he has absolutely demonstrated that he can supply a perfect rifle, until in fact he had supplied it. The thousand rifles supplied to the mounted police was a very practical test. Fortunately there was no trouble at the time, but suppose trouble had arisen as trouble arose before, and the one thousand mounted police had only these thousand rifles to depend on it would have been an awful thing to contemplate, that if the hard usage of an actual campaign took place it were found there were cardinal defects in the rifle and that it could not be used for their protection and defence. After all, a rifle will be best tested in the rough usage of actual warfare or under conditions which are similar to actual warfare. Of course, I do not want the Minister of Militia to get up a war in order to test that rifle. But at least, in these days of field fights and sham fights, which are, I suppose, synonymous with actual fights except for the loss of men, there ought to be a way of testing that rifle under all the conditions of actual warfare, with the hard usage, the lack of time for minute attention and the like of that which the service must meet when it gets into the actual war for which it is designed. Until a test like that has been given to the rifle, I would not feel that it has been really tested.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I omitted to say that the rifle had been issued to the permanent force some time ago, and is, I think, being used by the infantry in that force. Of course, that would not meet exactly the idea of my hon. friend, but it has been used in target practice and is being used every day in military evolutions by the permanent force. We think that is as good a practical test as we can give the rifle.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they Mark I or Mark II?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think Mark II.

Mr. FOSTER. The last observation I have to make is with reference to the cost. I have said that I would rather for my part have the rifle for our militia force made in Canada, if it could be made successfully, than abroad, because I believe that a country which is going to be a great country should be self-dependent as far as possible in the matter of its own defence. But I would like the minister fully to inform himself and the House as to whether we are paying inordinately for this rifle. We want to pay generously in the initial stage of the manufacturing process. As my hon. friend knows, being himself now an ardent protectionist and having studied the question, protection costs a little at first, but probably ultimately it brings you to the point where you can buy the article at home as cheaply or more cheaply than you can abroad. My hon. friend acknowledges that it will cost a little more. I am willing that it should, but I am not willing that we should pay an inordinate profit. I asked the minister what he thought was the cost of making the rifle. In ordinary circumstances, if you ask a man what it costs to make his goods, he will tell you that that is his own business; but when the manufacture is for the state, I think the government has a perfect right to know what its exact cost is. I do not think it would prejudice parliament to know that, because I think parliament would be willing to allow the manufacturer a reasonable profit, but not an inordinate profit. I am not saying that there is an inordinate profit, but I hope we shall have information which will make our minds clear as to that.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). This subject is a very important one, both to the militia and the country generally, because if we are to have a militia force at all, it should be armed with the very best rifle the country can produce or buy. I was very glad to hear the Minister of Militia say that while the Ross rifle had defects, those defects were such as could be remedied; because there is no doubt that the experience which the forces of this country have had of the Ross rifle has brought those defects very glaringly to the front. The experience which the third regiment of artillery in my own constituency has had with this rifle has been the experience which the Northwest Mounted Police met with, according to the statement of Colonel White, the controller of that body. A rifle needs to be more than fit to shoot straight, to have a low trajectory, a strong bore, a good sighting, and all that; it must also be capable of standing a little rough usage. Even in drill the handling which a rifle gets tests the strength of its different parts. The corps in my own town had some three hundred rifles issued to them, and when they

used a portion of these rifles on May 24 last, the result was that during the practice two of the breech blocks flew back, and the broken parts escaped, narrowly escaping hurting the faces of the men using them. So that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was not very far wrong when he held that this rifle was almost as dangerous to the man behind the gun as it was to the man in front of it. Another glaring defect was observed in this rifle, in that a small screw in the breech was very apt to break, even with the handling the rifle got in ordinary drill. This was supposed to be on account of the screw being over-brittle. The consequence was that the officers of the Third Regiment were afraid to have the men use the rifle any longer, and the corps had to dispense with its rifle practice last year. That is all I have to say. I am very glad this matter has come up, and I am especially pleased to hear the minister state that all of these defects can be remedied, because I am quite at one with him in believing that if a good rifle, such as our militia forces should be armed with, can be made in Canada, it ought to be made in Canada; but I do not think that in such an important matter as the arming of our militia, any risks should be taken. The department should find out early whether the Ross rifle is one which can be sufficiently remedied to make it safe to distribute to our men. If it is not, the department should cease to buy any more or have anything more to do with it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I fear that the minister has misinterpreted the object of my motion. I had no intention of decrying the Ross rifle. If any injustice has been done to the Ross rifle or the Ross rifle company, it has not been done by the discussion here this afternoon, but it has been done by the Militia Department in prematurely issuing to the militia of Canada a rifle which had not been thoroughly tested. The minister referred back to the commission which inspected this rifle, whose report will be found in volume 2 of 'Hansard' of 1906, at page 3408. One of the commissioners was a major-general. Mr. Speaker I have no higher opinion of the report of a major general on a rifle than I have of the report of Corporal Smith on the Bisley team. Then there is another colonel, a former president of the rifle association, presumably a good man. The third man is the superintendent of the Dominion arsenal. These all report that the rifle is a fairly good one, subject to a rider which they impose that Sir Charles Ross will make certain improvements. All I wish to know is whether the commission has sat and reported on that rifle since these improvements have been made. I see that for one of the men on this commission the name of another has been substituted who is assistant to the A.A.G.M. I do not know whether that is 'Amateur Athletic Gun Maker' or not, but I should advise the minister not to take the opinion of sappers, gunners and marines, on this matter, but to submit the rifle to a thorough and practical test that will forever silence the adverse criticism of the public or will so perfect this rifle that there will be no further subject for criticism.

The minister has said a good deal about the defects of the Lee-Enfield rifle. It was a most harrowing tale, I almost thought while he was speaking of the bursting of the arsenal in which these were made. I may say I have been on active service three times and on two of these occasions the Lee-Enfield was used entirely and I never heard of anything happening such as the minister has described. The minister also says that in the history of every rifle there are defects, that these defects are bound to occur. I agree that they are bound to occur, but I hope that in the history of any department rifles with these defects such as mentioned have not been issued to the militia of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

INTERNATIONAL WATERS—NIAGARA.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved:

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence and telegrams, since the 1st January, 1901, to the present time, touching the interest of Canada in the boundary line between Canada and the United States at Niagara Falls, and also with respect to the waters of the Niagara river, which have been confided under any order in council or otherwise, to the determination or report of the International Waterways Commission.

He said: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the House that anything I may say on this motion is said solely in the interest of Canada and not for the purpose or with the intention of finding fault from a party standpoint with the government or any committee or commission the government may have appointed. My sole object is to bring to the knowledge of every member of the House certain facts of which I think every member should have knowledge, facts which, in my, opinion must be taken notice of if we are to avoid unavailing regret in years to come. I speak in the hope that I may do something to prevent this House acting in a way which will cause that regret. Last session a report was brought down known as 'Return from the International Waterways Commission on conditions as to Niagara Falls and their recommendations in relation thereto.' Paragraph 3 of that report is as follows:

The commission therefore recommend that such diversion, exclusive of water required for

domestic use or the service of locks in navigation canals, be limited on the Canadian side to 36,000 cubic feet per second, and on the United States side to 18,500 cubic feet per second, and in addition thereto a diversion for sanitary purposes not to exceed 10,000 cubic feet per second be authorized for the Chicago drainage canal, and that a treaty or legislation be had limiting these diversions to the quantities mentioned.

Now, it is probably known to every member of this House that I represent one of the two boundary counties on the Niagara river, the county of Lincoln, the county of Welland being the other. It is natural, therefore, that members of the House should expect me, representing a constituency of that kind to inform them of matters, knowledge of which I have special opportunity to acquire. If I had nothing to say it is reasonable for other members of the House to infer that nothing was occurring there worthy of the attention of this House. It is in that spirit that I speak of these matters. I am a Canadian first. I wish not to say anything or to imply anything to the effect that the government is not doing its duty so far as its knowledge goes, or that the government's commission is not doing the best it can so far as its power will allow. Representing the county I do, I have heard much of what has been going on along that part of the international boundary for the last two years. I should not be doing my duty if I did not inform parliament and every member of parliament concerning the facts which have come to my knowledge. Now, according to the report that I have read the International Waterways Commission intend to recommend a treaty or legislation by which the United States will be given 28,500 cubic feet of water per second and Canada 36,000 feet. In other words, they propose that the United States shall get over 7 sixteenths of the flow on Niagara and Canada less than 9 sixteenths. Now, in looking further into this subject I found the summary report of Dr. Spencer, who had been employed by government to examine and report upon the Niagara river. Dr. Spencer says:

It may be added that the water-power that passed over the falls during its highest stage in May, 1905, reached 267,000 cubic feet per second; during its lowest stage in February the discharge fell to 164,000 cubic feet per second. These figures would correspond to 4,900,000 gross horse-power for the larger figure, and 3,021,000 gross horse-power for February. But the total work done by the river between the two lakes will double this amount.

Also, at page 88 of the blue-book, which is the second page of this report:

Less than one-tenth of the total discharge of Niagara passes over the American falls, the remainder coming down through the Canadian channel between Goat island and Queen Victoria Park.

Having this official information before me as a member of the House, it was natural that I should consider in the light of it the rumours going about in my part of the country that the United States had very carefully located the boundary line and was hurrying this matter along while apparently the Waterways Commission were not considering very much in the bargain they were making what proportion of water flowed on either side of the boundary line. What was I to do? I went down to the locality and interviewed Dr. Spencer there. He told me that the quantity of water going over the falls was then from 90 to 93 per cent on our side of the boundary line and only from 7 to 10 per cent on the American side. This is the flow over the Niagara Falls properly so called. Of course, there is a cataract higher up the river where there is an intake of the water for power purposes. At that point, Dr. Spencer informed me, the percentages are 20 to 25 on the American side of the boundary line, and 75 to 80 on the Canadian side. So, according to the flow of water, Canada is entitled to 75 to 80 per cent. In other words, the United States would be entitled to one-half of what the Waterways Commission proposes to give them, and Canada will be entitled to one-third more than it is proposed to give her—that is, Canada is property entitled to 12·16 and she is getting 9·16, or three-quarters of what she is entitled to, and the United States is getting 7·16 instead of 3½·16, or twice as much as they are entitled to. Dr. Spencer told me that a map accompanied his report showing the location of the boundary line. That map was not in the copy of the report that I have received, so I wrote to the department here at Ottawa and a copy of the map was sent to me by mail. I received it last October. Looking at that map I find where that boundary is shown, away east of the Horseshoe Falls and very near the American Falls. This being the case, I naturally sought more information. I wrote to Dr. Spencer asking him for information. He had in the meantime gone to Washington, where he lives. He is a Canadian, born in Nova Scotia and lives, I do not know whether temporarily or permanently, in Washington. He kindly replied to my letter. This was in November last. His reply was in the following terms:

2019 Hillyer Place,
Washington, D.C.,
November 5, 1906.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry about my Niagara work, I may say that in the Preliminary Report of the Geological Survey of Canada for 1905, there should be a short account by me of the recession of the falls with a map, which also shows the boundary line, approximately located. I located the line at the falls more accurately this September which is marked on a copy of said map inclosed. I have not a copy as yet of the report. Except on the map issued by the Lighthouse Board (United States) I know of no other map showing the approximate boundary correctly, hence

the erroneous ideas prevailing as to the ownership of the falls or the reasons.

Your inquiry about other features of the power question, discharge volume, and the effects of diversion upon the falls, &c., are fully considered in my report, several of the most important features of which have only lately been established. The results throw very much new light on the subject, which several most important points differing materially from prevailing opinions. I have succeeded in sounding under the falls and throughout the Gorge. These and other most important discoveries are shown on map No. 926, which should now be printed. But the manuscripts of the long main report is still in my hands, for reasons of which I refer you to the department.

On this map which Dr. Spencer has sent me, and which is a copy of the printed map got from the department, he has indicated with red ink where the water goes, and the depth of it on each side of the international boundary line. Among other things, he points out by that map that there is a strip of rock now almost bare on the far east side of the Horseshoe Falls, which are Canadian falls, running east to the international boundary, and Dr. Spencer says that if the present commissioners are empowered to use that water, in a year or two the rock will be absolutely bare, which rock is on Canadian territory. The House will see that not only is 80 or 90 per cent of this water upon our side of the boundary line; but if, as Dr. Spencer points out, the present franchises are used, there will actually be dry land on the other side of the Horseshoe Falls between us and the American boundary line, which we can utilize for any purpose we like, and which we would use, if we chose, as a barricade against the United States in regard to these falls. I know that some persons are talking sentimentally about the scenic beauty. I know that these gentlemen on the other side of the line are anxious to preserve the scenic beauty of the falls; but I am pointing out to the House that we alone have the power to destroy the scenic beauty, and for that reason, although we would give them justice, we should not give up any part of what we are entitled to when we not only have the right to insist upon all we have got, but could do them the very thing they don't want us to do if they did not give us what is only fair and what we ought to have.

Now being in that state of mind that I wished for more information, I asked some questions in this House at the beginning of the present session. On December 3, I asked:

1. Were any copies of a certain map presented by Dr. J. W. Spencer, printed, or engraved, by any department of the government, to illustrate a report on the recession lines of Niagara Falls ?

2. If so, how many copies were printed or engraved ?

3. Why was not the map included in the summary report of the Geological Survey for the year 1905 ?

I may point out to the House here that without that map one can form no accurate idea of the situation, unless he is fortunate enough, as I am, to have been in that locality. By merely reading the report a stranger to that locality could never understand what he should understand. The answer that I got from the Minister of Inland Revenue was this:

1. Yes.
2. 5,550.
3. The map was intended to accompany Dr. J. W. Spencer's report, the manuscript of which has not yet been received from Dr. Spencer.

Now there is evidently a mistake somewhere in the department. Dr. Spencer made his summary report, which was printed and published last year; here is a copy of it. He says in his letter that he sent this map to accompany the report, and the Minister of Inland Revenue being informed, I suppose, by some officer in the Geological Department, says that that manuscript had not been received, and therefore the map had not been printed. Now that was the position of matters on December 3, that is the answer made to that question. Then I saw Dr. Spencer again during the Christmas vacation, and I noted exactly what he told me. He said that there was friction between him and Mr. Low, of the Geological Department, as to his work, and how his report should be made, and what it should contain. That report, I may say, gives scientifically and in the best form the information as to whether what I am saying here to-day is correct or not. What I am urging by this motion is not only that these papers that may be specifically referred to in the motion may be brought down, but that some means should be taken by which Dr. Spencer should be hurried up in making that report; and if there is any such friction as he refers to between him and Mr. Low, some effort must be made by the government to allay that friction, so that we may have that report which will clearly demonstrate what is wanted, and give the most accurate information from a scientific standpoint. I then asked another question in the House on December 5 :

1. What steps have been taken by the government for the purpose of accurately determining the quantity of water passing over Niagara Falls on the Canadian side, and the American side respectively, of the internation boundary line ?

2. What steps have been taken by the government or by the Canadian members of the International Waterways Commission, for the purpose of furnishing evidence as to the proportion of water on the Canadian side, and American side respectively, through the said commission ?

3. Has the government any information of what proportion of the water of the Niagara River at Niagara Falls belongs to Canada, and what proportion to the United States, if the present franchises are not increased; if so, what are the respective proportions ?

The answer given by the government was as follows:

1, 2 and 4. The quantities of water which passed over Niagara Falls on the Canadian and American sides of the international boundary line respectively, cannot be accurately determined by measurements. These quantities have been variously estimated by competent hydraulic engineers who have looked into the question.

No special envidence in that respect was considered necessary by the International Waterways Commission who adopted the figures of the United States Army report of 1900 as being accurate enough for the purpose of determining the use of the surplus water available for power purposes, after providing for the preservation of the scenic beauty of the falls.

3. The government is aware that it would be of the highest importance to accurately determine the respective quantities of water on both sides of the boundary line, if it were possible.

I do not know exactly what those answers mean. The government admit that it would be well to get that information if it were possible. I do not know whether the government mean by that answer that it is not possible. If they do, I think that they are unduly afraid of the cost or of the trouble in getting the information, because Dr. Spencer assures me that in this manuscript of his, and in regard to which he has not been able to agree with Mr. Low, all this information is contained. That is why, as I said before, I think this House should get that report at once, the government should take strenuous means to get that report from Dr. Spencer, and let us see, he being the able scientist that he is, what the information is upon these matters which the government says it would be valuable to have if it were possible to get it. I may remark that these questions were put by me solely because I consider it of great importance that we should know about this matter before we make a bargain, because we cannot undo the bargain after we make it. There is a report of the commission recommending us to make a treaty or to pass legislation, and if I kept quiet, knowing what I do about this matter, until after that legislation was passed or the treaty made, I should consider that I alone was to blame, living in that locality, for not having brought to the attention of parliament the information which I possess. Now on December 13, I asked this further question?

Why has the manuscript of the report of Dr. J. W. Spencer, referred to by the Minister of Inland Revenue in answering questions on the 3rd December last, on page 445 of 'Hansard,' not yet been received, and what steps have been taken to obtain it ?

To that the answer was :

Dr. Spencer has repeatedly been requested to furnish the manuscript of his report under the terms of his agreement with the Geological Survey, but he has failed to do so.

I then asked :

What steps, if any, have been taken by the government, other than as shown by Dr. Spencer, on his recession map, to determine the exact location of the international boundary line at Niagara Falls?

The answer was :

The international boundary line at Niagara Falls was located by commissioners under article 6 of the Treaty of Ghent. They reported in 1822 and their report was illustrated by maps on one of which the international boundary line at the place in question was shown, and this continues to be the boundary line.

I also asked :

Is the boundary line shown by Dr. Spencer on his said recession map his final determination of the question ?

And was answered :

This is unknown.

One word about the treaty of Ghent that fixed the boundary line. A subsequent agreement was made by which Goat Island above the Falls was handed over to the Americans who gave water in return. The water of the river Niagara was given to Canada, and land—which everybody in those days, 1819 and 1820, wanted, when water was not considered valuable—was given to the United States. Everybody knows, who will take the trouble to look into that agreement—it will be found in the Ontario historical society reports, which I presume are in the library—that the United States compensated Canada for giving up the whole of Goat Island instead of only a part of it. Otherwise the lines would have divided Goat Island, and the United States compensated Canada by putting the boundary line where Mr. Spencer says it should go and giving the great bulk of the water to Canada. The trouble is that the present commissioners seem to be dealing with the question without considering the necessity of finding out where that boundary line is. Let me give another piece of information. I knew that in the counties of Welland and Lincoln during the last two summers, American engineers and surveyors have been surveying on our side of the river. What for? What have they been hunting up the old landmarks for? In order that they might ascertain where the actual boundary line now is, because it is a certain distance from each shore as that shore was in 1820 and 1822. The rocks have since then moved on both sides and the shore line has become changed. In some cases it has receded several feet and in others it is almost the same as it was. As you go along the banks of the river, you will find inlets in the precipices on either side caused by the rocks having fallen. Well, the American engineers have found out where that shore line was at the time the treaty of Ghent was made, and they

have ascertained where it is now. They know where that international boundary is, or ought to be, but they are careful not to say a word about it. No attention is evidently paid to it, and it is not brought up by the American commissioners. But, surely that is a most important factor in determining our rights. If we go on recklessly disregarding it, we shall probably wake up to the fact some five or ten years later and have to bemoan that we did not make sufficient inquiry at the proper time. We will then ask ourselves how it happened that we did not take the ordinary precaution of discovering where that boundary line was before making any treaty or legislation to confirm any bargain. So far we have the statement of the government that they believe it is all important that that boundary line should be determined, but on the other hand we have the commissioners which the government has appointed to deal with this matter going the length of recommending that a certain agreement shall be confirmed and become a treaty without considering that question at all. I agree with the government that it is necessary we should exactly determine where that international boundary line is before we make any bargain; but if I did not draw the attention of parliament to this, and if a treaty were made or legislation passed to confirm it, as recommended last year by the International Waterways Commission, we would find when too late that the Americans got twice as much water as they should have, and Canada got only three-quarters of what it should have. I am bound therefore to lay before government and parliament what I believe to be an absolute necessity in the case, namely, that Dr. Spencer's report should be obtained at the earliest possible moment. If then we should find that we are entitled to so much more, we will either get what we are entitled to or get some compensation instead. There are many things which Canada requires from the United States. There are lots of deals which can be made with the United States to the advantage of Canada, and if we give away anything to which we are entitled we ought to get something in return. If we are going to divide equally or practically equally the waters of the Niagara river with the United States, we ought to get some concession or advantage from them in return. Somebody seems to have sent Dr. Spencer the 'Hansard' containing those questions because, unsolicited by me, he sent me this letter which I received about January 4 or 5. It was sent to Ottawa and from Ottawa sent to me at St. Catharines during the Christmas vacations.

Washington D.C., Jan. 2nd, 1907.

'E. A. Lancaster, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—My attention has been called to the 'Hansard' of the House of Commons containing questions relative to the work on the waters of Niagara and the international boundary line and the government replies thereto, which were erroneous in placing the responsibility of furnishing the report on my failure to comply with the agreement.

He objects to the statement that he failed to comply with his agreement.

The work was stopped, according to my legal adviser, for want of the necessary means to continue the same, as it was impossible to complete it within the expected time. But although stopped in this way, I resumed it on my own responsibility and have continued it to completion at the present time.

I am bound to say the government was most fortunate in having such a man as Dr. Spencer to deal with in this matter.

During these last months, I have revised it in the field, including the boundary line on the recession map, and furnished the corrections on the large map already printed. The recession map as printed was only intended for the summary report for 1905. Before the revision, some of the most important results had not been established ; for instance, the discovery of a permanent lowering of the lake outlet from natural causes, with the consequent reduction to be made from the reported discharge of the river ; also the actual quantity of water on the Canadian side of the line, and the effect on navigation of the upper lakes—results, without the knowledge of which, not merely Canadian rights might be imperilled, but also serious consequences might arise to both countries.

My original instructions were for a complete report, which has only now been closed. Since the opening of the correspondence, I am happy to say that arrangements have been made for the publication of my report as rapidly as it can be got through the department.

Believe me,
Your obedient servant,
J. W. SPENCER.

Dr. Spencer was also kind enough to send me a photograph, which I value and want to keep, but which any hon. gentleman is quite welcome to see. He has marked in ink that shelf of rock running east and west from the international boundary to the far end of the Horse Shoe Falls, which he says will be bare if the present franchises are availed of. He from time to time has given me information which I have taken down. He says the United States army report of 1900 based on measurements taken from 1898 to 1900 in its relationship to Lake Erie level daily. Then calculated back to 1860. He says that suddenly about 1890 the lake fell by about a foot, that it has never risen that foot since, that consequently they did not deduct that fall of a foot for the fluctuations before 1890, with the result that the determinations as taken by the Deep Waterways Commission is 18,000 cubic feet per second too much, equivalent to 400,000 horse-power too much, or equal to the whole quantity Canada could take under the proposed agreement. These facts were stated

to me by Dr. Spencer and no doubt they will be stated in his full report which is to be made. They were stated to me verbally in my capacity as a member of parliament representing the people of Canada. I repeat that Dr. Spencer is as able a man as the government could employ. I have heard of his high reputation for a number of years past; he has been over the greater part of the world doing just such work as he was sent here to do. He has been employed in research work by the governments of different countries; because of course it is only governments that need the services of a man of that kind. Dr. Spencer tells me also that he has done borings, and soundings, and levellings to ascertain the actual old points by instruments. He says he has determined by hydraulics the rise of the river; he has investigated the results of these measurements for velocity and variableness of discharge; he has investigated because of the fluctuations of the lake and separated these fluctuations due to rainfall from those due to lowering of lake outlets. He has pointed out in a letter that the estimates of the United States army which this government has chosen to abide by holus-bolus is absolutely erroneous, at all events in one place. I am bound to say that I think this government is going to have another Alaska trouble on its hands if the Waterways Commission is not more careful as to where it gets its evidence from. I do not think the government was right in taking the United States army report of these years and without inquiry as to whether the conditions are the same now as when the reports were made. The Waterways Commission has been so anxious to make a bargain with the United States that they have accepted the United States army report in regard to this matter. I repeat that it is most important that that report should be scanned most carefully, and investigated, and criticised if you will, by some one like Dr. Spencer employed for that purpose by the Canadian government. These reports should certainly have been verified before being adopted by the commission appointed by this government to settle this question and to advise us as to the making of a treaty in regard to this question. The people of this country would have a right to blame me if they knew that knowing what I do know about this matter I had kept silent and allowed a treaty to be based upon any such evidence as a United States army report which I have discovered from Dr. Spencer is entirely erroneous. Dr. Spencer says that investigation also shows that the lakes are affected by diversions for power purposes and to what extent he says his new report will show, and what effect it is to have on the falls, and how much effect on the Canadian side and how much on the United States side, which necessitates the ascertaining of the proper boundary line. Dr. Spencer says also that it is common knowledge in the locality that United States officials have been all summer making measurements and putting in stakes on each side of the river and between the river and a mile and a half inland of the Canadian side, and noting every side road, and the position of the buildings and the old land marks there as would be done if they were making an ordinary military map. But we know they have no business to make a military map of our territory and we know that their purpose is to accurately locate the boundary line. They have located it no doubt; they have been at it two summers. Dr. Spencer says he has located it and has found that the United States is not entitled to that large proportion, but to a very small proportion of the water as regards the boundary line. Now, there are two maps made by Dr. Spencer, one large and one small and the United States army report is of 1900. Apparently the Waterways Commission did not know there were these maps, but they adopted the report that was placed before them by the United States authorities. Dr. Spencer says there were maps of the United States also and that these maps and reports do not agree one with the other. I do not want to suggest anything against the Americans ; I do not want to suggest they have two documents one of which they use for one purpose and one for the other, but Dr. Spencer says there are both United States army report and map of that year and the government tells us the commission has based its report on the report of that year. Now which of these—maps or reports—did the commission rely on ? For that reason also we must do nothing in regard to this matter except to tell the Waterways Commission to close up shop for a while ; we must do nothing else than stay the hands of the Waterways Commission until we get Dr. Spencer's report which will show exactly what our rights are, and then if we do give away our rights we will do so knowingly and expecting in the future some concession from the United States as a quid pro quo. Dr. Spencer tells me that the most important of the reports however is the one of 1903 and another of 1904 made by the United States government. Why did the United States government give the Waterways Commission one of the reports of 1900 when there is a more correct one of 1903 and another more correct one of 1904. It it a most fortunate thing, and the government is to be congratulated on having retained the services of a man like Dr. Spencer, who no matter if he does have a dispute with his superior officer, Mr. Low, in this case is still loyal to his employers. His superior officer wants to edit his report and change it and that I do not think to be proper. My sympathies are with Dr.

Spencer. I never would want a witness to let me tell him what he should swear to; I would let him make his own statement as he is responsible for it and I do not see why Dr. Spencer should not be let state his own views. Dr. Spencer is loyal to Canada and under the circumstances he says: I will go to the member of parliament in the locality who takes an interest in this matter, and he having applied to me I will give him all the information in the matter, and then I shall have to a certain extent washed my hands of the responsibility.

There are two later army reports than the one mentioned by the Waterways Commission, there is the report of 1903 and the one of 1904. Dr. Spencer says that either of these is more correct than the report of the Waterways Commission, and he gives the reason. They show the amount of water carried over the falls after 1900 and before 1903, but the full effects of it were not noticed until 1904, and the United States government had a report made in that year to show what the difference would be. Now, without knowing how the boundary affects Canada, we are giving up 1,800,000 horse-power and the United States are giving up less than 200,000 horsepower. According to the figures and what Dr. Spencer tells me, the United States are giving up one-ninth of what we are giving up, and they are entitled to from three-sixteenths to four-sixteenths, while we are entitled to over twelve-sixteenths. Then, the United States government have made full surveys and they have found that the diversion of the water will lower the levels of Lake Erie, Lake Michigan and Lake Huron from two to three feet, and thus affect the Welland canal and the upper lake harbours. The Waterways Commission may know that or they may not, but Dr. Spencer says that is the case.

Now, the press has lately stated that the United States government are pressing for a settlement of all outstanding questions with Canada. Well, from what I know of the Americans' way of dealing, when they think they have got you in a tight place, they do not give you much time to think matters over. Is it possible that they are pressing now for a settlement of these questions because they are afraid that we may learn some of these facts which would cause us to change our attitude and our willingness to make this bargain? At any rate, it is no harm to get the evidence from our own responsible employee, scientist as he is, and employed for the purpose of getting that evidence. Havng seen the necessity of engaging him, surely we ought not to make this bargain until we get his full report. If we see on the face of his report that he does not know what he is talking about, it will be time enough for us to make the bargain, instead of allowing ourselves to be stampeded by the United States government into making it now, because we have been too long about getting at the facts. Our right to the larger share of the power should not be surrendered. If we have that right, we should have it recognized in some bargain. I do not mean to say that we should get dollars and cents for it; but we should either get more water-power in proportion to what the United States are getting or else we should have it understood in some treaty or bargain with them that there is something coming to Canada for it as a quid pro quo.

There are two more significant facts to be remembered. It was the United States that started this matter of finding fault with the interference with the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls. Canada was going along looking after her interests and developing the water-power on her side of the river. All of a sudden the United States—I think because they wanted to make a bargain before we realized the true state of the case—discovered that the scenic beauty of the Falls was in danger. In connection with that Dr. Spencer stated to me that the United States government had been investigating the international boundary for two, years, but did not mention the fact in any way in these negotiations. That is the second significant fact, which in my opinion we should pay some attention to. Having ascertained exactly what quantity of water we are entitled to, they have never raised the question. Why have they not? If it were in their favour, they would raise it. They are justified in getting the best of us, if we let them. I do not blame them for doing that if they do not commit a crime; I do not blame them for not putting forward the evidence favourable to us; but I say it is a most significant fact that having taken the trouble during the last two years to locate the boundary, they have not informed the committee how it affects the division of the water.

In conclusion, I beg to say that we do not want to cry over spilt milk again. We have had enough heart burnings and dissatisfaction in connecton wth the Alaska boundary. I do not want us to have any more spilt milk to cry over; I want to save the milk from being spilt. That is my object in speaking to-night, so that hereafter we shall not be regretting that we got the worst of it in some arbitration in 1906 or 1907. My object is to prevent the injustice being done. My present opinion, subject to correction when we get more evidence, is that we are gong to have an injustice done us if we consent to pass that legislation which was recommended in the report of the Waterways Commission brought down last session as Sessional Paper 19—C. My principal object, I may say my whole object, in speaking to-night is to have this whole matter delayed until Dr. Spencer's report is received. If there is anything startling in that report, let it be worked out and checked over; and if it should be found that all I have said to-night is moonshine, no harm will have

been done. I have simply put before the House what I believe to be the true state of the case. I am satisfied from what Dr. Spencer tells me, and from what I see by the documents, that there is a great likli-hood that if the report of that commission is adopted we shall a few years from now be crying over spilt milk, as we did in the case of the Alaskan boundary. I have trespassed upon the patience of the House longer than I had intended to ; my apology is the importance of the subject on which I have been endeavouring to assist the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, there can be no objection whatever to the granting of the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), but I do not know that I would be doing him the justice to which he is entitled if I simply made that statement. I would like to know exactly the object which my hon. friend wishes to serve in this motion. If I understood him aright his principal object is to get before parliament a certain report of Dr. Spencer, which has been presented by him to Mr. Low, who is now the head of the Geological Department, and which Mr. Low has refused to receive. There is some misunderstanding, as I understood the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), between the head of the department, Mr. Low, and his subordinate officer, Dr. Spencer, as to the character of tenor of his report. I am not prepared to say who is in the right or who is in the wrong, whether it is Mr. Low or Dr. Spencer, but if the object of my hon. friend is to get the report of Dr. Spencer before parliament, this motion can hardly do that. This motion is simply to obtain from the House the necessary power to force the government to bring before the House what is in their archives at the present moment.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence and telegrams, since the 1st January, 1901, to the present time, touching the interest of Canada in the boundary line between Canada and the United States at Niagara Falls, and also with respect to the waters of the Niagara river, which have been confided under any order in council or otherwise, to the determination or report of the International Waterways Commission.

So far so good, everything which we have, orders in councils, reports, &c., shall be brought down. If the report of Dr. Spencer is in our archives it shall be brought down, but if it is not in our archives we cannot bring it down under this order. It may be that it would be necessary and advisable to have this report and it may be that Mr. Low should be ordered to receive this report, but as to this I cannot say at the present moment. I have to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) that if it be advisable to have this report of Dr. Spencer, which Mr. Low refused to receive, he will have to take some other proceeding in order to obtain it. Whether it should be obtained or not is a matter as to which I have no opinion myself, and I do not know whether my hon. friend is in a position to say whether Mr. Low is in the right or in the wrong in refusing to receive the report of Dr. Spencer. If I followed the remarks of my hon. friend correctly he was also intending to serve another object, that is to say that no action should be taken on the report of the International Waterways Commission, which has made certain suggestions to the House. The suggestion they made to the House was that with regard to the waters of the Niagara river, there should be a limit fixed and stated at once by treaty as to the amount of water that should be diverted from the main channel of the river. I forget the quantities now as stated by my hon. friend, but it does not matter for the purpose of the argument. At all events he will agree with me in this, that the suggestion, or rather the recommendation, which is made by the Waterways Commission is an eminently wise one, in so far as the commission recommends that by treaty between the United States and Great Britain the amount of water which can be diverted from the main channel of the Niagara river should be limited should not exceed a certain quantity.

Mr. LANCASTER. For each.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For each of the two parties. As to that there can be no difference of opinion, it is eminently wise, whether we consider only the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls or any other purpose, it is eminently wise that the amount of water to be diverted should be at once limited and that we should know exactly where we are in that respect and that you should not give unlimited power to either side to take water ad libitum.

But the main question to which my hon. friend wanted to draw the attention of the House was that the commission having proceeded also to apportion the amount of water to each party, in so limiting the amount to be diverted, in his opinion, the apportionment is not just and fair to Canada. At the present time I am not prepared to express any opinion on that; I have merely to suggest this to my hon. friend that the commission can settle nothing permanently. They can only make a report which is to be acted on by the United States and Canada, and it would be time enough when we come to consider that report and the action to be taken on it, what instructions we shall give to the commission or whether we shall agree with them or differ from them, to decide upon the merits of that apportionment. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) stated that in his opinion the apportionment is not fair to Canada, that we do not receive under the reccommendation of the commission the amount of power to which

we are entitled, according to the amount of water which flows on our side of the boundary line as compared with the amount flowing on the American side. The commission have reported that the allotment shall be seven-sixteenths to the United States and nine-sixteenths to Canada, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) says that this is not fair, or at all events that if we agree to this we should try to obtain some quid pro quo for the concession we make to the United States and he says whether we receive the compensation in land or trade concession or in any other way we should have a quid pro quo.

In my estimation this is not the way we should proceed about this. I am strongly of the opinion, and I have entertained that opinion for a long time, that we ought, apart from the action of this commission or that commission, to endeavour at the present time to settle permanently the question of the division of waters between Canada and the United States from Puget sound to the St. John river. There are many and many places where the interest of Canada and the interest of the United States come into conflict. On the Sault Ste. Marie river, for instance, on the Rainy river, on the Fraser river, on the St. John river, in all those localities we have vast interests which at the present time are in conflict between Canadians on one side and Americans on the other side, and if we can, in connection with this present commission, settle all those differences, for my part, I would not be averse to trying to get a quid pro quo here and a quid pro quo there. It seems to me to be the best way to settle this question, and I invite the serious consideration of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) to this view of the subject. I do not think it would be possible to obtain from the United States at the present time or at any time any quid pro quo in the way of trade concessions. We have been looking for trade concessions for a long time, but we do not look for them any more now, we have abandoned that idea long ago. We do not care any more to have these trade concessions. There was a time when we would have given a great deal to have trade concessions from our American neighbours; they chose in their own way to refuse these; we have done pretty well without them and at the present time we do not expect anything of that nature. I do not expect that we can receive any concession from the United States in the way of land, but if it were possible at this moment to settle all these differences which we have at the Sault Ste. Marie river, the Rainy river, the Fraser river, the Niagara river and also the St. John river, we should be doing as much as we can do for Canada under existing circumstances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I do not propose to discuss at length the general subject in connection with which some additional papers will perhaps be brought down; indeed I thought a very recent report of the Waterways Commission had been laid on the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is one that has come recently.

Mr. LANCASTER. It does not cover the Niagara river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not cover the Niagara river. I merely rise to suggest that if there is a report of Dr. Spencer to the effect mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and if that report has been made by Dr. Spencer as an officer of this government and if it is based upon the careful research and inquiry and investigation which have been indicated here this evening, it does not seem to me that in justice to this country any friction between Dr. Spencer and his superior officer should not for one moment be permitted to keep that report back from the House and the country. I think the right hon. gentleman should have made that qualification in pointing out the difficulty of placing that information before the public. The subject-matter of this report, according to the information of the hon. member for Lincoln, touches the very basis upon which the International Waterways Commission has proceeded. And the right hon. gentleman tells us this evening that he has no more hope of better trade relations with the United States. Well, that is a remarkable change from the song that the same right hon. gentleman sang years ago. We must assume that there is good reason for that change. One reason which has been put forward by the right hon. gentleman and his friends is that, when they came to the actual task of making a bargain with the diplomats and statesmen who represent the United States, they found it a very much harder task than that of criticising those who were engaged in that operation years ago. The right hon. gentleman found that he could not make a bargain, so far as trade relations were concerned, without sacrificing, as he thought, the interests of this country. The only thing my hon. friend from Lincoln is suggesting to-night is that the right hon. Prime Minister should take heed lest any arrangement made with regard to the boundary waters between Canada and the United States may be attended with similar results. One would think that the lesson that the right hon. Prime Minister had received in the negotiations, the futile negotiations, which he had carried on with the government of the United States would teach him reasonable caution in making any arrangement such as he has spoken of to-night. And one would suppose also that such a report as has been referred to by my hon. friend from Lincoln is one which,

whether it meets the concurrence of the head of the department or not, ought to be presented to parliament and made known to the people of Canada for what it is worth. I do not know what the intention of the government is so far as concerns a permanent arrangement with the government of the United States in respect of these matters. But I should think it wise for the government to make haste slowly, although I agree with the right hon. Prime Minister that it is desirable that some arrangement should be come to if possible. But so far as the waters of the Niagara river, or the boundary waters in any part of Canada are concerned, the enormous use of these waters which may be demanded by the interests of Canada in the future, should make us extremely careful as to the terms of any permanent arrangement For my own part, I should be inclined to doubt the advisability of making an absolute arrangement which would be good for all time to come, instead of an arrangement for a certain number of years, during which years the enormous development of this country might possibly make a reconsideration desirable. I do not desire to say anything further, except that I think that the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) did no more than his duty in presenting this matter to the House this evening.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). It seems to me, from the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) concerning the report said to have been made by Dr. Spencer and given to the director of the Geological Survey, that there must be a mistake. In answer to a question of the hon. member from Lincoln and Niagara some weeks ago, I stated that Dr. Spencer had been asked to prepare and submit a report, but, that up to the present time he had not done so. The facts of the case, as I understand them, are these : Dr. Spencer is an eminent geologist who was at one time connected with the Geological Survey of Canada and who is at present a resident of the United States. He was employed by the late director of the survey to make a geological examination of the Niagara Falls and district for the purpose of showing the recession of the falls and the erosion of the rocks by the waters there. He continued this work for a considerable time and was paid a considerable amount of money. The disagreement between the director of the survey and Dr. Spencer is that a larger sum of money than was originally agreed upon has been already paid to Dr. Spencer, and Dr. Spencer has never presented his report to the department. Mr. Low, very properly, intimated that when Dr. Spencer presented his report to the department he would be paid in full for his work. I think it would be a reflection upon Mr. Low to allow the remarks of the leader of the opposition to pass without this explanation. There has been no friction, so far as I am aware, between Dr. Spencer and Mr. Low. I may say, further, that Mr. Low, being in New York during the Christmas holidays, met Dr. Spencer, and, as I understand it, an agreement was come to at that time, that Dr. Spencer should complete his report and present it to the department. That work was not as I said, to determine an international boundary, but was entirely a geological report and intended for the Geological Survey. Necessarily, the quantity of water passing over the falls would be ascertained and noted upon the maps in connection with the report. We are anxious for that report and will make every effort to get it. And, as I understand, a verbal arrangement was made between Mr. Low and Dr. Spencer with respect to the unpaid amount which Dr. Spencer claims to be his due, and that the report will be presented shortly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister one question. He says that Dr. Spencer was not commissioned to make an investigation as to the international boundary line. Was anybody else commissioned for that purpose?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no knowledge of that. I speak for the Geological Survey. Dr. Spencer had nothing to do with mapping out the boundary line. Dr. King, of the Astronomical and Geographical Department is the man who would have charge of all boundary surveys in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John city and county). I think all will admit that this is an important question, that there should be some knowledge as to where the international boundary is; and if this official of the Canadian government, in the prosecution of his geological work has also been in a position to give definite and accurate information as to the boundary line between the two countries, surely it is important that the government should accept it and lay it before the public. After what has just been stated by the minister (Mr. Templeman) it seems to me that there can be no difficulty in having the report of Dr. Spencer among the papers called for by the resolution of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster).

Motion (Mr. Lancaster) agreed to.

COASTING TRADE—TREATIES WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the government of Canada should take such steps as

will secure for Canada the cancellation of existing coasting privileges now enjoyed by foreign countries, under imperial treaties, and to that end should open negotiations with the imperial government with a view to the abrogation or amendment of such treaties.

He said: Mr. Speaker, If I had known as much of the literature of this subject as I do now, I should probably have given different wording in my resolution. Like a great many other members of this House, and the majority of our people in Nova Scotia at least, I thought that this right existed in consequence of treaties between England and certain governments, as Norway, Sweden, Italy, Germany, Austria and some other countries. But I have not been able to find any treaty bearing on the subject, and I have been informed by an official that there is no such treaty in existence. I find also that this right to the coasting trade exists by order in council, and that this government has the power to cancel such right whenever they please. This being the case, I speak on the subject all the more readily.

This is a subject of the greatest importance to eastern Canada, and to that province from which I come. The shipping trade of eastern Canada particularly is of the utmost importance to the people of the maritime provinces. A few years ago Canada stood fourth among the nations of the world as ship-owners. Nova Scotia was the greatest ship-owning community per head that the world had ever seen. Only a few years ago my own county, the county of Hants, led them all, possibly with the exception of the county of Yarmouth. Our ships were literally on every sea in the world, and vast sums of money came back to the owners, and prosperity reigned all over the country. This shipping trade not only benefited us in our home life, but in our educational and even our religious life. The money coming back to that province was generously given to support colleges and public schools and erect better places of worship, which were well filled all over the province. Our young people received in consequence a better education, and I think that one of the results of our prosperity in the shipping trade is the fact that Nova Scotia has been able to send up to this House political leaders of great ability. But, Mr. Speaker, with the advent of steam and iron ships, all this has passed away. Instead of being the fourth nation in the world as ship-owners, we are now, I believe, the eleventh. At the present rate of our downward career in this regard, if a stop is not put to it, we shall soon, particularly if the Norwegians have their way, be not only the eleventh but the twenty-fifth or the one hundredth. It is, I repeat, of the greatest importance that our coasting trade should belong to ourselves, that our mercantile marine should be not only protected but encouraged.

Our people have it in their blood to follow the sea. Notwithstanding this decline in our shipping trade you will still find natives of Nova Scotia sailing the ships of other nations all over the world. If you go to Hong Kong you will find that the harbourmaster is a Nova Scotian. Take the largest steamers sailing out of New York engaged in the South American trade, and their masters are Nova Scotians. Our men, rather than go into other businesses, have chosen to enter the employment of other nations in order that they may still follow the sea. But they are all ready to come back again to Nova Scotia and sail our own ships, in our own coasting trade, if they are only allowed to do so on equal terms with foreign nations. But unfortunately they are not allowed to do so on equal terms. As it is, our seafaring men have been driven over the face of the earth to seek employment on the waters under other flags. Some of them, it is true, have turned their attention to farming, but they are doing it indifferently well; some have tried to be fruit-growers, and they are doing it indifferently well. Indeed, it is not in their blood to do anything else than to sail the ocean, and that they can do successfully. Down on the southern coast some of them have gone to fishing, and there they have succeeded. If you go down to the county of Lunenburg and around the coast to Yarmouth, you will find a large number of comfortable homes free of mortgage owned by the fishermen, and I think many of them have deposits in the banks.

Now I wish to speak concerning the present coasting trade by foreign ships. I know very little of the Pacific coast trade but what has been told me, and I am informed that, apart from the steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Americans are doing most of the coasting trade. Along the coast of Nova Scotia, both on the Atlantic, the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy, the Norwegians have driven our vessels from the sea. They have almost a monopoly of the coasting trade of Nova Scotia. In speaking on this subject last session I made the statement that there were forty steamships, some of them large, some of them of 7,000 tons burden, forty steamships alone in the employ of one firm carrying ore to the St. Lawrence ports and to Montreal. These vessels have succeeded so well under the unfair conditions that our men have to compete with, that this year they have added to their fleet three new ships. I read the following from a paper published in Sydney, Cape Breton:

> The Dominion Iron and Steel Company have chartered three steamers now being constructed in England, for a period of four years, and these boats will comprise their ore and limestone carrying fleet. The steamers are being built at the works of Sir Raylon Dixon, and two of them will be exact duplicates of the 'Chrknudsen' class——

That is a steamer carrying about 7,000 tons burthern.

—chartered to the Dominion Coal Company. These boats will carry ore from Belle Isle and will have a carying capacity of 7,000 tons. All these boats are owned in Norway.

Now, Sir, the question may be asked: How did the Norwegians get a monopoly of this trade? In answering that question, I may have to repeat some things that I have said on another occasion. The Norwegian captain and all his officers and sailors work for a less wage than any Canadian or American will undertake to work for. I have been told by collectors of customs that the usual pay of an able bodied Norwegian seaman is $8 per month, on a contract for two years. These men not only work at a smaller wage than our men do, but they live on food that our men will not live on. They buy scarcely anything at all in Canada. They bring everything with them, they cut down their expenses to a minimum, and then of course they can compete with and drive our Canadian vessels off the course. I have said that the Norwegian vessels, in our coasting trade, buy nothing in Canada. I believe all they buy in this country is sufficient vegetables to ward off the scurvy from their crews. They bring all their food supplies with them, purchased at home as ships stores. They bring everything they have to use. They make arrangements at home for emergencies. Spare spars, spare machinery, everything they can possibly need for an ordinary emergency they bring from their own country. I have known of cases where they were engaged in the carrying trade between our ports and the United States in which, if they wanted a barrel of beef or pork, they would not buy it in our ports. Or if compelled to buy in our ports, they would not buy it from Canadians, but buy it in bond from the United States. American beef and American pork they buy in bond at our ports. I have here a letter from the manager of the graving dock at Halifax, which is the largest and best equipped graving dock on the continent of America. In this letter he says:

At the close of the season a Norwegian vessel collided with another vessel in the St. Lawrence and we competed for the repairs to it against New York. Our bid was much lower than that of New York, but the Norwegian went to New York for repairs, simply because she could get a load at New York. She was done with her charter party, and it was more convenient for her to go to New York for repairs than to leave a little money for repairs in the country from which she had taken everything.

Canada has, with a great deal of energy, developed a great many of her resources. We have spent millions, and rightly so, in improving our harbours and dredging the St. Lawrence and vast moneys have been spent in developing other resources. Yet, after doing all this, we have stopped short of promoting the carrying by Canadian vessels of the articles we produce, and we allow foreigners, who leave nothing with us, to monopolize our carrying trade on the ocean.

Let me now suggest what is the remedy. I would say in brief that the remedy is, in the first place, to cancel the present privileges given to foreign bottoms and charge them a license per ton for carrying along our coast. But that remedy is not sufficient. I believe that the government should further assist our maritime people in building our own ships. With a coast extending along the Pacific and the Atlantic, with the vast inland waters which Canada owns, we are bound to be a maritime people in spite of ourselves, and we must of necessity develop our maritime trade. The question for the present government to consider is whether it shall have the honour and glory of assisting Canada in starting a maritime trade. Shall it lie with the present government to have the distinguished honour of helping Canada to work out her destiny in this respect? A bonus per ton for the building of iron ships and a license exacted from all foreigners to carry our coasting trade, would materially change the face of things and bring back to maritime Canada a measure of the prosperity she enjoyed in years gone by. We have the support of this bonusing system from many sources. Of course we have it in Nova Scotia, which is always first in Canada in everything that promotes our progress and prosperity. May I be allowed to read a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade with regard to this question of bonusing, in order to show that I am giving expression to the opinion of our people:

Resolved, That as it is of the first importance to the maritime interests of Canada that we should secure and hold a place in transportation by sea, therefore to revive our fast declining shipping industry it is desirable to promote Canadian ship owning under the new conditions now prevailing; moreover, as supplementary or corrollary to this it is necessary that Canada should have the power to limit the coasting privileges now enjoyed by European nations.

They evidently did not know that we have that power.

Therefore resolved, that in the opinion of this board the Dominion government should first pass a ships subsidy Act for the promotion of seagoing Canadian owned tonnage, and second, take such steps as will secure for Canada the privilege of cancelling existing coasting privileges now enjoyed by foreign countries under old imperial treaties, the idea being to have Canada control these treaties as we control our tariff.

May I read further on this point:

About $70,000,000 of Canadian capital, within a few years, have been expended in Cape Breton in the development of coal and iron. Many

millions have been invested in Sault Ste. Marie in steel production. The erection of steel ship-building works is a fitting supplement and crowning measure to the establishment of great coal, iron and steel producing industries The latter completes a series of conditions required in steel ship building such as exist in the great ship building centres in Great Britain. The fisheries are demanding more and more steel vessels. Harbour, river and coast improvements are requiring more dredges. The government marine service necessitates new steamers. The coastwise business of the country is developing into regular steam packet lines. The influx of population into the Northwest, the development of the grain-growing sections, demand rapidly increasing steam tonnage on the great lakes. Shall Canadian skill, labour and capital have an opportunity of employment in the development of and the profits in this growing business, or shall it be left to the enterprise of outside people ? Canada possesses extensive coal deposits at tide water, which afford a marine traffic of over 4,000,000 of tons; she ships a million thousand feet of lumber products annually; her export of grain, rapidly increasing, will soon reach a hundred millions of bushels. Of other products Canada has hundreds of thousands of tons to export. In addition to providing this enormous trade for a shipping business Canada has excavated canals, deepened rivers, dredged harbours erected docks, buoyed and lit the entrance to all our waterways, and in short created the business, the facilities and conditions demanded by a maritime power, and then stopped short without taking the one effective step to bring into being the thing itself—a mercantile marine.

May I read a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Toronto branch of the Navy League? There are a few things that the Toronto Navy League believes in that I do not, but there is something in this resolution which suits my belief exactly. It says:

That it is not consistent with the true interests of Canada, either from a political or from an economic point of view, that we should continue to neglect all preparation to take our part in the naval defence of the British empire, and that it is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our floating commerce, and to the empire, that we should lay the foundations of a broad national maritime policy, in which naval preparation will go hand in hand with the development of a Canadian Mercantile Marine, with the encouragement of the Canadian ship-building industry, and with securing for Canada her fair share of the world's maritime transportation.

The writer of an article commenting on this resolution says:

There are few rational Canadians who recognize the 'duty' or the expediency of embarking upon a policy of 'naval preparation' which the Toronto Navy League puts first and foremost but of which there is not the slightest immediate or prospective need. There will, however, be very general endorsement of that portion of the resolution which urges the adoption of a policy for the upbuilding of a Canadian mercantile marine and the encouragement of the ship-building industry on our sea coast.

May I also read a quotation from the Ottawa 'Citizen,' which often contains some things I do not believe in, but at all events with the following extract I am in accord:

The Ottawa 'Citizen' approves the suggestion that the government should take action to arrest the decline of Canada's ship-building industry. 'The suggestion is made,' it says, 'that the government should grant a bounty of $6 per ton to the builders of steel ships in order to renew the ship-building industry and it is pointed out with much truth that with coal and ore near the sea in Nova Scotia there should be opportunities there for the upbuilding of a great industry. If the granting of such a bounty will be sufficient to induce the undertaking, the government would be wise in conceding it. Its existence would do much to maintain the manufacturing importance of the maritime provinces, and in addition would be of general advantage to Canada.'

Now, all progressive governments foster and protect their mercantile marine. The United States as you are all aware is doing so now, and Great Britain which is a free trade country is spending about $5,000,000 annually on marine subsidies at the present time. Canada being particularly a maritime country, it is of supreme interest to Canadians that we should not only support the coasting trade, but the ship-building industry as well, and I commend this view to the government in the hope that they will number it amongst their many other progressive policies which have so tended to the welfare of our country.

Mr. FREDERICK A. LAURENCE (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to what my hon. friend from Hants has said on this subject which is one of very great importance to the people of the maritime provinces and which is of considerable importance to the people of all Canada. The statistics having reference to our mercantile marine teach us a lesson which is by no means complimentary to Canada as a young nation, and which must be very discouraging to our people. It is true as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Black) that forty years ago Canada stood fourth in the list of the maritime nations of the world in point of shipping, but to-day she only holds the eleventh place. In 1878 our registered tonnage was 1,333,015 tons but in 1904 it had declined to 672,838 tons or a decline of over 50 per cent in these 26 years. In 1874 we built 183,010 tons of shipping, but in 1904, thirty years later, we only built 33,192 tons, scarcely more than one-sixth as much as we built thirty years before. There are causes for this very serious decline in this industry. No doubt the introduction of iron and steel ship-building has had much to do with it, because in the maritime provinces, from which I come, our ship-building industry was then confined entirely to the construction of wooden ships. Now, this

serious decline in our ship-building industry is all the more discouraging and all the more conspicuous because of the enormous expansion of our trade. While we have increasing work every year for our ships to do, we have less ships to do this work. Therefore, although we have had this very great expansion in our carrying trade, Canada has not been able to realize the full benefit of it. Just a few figures more to indicate the serious decadence of this industry in Canada. In 1876 the sea-going trade of Canada, in and out, was 5,914,764 tons, and in 1904 at the end of twenty-eight years, it was 15,826,705, which shows an enormous expansion of water-borne traffic which, as a maritime people, our own vessels ought to have been able to take care of. But, foreign vessels are carrying our trade; ships owned elsewhere than in Canada are doing that trade for us, British ships are coming here to do our carrying trade and Canadians are not getting the benefit of their development in this respect. In 1876, British ships carried 1,896,603 tons; foreign ships carried 2,379,828 tons; while Canadian ships carried 1,634,333 tons. Coming down to the year 1904, British ships carried no less than 8,046,815 tons of our traffic; foreign vessels carried 5,801,000 tons; while Canadian ships only carried 1,979,803 tons. This indicates an enormous decadence in this industry which ought to be naturally an industry peculiar to Canadians who are a maritime people. Thus it is that Canada, though a maritime country, does only 12 per cent of its own water-carrying trade.

On the shores of the great lakes in the central portion of our Dominion, where to a very large extent our interests in this direction are protected from foreign competition and from the admission of British ships, we make a little better showing; but still we have there to contend with, the competition of American vessels, which divide equally with our own vessels the carrying trade of Canada on the lakes. While the sea-going water-borne traffic of the lakes amounts to 16,000,000 tons a year, Canadian ships carry only about 8,000,000 tons, while United States vessels carry 7,400,000, indicating clearly that the United States is our serious competitor, largely taking the coasting business out of the hands of our own people in these waters. It is rather extraordinary that we are so situated, whether in relation to the duties imposed upon us of an international character or by reason of our relationship to the empire to which we belong, that we have to maintain regulations which admit to our coasting privileges foreign vessels which are able not only to compete with our vessels, but to take our trade almost entirely from us. The coastwise trade of Canada in 1876 amounted to 10,000,000 tons, and in 1904 it had grown to the enormous figure of 45,000,000 tons; and yet Canada to-day is doing only an insignificant percentage of that enormous carrying trade. I fully realize that this subject, important as it is, is surrounded with considerable difficulties. The repeal of the orders in council which admit these foreign vessels to the privileges of our coasting trade may involve international obligations. We know that England, free trade in its principles, and broad in its views of reciprocal relations with all the world, whilst securing the admission of her own ships to foreign countries, admits foreign ships to all the privileges of British ships in her own country and in her colonies as well. I quite understand that under our shipping laws it may be a very serious problem for our government, how these privileges can be rescinded; but I presume that the object of my hon. friend from Hants is to have this matter ventilated in parliament, so that we may understand where we stand, and ascertain if possible by consideration and deliberation if some relief cannot be given to our people in this respect. Our government, and we as a parliament, ought to be able to do something for the shipping industry, which to my mind is one peculiarly suitable to Canada and Canadians. We ought to make an effort to revive that industry, whether by direct bounty or by other means it is not for me to say; but, sympathizing as I do with the object of this resolution, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I think it is well that the hon. gentleman has brought this question up for consideration, for it is one of very great importance. I may say at the outset that it is a subject which the government have had under consideration for some time, and it is under consideration now. The matter has been to some extent shrouded in mystery. These orders in council, under which privileges are given to the vessels of Norway and other countries, were passed a great many years ago, and I suppose they were passed under the impression that there were treaties between the imperial government and those countries which rendered that action necessary on the part of the Canadian government. For the last two or three years at long intervals communications have passed between this government and the imperial government as to the exact position we occupy in reference to these treaties, what treaties were in force, if any, with what countries they were in force, and whether Canada was bound by them. I am happy to say that so far as we have been able to get definite answers from the imperial government on these questions—for they seem to hesitate to answer directly the question as put to them—it is in my mind extremely doubtful if any of these treaties are binding upon Canada at the present time, whatever they may have been in the past; and if they be not binding upon Ca-

nada, then it would be within our competence, I take it, to repeal the orders in council under which ships of foreign countries are allowed the coasting privilege. That subject, as I have said, has been for some time engaging the attention of the Canadian government, and it is still engaging our attention; and, if I might speak personally for myself, I think with reference to some of the countries that are now enjoying this privilege, that whether they shall continue to do so or not is at the option of the Canadian government, and I may say that the government are seized of the importance from a national point of view of giving every consideration to this question. That is what is involved in the hon. gentleman's proposition. He has mentioned another matter, that is, whether, in addition to the cancellation of these orders in council, if it be found that that is within our power and it be thought desirable, further steps should be taken in the way of aiding the shipping of Canada by way of bounty. Upon that I express no opinion myself other than to say that strong representations have, I think been made at different times to the Minister of Finance of this government and I have no doubt that he is giving his consideration to that question. Upon that I say no more.

Upon the question as more directly before us I think the position is that while orders in council were passed many years ago they would have been passed as I suppose under the belief that treaties existed between the imperial government and the countries whose ships were entitled to that favour which led to that action. But when we can ascertain definitely that these treaties do not apply to many of these countries, even if not to all, then the government would be free to act in the direction of considering the order in council and considering whether in the interests of the country the rights which were conceded to nations that we supposed had treaty rights might not safely be abrogated. The hon. gentleman having expressed his views on the subject which is one of importance, I trust that after what I have said he will withdraw his motion and leave the matter in the hands of the government and I will assure him of every attention being given to this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I would think the reply of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is so remarkably definite and reassuring that there should be no hesitation on the part of the mover and seconder at once to withdraw this motion. In the first place the minister is not very sure whether there are or are not any treaties in force and in the second place if he were quite sure there are no treaties in force would not be quite sure what the government would do in that case. Nothing can be more definite and comforting to the people of the maritime provinces than that statement of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and I am sure it will be with the greatest possible pleasure that the member for Hants (Mr. Black) will announce to his constituents by letter or by telegram tomorrow that at last there is a definite settlement of this matter which has so long agitated the people of those provinces. The government do not seem to be quite so sure of their position this evening as they were a short time ago. I asked a question on December 17, as follows :—

1. Are there any treaties now in force which prevent the parliament of Canada from enacting legislation to exclude foreign vessels from the coasting trade of Canada ?
2. What are such treaties ?
3. Upon what notice can they be denounced?

I asked that question for the purpose of obtaining information because I really was not sure as to the existence of these treaties, and I had not at my command means of information which are or ought to be in the possession of the government. To this question I received this reply :

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) to accept this general answer to this question.

1. The government is not aware that any treaties are now in force which prevent the exclusion of the vessels of the following countries from the coasting trade of Canada, viz. :—Germany, Austria-Hungary, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, The Netherlands, Denmark, Argentine Republic, Italy.

Mr. Barker, who put the question for me, then said :

The hon. minister has not answered the other parts of the question.

To which the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) replied as follows :

I simply made the specific answer with reference to those upon which there is no doubt. I think that these are the countries now that under order in council are permitted to engage in the coasting trade.

Therefore, whatever doubt there may be in the minister's mind to-night, there was no doubt when he answered that question.

Mr. PATERSON. With reference to some of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With reference to vessels of the particular country upon which my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) has made his case, Norwegian vessels, I understood, so far as I was able to understand the hon. gentleman's remarks, that the competition in the maritime provinces arises almost altogether from Norwegian vessels. Whether he made that statement or not I have information from persons in the maritime provinces which would justify me in making that statement in the House this evening. Norway is one of the countries as to which the minister says there is no doubt. If the minister had no doubt in December 17, why is it that he has any doubt to-night on the subject?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not expressed doubt ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well I certainly did not quite understand the remarks of my hon. friend in that way. However, I accept his statement of what he intended to say. There is therefore no doubt as to the right of the government to accede to the demand of the member for Hants (Mr. Black) and the member for Colchester (Mr. Laurence) if they see fit to do so, and to bring into force, by repeal of the order in council the general provision of chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, which enactment declares that no vessels except British vessels shall be allowed to engage in the coasting trade of Canada. That is the general law of this country at the present time, under the general chapter to which I have referred, except in so far as the general law is affected by an order in council passed under section 5 of chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, or by reason of any provision contained in section 6. These provisions are of course very familiar to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I might quote the section of the Act under which, as I understand, the orders in council were passed. Let me quote section 2 of chapter 83, or at least so much as may be necessary for the purpose :

> No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port of Canada to another, except in British ships.

That is the general provision of the law.

Section 5 declares that :

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another, in such country.

As far as I understand the situation, as far as I am able to apprehend from the information placed before the House by the government in answer to my questions and the statement of the Minister of Customs to-night, these orders in council have been passed under that section and the government is at liberty to repeal that to-morrow if it sees fit to do so as a matter of policy. Therefore, so far as the power of the government in the premises is concerned, it seems to me, having regard to the statements of the government, that there is no possible doubt whatever. Then the only question that remains is as to what should be the policy of the government. I do not think my hon. friends from Hants (Mr. Black) and Colchester (Mr. Laurence) put the case in any exaggerated form in the remarks which they addressed to the House this afternoon. It is beyond question that the carrying trade of Canada, on the Atlantic coast at least, is passing very largely into the hands of owners of foreign vessels, and the remarks of these gentlemen as to the developing of the ship-building industry in Nova Scotia are equally true. The decline of the ship-building industry in Nova Scotia is not wholly attributable to these orders in council. It would be absolutely going too far to make a statement of that kind. It is also due of course to the use of steam for carrying purposes all over the world and to the use of iron vessels instead of wooden vessels. The remarks of these gentlemen with regard to the desirability of the establishment of iron ship-building in Nova Scotia are worthy of every consideration by the government. That subject first engaged the attention of parliament three or four years ago, and if I mistake not, some gentlemen in the city of Halifax and elsewhere in Nova Scotia were prepared three years ago to engage in that enterprise, provided they could get an assurance of assistance from the government in the shape of a tonnage bounty for a certain limited period. The gentlemen to whom I refer had associated with them ship-builders carrying on this busness to a very large extent in the mother country. These people were prepared to engage in the enterprise in Nova Scotia, to invest a very considerable sum of money for that purpose. I saw some of the correspondence at the time. The proposal however, did not commend itself to the government or they deferred it for further consideration, I do not know which.

To come back to the general question of the carrying trade of the maritime provinces, it is beyond doubt in the condition described by the mover and seconder of this resolution. The power to deal with that situation, so far as competition from Norwegian vessels in concerned, is in the government. And, while the remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) were not very definite or very reassuring, I do venture to add my own voice to those of these gentlemen and to ask the government to take the subject into immediate consideration, and, if possible, to take such action as may restore some share of the carrying trade that should be borne by Canadian vessels.

Mr. PATERSON. I was not fortunate enough to hear all that was said by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black). I should infer from what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said that the hon. member for Hants confined his remarks to Norwegian ships. Am I right in that?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Hants did not speak in a very loud tone of voice and I am not sure that I gathered the full extent of his remarks. But I understood him to speak more especially of the competition of Norwegian vessels.

Mr. BLACK. Yes, that is right.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). The subject introduced by the resolution of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) is a very important one, and it opens the consideration of important collateral questions which naturally group around the settlement of the proposition contained in the resolution. I find that in 1902 an Act passed by this parliament declared that the policy of Canada at that time was the protection of the coasting trade against the competition of foreign vessels. That law, which is chapter 7 of the statutes of 1902, is very clear and positive on this point. Section 3 provides for the complete and absolute exclusion of foreign ships from the coasting trade of Canada, so far as the interprovincial trade is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is an amendment.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It is an amendment of the revised statutes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does it alter the statute greatly?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It expressly repeals the provision of the revised statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I refer to section 2 of the revised statutes which declares that the coasting trade of Canada must be carried on in British vessels. Does that still remain in the amended Act?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It is reiterated in the following words:

No foreign-built British ship, whether registered in Canada or elsewhere shall be entitled to engage or take part in the coasting trade of Canada unless such foreign-built ship has first obtained a license for that purpose which may be granted by the Minister of Customs.

That is the same principle as in the other statute. The only exception to that is provided under section 7 as follows:

Where by treaty made before the passing of the Merchant Shipping (Colonial) Act, 1869, (that is to say before the thirteenth day of May, eighteen hundred and sixty-nine), Her late Majesty, Queen Victoria, agreed to grant to any ships of any foreign state any rights or privileges in respect of the coasting trade of Canada, those rights and privileges shall be enjoyed by those ships for so long as Her late Majesty agreed, or His Majesty the King may hereafter agree, to grant them.

Now, the point is whether or not there is any treaty by which the vessels of Norway and Sweden or any foreign country have any special privileges within our waters. The answer given by the Minister of Customs some days ago indicates that, according to the view that the government holds, there is no treaty right in the various nations mentioned in that answer, whereby the ships of those countries can engage in the coasting trade of Canada. The examination of whatever evidence we can obtain in this country, in the libraries here, would go to show that the statement made by the government is absolutely correct. This Act of 1902 is not to come into force until its publication, by His Majesty's pleasure, in the 'Canada Gazette.' One can well understand why it is there should be some delay in having this matter finally declared and this Act positively promulgated, because the right to legislate in these matters has always been deemed to be vested to a certain degree in the imperial parliament. When we deal in this country with a question involving treaty rights between this and other nations, naturally we are in danger of trenching upon some powers of the imperial parliament and assuming to exercise powers which we may not enjoy here. It seems to me that this question is one, considering the views expressed on both sides in this House, which it would be the duty of the representatives of the government who are to take part in the imperial conference to bring before that conference with a view of having it settled, so that the relative rights of the colonies and the imperial authorities to positively legislate with regard to foreign countries in subjects of this kind, may be settled. And I apprehend that the carrying out of the views of the government would naturally be delayed by the legal and other complications arising in connection with the matter. But, so far as a declaration of policy is concerned, that is clear under the Act which I have read. The delay in its publication must have been due to considerations of the kind I have indicated.

Mr. LAURENCE. The proclamation issued in September of last year

Mr. PATERSON. That is, with respect to foreign-built British ships.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That is, as I understand, this section 2 was brought into force, but the remaining parts of the Act have not yet been brought into force. It cannot be brought into force, I assume, until the government are secure as to their rights in this matter, without involving complications with the imperial government as to the rights which any foreign nation may have obtained by reason of the complicated jurisdiction, colonial and imperial, in reference to the matter of shipping. I would ask the members who attend the imperial conference to submit this whole question as to the right of Canada and the colonies to legislate in regard to shipping matters to the fullest extent, so that our jurisdiction may be clearly defined and that there may be no doubt as to the power of this parliament to deal with this and kindred subjects. As to the existing situation the arguments of my hon. friends from Nova Scotia have been so clear that I do not desire to add anything. The decadence of the wooden ship-building in the maritime provinces is admitted. But that decadence, so far as the coasting trade of to-day is concerned, has occurred all over the world.

Thirty years ago the coasting trade between the maritime provinces and central Canada was infinitesimal compared with that which exists to-day. Under existing conditions, steel bottoms are used more, particularly in the carrying of coal, which is our greatest product and which we supply in large quantities to central Canada. Wooden ships could not carry on this trade satisfactorily if they were in existence. As they are out of existence we cannot complain, though we may regret their departure by the changed conditions of the world's industry. To-day a million and a half or two million tons of coal are carried every year, largely in foreign bottoms.

It would be a matter of great pride to every Canadian if this large carrying trade were in the hands of Canadian bottoms, if possible. I would submit however, that no rapid change should take place in this regard until it was clear that we could supply to this carrying trade Canadian bottoms that would be able to meet the demands of the people of the maritime provinces who send their coal and other products to upper Canada. A speedy bringing into force of this Act, unless the conditions were prepared for it, would interfere with the carrying trade in coal from the maritime provinces. But the ultimate goal should be the placing of that entire trade in the hands of Canadians, with Canadian built ships. I am not going, on a resolution of this kind, to attempt to discuss the wisdom of assisting in the inauguration of a steel industry in Canada by means of a bonus. That is a question which I hope the government will early take into their favourable consideration, so that if possible some means may be found of establishing that industry, not only in the maritime provinces but all over Canada. We are essentially a maritime people, whether we live on the Atlantic, or the Pacific, or the great lakes. The building up of a Canadian marine is a question which must always be of supreme importance to every citizen of this country, and any encouragement which the government could give in promoting that industry would be viewed with gratification by every lover of his country. Let me say in conclusion that I think this question is one in regard to which we ought at a very early day to have a clearly defined policy, with the rights of the colony clearly settled, so that we can legislate independently regarding our rights in connection with any foreign country. The policy of the government having now been declared, subject to these limitations, I presume my hon. friend who moved this resolution is satisfied by the discussion which has taken place upon it, and by the fact that we have had a clear statement as to the position of matters generally, and can look forward to favourable action by the government at as early a day as possible, having regard to all the conditions.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Those of us from the maritime provinces are deeply interested in anything that affects the Canadian merchant marine. My hon. friend from Colchester, (Mr. Laurence) gave some very interesting figures with regard to the amount of our ocean going commerce. But a little consideration will show us that those figures after all may be somewhat misleading. A large quantity of the tonnage which really is owned by the people of Canada and controlled by the people of Canada, is registered in England. I have in mind just now one line, the Battle Line of St. John, all the vessels of which are registered in England, and of course, in making up your statistics, those go to the English lines. We do not get credit for that, whereas as a matter of fact it is Canadian capital and Canadian management which control that portion of our ocean-going commerce.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same as the trade on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. STOCKTON. I was going to mention the empresses of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I have no doubt there are other vessels carrying produce to and from Canada on the same conditions. I feel strongly that so far as possible we should control our own carrying trade, or at all events, should not allow our own carrying trade to be taken away from us in unfair competition. If we can protect that trade in a fair and legitimate way, we ought to do so. I expected of course, that some gentleman from my own province supporting the government would at once have risen to his feet to speak upon this question, particularly my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. Probably it is known to you, Mr. Speaker, especially, and to other members of this House, that during the Christmas festivities there was a little meeting in my constituency to pay some respects to myself and to my colleague from the City and County of St. John, I think, probably quite an enthusiastic meeting on the whole. There were a few jars, I believe, but taking it all in all, it being the Christmas season, it was a fairly brotherly gathering. At that meeting a resolution was moved with respect to the construction of iron and steel ships, and I am quite satisfied that my right hon. friend the leader of the government must have given his sanction to the principle involved in that resolution, because I notice that the gentleman who seconded the resolution with regard to ship-building and the fostering of the marine commerce of Canada, gave a definition of what a Liberal ought to be. He said that a Liberal ought to be one who did just exactly what the leader of the government wanted him to do. I presume, of course, he would not have seconded a resolution of that kind unless he had consulted with my right hon.

friend the leader of the government with regard to it, and received information probably from the Minister of Railways. I am in favour of the general principle that has been propounded by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black), and I should like to see anything done that reasonably can be done to promote the mercantile interests of our Dominion.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Coming as I do from the maritime provinces, I naturally feel a deep interest in this matter, though it is only right to say that it would be a mistake to assume that the question is one which concerns the maritime provinces alone. The ship-building interests of the country are not confined to our Atlantic coast. We have important shipping interests on the great lakes, on the Pacific as well. So this is not a local matter, but it is one which affects all portions of the Dominion. I am afraid, however, that one of the chief difficulties in the way of the extension of our marine at present has not been mentioned, or if mentioned, has not been dwelt upon. It is not after all a question between Canadian and foreign ships. I am afraid a more serious difficulty arises between Canadian ships which are British ships, and ships which, in a narrower sense are British, inasmuch as they are built in the mother country. It would be a mistake also to assume, although hon. gentlemen have taken account of that, that the decay of our mercantile marine is due to our coasting laws. While our coasting laws remained substantially as they are, we had a very large fleet of vessels. They were not built for the coasting trade alone, but they were built for the trade of the wide world. The real cause has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John (Mr Stockton). The real cause of the delay of our shipping is the passing of the wooden ships, first, passing from wood to iron, then from iron to steel, then from steel sailing ships to the steamships. Our shipping industry in Canada was a wooden shipping industry, and we are not equipped yet for building iron and steel vessels. It naturally follows that as the world outgrew the wooden ships we in Canada were no longer able to comply with the world's demands, and we lost our shipping in that way, not because of the coasting laws. With regard to Norway, if we should, as the hon gentleman pointed out, bring to an end the arrangement with the Norwegians under which they enjoy our coasting trade—and I agree with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that that should only be done after reasonable notice, so that we should not disturb existing contracts—and shut out the Norwegians, it would not follow that our Canadian vessels would have the bulk of the traffic. In the first place, we are not well enough off in vessels in Canada to do the business. And in the next place, there would probably be brought in as a substitute the British built ships.

Mr. STOCKTON. Most of the Norwegian ships are British built.

Mr. FIELDING. British registered ships. Reference has been made frequently to the competition of foreign vessels; but after you have shut out all the foreign vessels, you will still have to compete with the British ships. And we are in this curious position. The British ship goes free the world over where the British flag flies. She is admitted free into Canada, while many of the materials out of which that ship is built, if brought into Canada separately, would be subject to duty. The conditions are therefore such as to discourage, if not to prevent the building of iron and steel ships in Canada, in competition with the shipyards of the mother country, which are so widely experienced and have such great capital and skill. Unless we are prepared to adopt the principle of taxing British ships coming into Canada—there might be difficulties in the way of doing that, and hon. gentlemen on both sides might see grave objections to it—there is no way in which we can aid our shipbuilding enterprse other than by the direct way of granting a bounty. Applications for a bounty have come, not from the maritime provinces alone, but from the builders on the great lakes and to a lesser degree on the Pacific. If the government and parliament should see their way to granting a substantial bounty for the aid of that industry, we should no doubt witness an expansion of the operations of the existing ship-yards in Toronto and on the lakes and rivers of middle Canada. No doubt also we should have something done in a larger degree than to-day in that line on the Pacific coast, and possibly we should see the establishment and development of shipyards in the maritime provinces. The shutting out of foreign vessels will not alone suffice. If we are to agree that it is important to expand our shipping interests, I see no way in which this can be effectively done other than by the granting of a bounty. That matter has been before the government and is under consideration at present. We cannot tax a bona fide British vessel, but a vessel which has been built abroad and comes only colorably under the British flag and then comes to Canada can be dealt with. We found in some instances that American vessels, built in the United States, were sent to Newfoundland, there took out a British register, and came to Canada as British ships. They were really foreign built, and the law was amended with the view of guarding against what seemed to be an abuse. But the real difficulty in the matter is that after you have shut out the foreigner, it is the competition of the British ship which is making the difficulty. Of course many of our Canadian people, like the gentlemen from St. John who es-

tablished the Battle line—a very enterprising firm—and some from Pictou county, have seen that difficulty and had their ships built and registered in Britain. These vessels are controlled by Canadian capital and Canadian owners and are manned by Canadian seamen, but they are not built in Canada. Canada enjoys the investment of Canadian capital and they furnish a field for the employment of Canadian sailors. But the construction of the ships, under existing laws, must take place abroad.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Reference has been made to the very large percentage of foreign vessels which do the Atlantic trade and carry tonnage across to the old country from Canadian shores. It must be borne in mind that a large percentage of the foreign going ships, carrying on our lumber trade particularly, although sailing under the Norwegian flag, are Canadian ships which were constructed here many years ago and were in recent years assigned over to Norwegian owners. That would explain, I think, somewhat the figures which have been presented—and so clearly presented—by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Laurence). My hon. friend from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Stockton) made reference to the little gathering that was held in his constituency recently. I think my hon. friend did not use the correct adjective. It was a very large gathering and indeed a very harmonious one, and I think we can fairly say a very successful one. He made reference to the fact that there was a resolution passed but he did not quote the resolution. It was to the effect that that very large gathering favoured the idea of granting assistance to Canadian ship-owners in the construction of Canadian sea-going vessels. This of course had reference to one aspect of this resolution—rather not so much to the resolution itself as to the discussion which has taken place. In the discussion of this resolution, reference has been made to the necessity of adding to our Canadian mercantile vessels. But apparently the impression very largely exists that in order to compete with Great Britain in this regard, it will be necessary to give substantial assistance to Canadian ship-builders. That matter has been discussed in the press and by boards of trade. Resolutions have been passed, and are being passed yearly, by the Maritime Board of Trade and by many other boards of trade in the west. I know that the Montreal Board of Trade has put itself on record in that sense. I think also the Toronto Board of Trade, and I know that many of the boards of trade in the towns and cities along the great lakes favour the proposition of aiding by a bonus the construction of our own ships in Canada.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). This has been an interesting discussion in several respects, both on account of the arguments which have been advanced and the evolution in certain directions which has been demonstrated, as well as for other reasons. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) who introduced the subject and did it so well—although unfortunately we could not hear him very well at this distance—seemed to be very willing to withdraw his motion on the statement which was made by the Minister of Customs. Well he must be very easily satisfied if he would withdraw his motion on that statement, for it did not seem to me very luminous or definite. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) endeavoured to break the fall somewhat by assuming that possibly there was some difficulty about this in the matter of treaties and that it might be necessary to move very slowly and have the matter ventilated before the Colonial Conference in London. But when I read the Act as it was—the old statute—and the Act of 1902 as it was read by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), so far as this matter is concerned, nothing new was enacted in 1902 from what had been enacted before and had been the law since 33 Vic., so far as I can judge. Section 2 of the old act says:

> No goods or passengers shall be carried by water from one port of Canada to another except in British ships, and if any goods or passengers are so carried as aforesaid contrary to this Act, the master of the ship or vessel so carrying the same shall incur a penalty of $400, &c.

Again in section 5:

> The Governor in Council may from time to time declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another of such country.

Therefore, this could have been done by order in council, and in section 6 there was provision made in treaty cases. The statement of the government given on December 17 was absolutely clear and definite; it included Germany, Austro-Hungary, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, the Netherland's Denmark, Argentine Republic and Italy; it included all the countries with the exception of Great Britain. With reference to all these countries the statement of the government was that it was not aware that any treaties are now in force which prevent the exclusion of the vessels of these countries. Therefore, with reference to the whole gist of the reasons adduced by my hon. friend from Hants—for he did not take up the question of the competition of British vessels—with reference to his whole contention, the government had, before he had spoken, made it absolutely clear that there was nothing in the way of their taking action with regard to all these countries, because if you cut these out there are no coun-

tries left which compete for Canadian trade within Canadian waters as to the coasting privileges. So that the reason that the Minister of Customs endeavoured to give, that there was some mysterious difficulty in the way, does not seem to have existed judging by the answer which the government gave some days previously. That much being clear there does not appear to have been anything which the Minister of Customs said whch could be taken as a reason for withdrawing the motion. No comfort was given, no solace was tendered, no hope was held out. The fact is that the government had the power by statute, that they knew they had that power, and that there were no treaty rights in the way, and yet they had done nothing. But the answer of the Minister of Customs was that the ministers had looked into it, that they had been considering it, that they would continue to consider it and that there might be legal difficulties in the way. The fact is there are no such difficulties in the way. So much with reference to that phase of the question. Now, I did not understand the member for Hants to direct his remarks to the competition of British shipping. Britain is a part of the empire as we are, and a different question is raised when it comes to a discussion as to what shall be the relations in coasting and other trade as between the mother country and ourselves. As far as the countries are concerned against which the grievance was laid by the member for Hants, not one of them has a treaty right, and the government can by order in council withdraw the coasting privileges which they have at present. The government has not withdrawn these privileges. That may be for good reasons, but no reasons were given by the Minister of Customs. Another interesting thing to notice is the revolution in sentiment which appears to have taken place among gentlemen opposite, and which is another illustration of the fact that men out of office have very different ideas from those which they have when they are in office and have to face the responsibility of grappling with public questions. I remember hearing arguments (or what passed for arguments) addressed to this House when the Liberals were in opposition in which the National Policy was declared to be the reason why there was this decadence in Canadian ship-building. They told us it was the curse and blight of protection which was wiping out the mercantile marine of Canada. Such assertions were made by some of the gentlemen who now are on the treasury benches. But to-day they give a different reason, and they give it because the principle of protection is in force now as it was from 1879 to 1896, and still the decadence goes on. They are driven now to find a reason other than protection for the decadence of ship-building. They do not like to apply the rod to their own backs and now they tell us it is due to the going out of wooden ship-building. But the Minister of Railways made a statement which does not carry much hope for the future of Canadian ship-building when he said that these Norwegian vessels—we call them Norwegian now—are really Canadian ships built in Canada and run in Canada. If Canadians have built ships and have found that they cannot run them longer and have to sell them to the Norwegians it makes one think of what would take place if you pass your order in council and shut out these foreign vessels in the hope that their places would be taken by Canadian vessels which would be built by Canadians, manned by Canadian seamen, and under the direction of Canadian owners. If it were impossible for Canadians owning vessels to continue in the race, and if they had to sell them to Norwegians who it seems can run them much more economically, then there is not much hope to think that even if you strike off these foreign vessels from the coasting privileges, that Canadian vessels would supply their place. It appears to be the case that the Norwegian is the most provident runner of ships in the world, as was well explained by the member for Hants. There is the point also that Canada does not give these coasting trade privileges to countries in which Canada does not get a reciprocal advantage. It may be that Canada is so situated that she cannot invade Norwegian trade or the trade of any other country which has these reciprocal coasting advantages with us. But there is that fact nevertheless, that if we give them the opportunity and privilege of coasting here, they give us the same in their country, and the privilege is a reciprocal privilege. Well, what is interesting is this, that the gentlemen who for many years were free traders out and out, preaching the doctrine that it was for the benefit of the consumer to get his work done and his things made for him at the very cheapest rate, that is, to buy in the cheapest market and to sell in the dearest, have moved out from that atmosphere which they breathed and that region which they inhabited ; and, lo and behold, they appear before us to-night ready to tax a ship that carries goods to Canada for the consumers at so low a rate that no Canadian vessel can compete with them.

Mr. BLACK. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me for a moment? I am not willing to lie under that accusation, for I never was a free trader.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there is one less of that band who at one time were supposed to encircle the whole party. Not only have we those who are protectionists and do not like to admit that they are, such as those spoken of by the Minister of Finance, but we have now members of that great free trade party who resent it rather as an insult to be called free traders, and who get up and stoutly declare that they are not

and never were free traders. To-day we have gentlemen on that side of the House who are willing to tax these vessels so that they shall not be allowed to trade in this country except under such disabilities as would practically drive them out. They would prohibit them from trading in this country, and call loudly for subsidies and bounties—what for? To protect Canadian vessels and the great mercantile interests of this country. Wherever you put these gentlemen up against the problem and make them feel their responsibilities, and bring them to the task of settling or trying to settle a subject, the sense of their responsibilities and the conditions which surround them make of them protectionists, subsidists and bountyists and prohibitionists—in the line of preventing foreign vessels from trading in this country. To make prohibitionists of some of them in any other light I would have no hope of succeeding, if I were to attempt it. So we have this interesting spectacle of a complete revolution. What is left now, Mr. Speaker. Is there any former creed that they have not repudiated? Is there any form of protection that they have not swallowed, and that they do not now hold as being the only proper digestible food for this great country? They took the protective policy for our general tariff; they took it for the special parts of the tariff; they took what was formerly the most objectionable part of the protective policy, the bounties, and applied it to everything to which the Liberal-Conservative party had applied to it, and when they get that far they try to extend the application of it until it embraces wooden and iron ships. It has got down to binder twine; it is in the oil fields, it is in the steel and iron fields, it is everywhere that it is possible to apply it. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think I must congratulate the Liberal-Conservative party on the sturdy doctrine that for eighteen years they consistently taught in this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Consistently?

Mr. FOSTER. Consistently and persistently taught in this country. I not only congratulate them on the seed they sowed, but also upon the ripened heads of wheat, showing all over the benches on the other side, that are proof of the goodness of the seed, and the fertility of the soil. After a few years of culture, picking out the best and re-planting it, we may expect the party to arrive at protection in every respect. Yes, there was a meeting, I believe, in St. John. The adjective to be applied must be corrected—it was harmonious. There is a kind of harmony which sometimes takes place—the lion sometimes eats the lamb, and there is harmony. In St. John the lion appears to have crawled inside the lamb, and again there is harmony.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr Speaker, I have been accustomed for many years to

the spectacle of my hon. friend taking liberties with truth; but this evening he has taken too great a one for me to swallow when he claims to have been all his life, I will not say a consistent prohibitionist, but a consistent protectionist. How can he make that boast in the face of the discussion we have had to-night? What is the policy which has been brought to the attention of the House? It is that at some time the government, I will not say of which my hon. friend was a member, but of the party of which he was a member, took a very wide departure from protection when they allowed foreign ships to come into competition with Canadian ships. If there is one thing of which every nation, not merely a protectionist nation, but a free trade nation also, is jealous, it is to keep for its own people its coasting trade. But it appears that at some time when the government of the country was in the hands of the Conservative party, they passed an order in council which departed from this wholesome principle and admitted Norwegian vessels amongst others to participate in our coasting trade. Was that the consistent protection of which my hon. friend boasted a moment ago? I do not know for my part the circumstances under which this order was passed; I have not looked into them. The government has been engaged in looking into that question. But for some reason, I presume a good one, the government of that time thought it advisable to admit foreign ships to competition with Canadian ships in the coasting trade; I think it was chiefly for the coal trade of Nova Scotia. I presume there were good reasons for that, because for many years I am not aware that any complaint was made against it. But we are advancing all the time, and of late years the people of Canada, especially the people of the maritime provinces, have come to the conclusion that they are able to take care of that trade themselves, and they insist on the privilege being given to Canadians which every nation claims for its own people. At the present time the people of the maritime provinces believe, and I think they are right in believing, that we can dispense with foreign competition in our coasting trade. And therefore they have asked the government of Canada to look into that question and to take away the privilege which has been given to foreign ships to come in competition with our own and to keep that trade for our own people. The government of Canada should not jump too quickly into that question, it required some consideration. We had to look into the history of that question and the circumstances which induced the government of Canada at that day to take such a wide departure from what is always the accepted doctrine of reserving the coasting trade of a country for the people of that country. We are looking into the question at the present time, and I do not know that any better or

more satisfactory answer could be given to the hon member for Hants (Mr. Black) than the answer given by my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who asked him not to insist on a division because at this very moment the question is engaging our attention. And I may say to the member for Hants (Mr. Black) that the word of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will be made good. He did not expect us to jump too quickly into that question. I think there was a good deal of wisdom in the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) that even if we made up our mind at the present time to withdraw that privilege we should not withdraw it too quickly, we should give notice so that no interest would suffer and in such circumstances I am sure my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) would have no hesitation in withdrawing his motion.

Mr. BLACK. In moving that resolution I had no intention of pressing it to a division. My object has been fully attained in the full and wide and free discussion we have had here to-night; and, apart from that intention, I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) would not think kindly of me if I should take a mean advantage of him and press a division when there are only eight or ten voters behind him. Taking this into consideration, I am perfectly satisfied with the discussion that has taken place; I therefore withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing :—

1. All amounts which have been since 1st July, 1904, expended, chargeable to capital account, upon the strengthening of bridges along the line of the government railways.

2. The estimated cost of each work, which it is proposed to carry on during the fiscal year 1907-8.—Mr. Crocket.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and other papers, addressed to, or received by the Department of Railways and Canals, from any persons, organizations, or associations, asking for the institution of a system of annuities for employees on the Intercolonial Railway.—Mr. E. M. Macdonald.

For a return showing the number of miles of government telegraph lines, respectively, in each of the provinces and districts of Canada, the points between which they run, and the various stations on each line, and population of the same, the working expenses and receipts, respectively, of each station and line for the ten years ending December 31st, 1906 ; the amount that has been spent yearly during the ten past years, (a) on construction of new lines or extensions ; (b) on repairs and maintenance of existing lines ; and the total expenditure for, (a) construction ; (b) repairs and maintenance of the present government telegraph lines, and the receipts and working expenses thereof by years.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing :—

1. In respect of each and every voucher for any payments since January 1st, 1904, by the government to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or any one acting on its behalf, (a) the date when such voucher was presented for payment ; (b) the date when the amount specified therein was paid ; (c) the amount of said voucher ; (d) the purpose of said expenditure.

2. In respect to each application to the Auditor General's office for payment of hereinthe name of bank ; (b) official number of said applications ; (b) the date of receipt and acceptance thereof ; (c) appropriation to which amount was charged.

3. In respect of each cheque issued in payment of accounts hereinabove referred to, (a) the name of bank ; (b) official number of cheque; (c) name of payee ; (d) date of issuance and payment ; (e) endorsements thereon. —Mr. Crocket.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports, memoranda and other documents and papers, respecting supplies purchased or ordered for or in connection with the government steamer 'Kestrel,' from January 1, 1903, up to the present time, including all correspondence between any department, officer, or agent of the government, and the captain of the said steamer.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. AYLESWORTH laid upon the table of the House a copy of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be possible for the minister to furnish a copy to the library, merely as a matter of convenience?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I will endeavour to do so if one is available.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION—MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Chief Justice Tait and the Hon. Mr. Justice Taschereau, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, their judgment in the matter of the election petition for the electoral district of Montreal (St. Antoine division), by which the petition was dismissed and confirming the sitting member in his seat.

ADJOURNMENT—RETURNS, INQUIRIES, &C.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any further information about the last volumes of the Auditor General's Report? It is desirable that we should have the other portions as soon as possible in order that the

Commons, especially the Public Accounts Committees, should be able to commence work.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite sympathize with the desire of the hon. gentleman, but I have no further information. I may say that it was fully mentioned at the close of last session that in the beginning of the new system of winter sessions it would not be possible to have all the public documents ready. That is not a reason why every effort should not be made, but there is really no delay. It was quite impossible to get the Auditor General's Report ready at the beginning of this session, but I shall see the Auditor General again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister will admit that it is important to expedite the remaining volumes, and I would suggest that for purposes of convenience in issuing it, it might be published in a number of volumes, if necessary one for each department. I am not suggesting that for every year, but for the exceptional conditions this year.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up the resolution of the Minister of Railways and then the Bills.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say that so far as two of these Bills are concerned, the Bill of the Minister of the Interior in regard to public land and the Bill introduced by the Prime Minister with regard to the distribution in the Northwest, that we would like a little delay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the first place we have not information that ought to have been available from the returns of the census taken last year as to the distribution of population in the two new provinces. Hon. members on this side inform me that they have repeatedly applied to the proper department for that information and up to the present time they have not been able to obtain it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman mean distribution by ridings?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We want to know the population by townships or by districts in order that we may be able to judge whether the distribution proposed by the government is an equitable one or not. The Prime Minister will see at once that the information should be in our hands for a reasonable time before we are called upon to discuss this measure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will not take up that Bill to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand we desire also some information with regard to the Bill introduced by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) with regard to public lands. I am not in a position to state at this moment definitely what that information is.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 15, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Charles Devlin, Esq., member for the electoral district of Nicolet, introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. R. Lemieux.

RESIGNATION OF HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he or any member of the government have received the resignation of Mr. Hyman in proper form, I mean the resignation of his seat as a member of this House?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No.

FIRST READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Alaska and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Annuity Company of Canada.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

POPULATION OF ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) made last night, I beg to lay on the table three typewritten copies of the details of the population of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The original copy is in the hands of the Printing Bureau and may not be printed for a few days, so that I took pains to have these copies made for the use of the House in the meantime.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW SENATORS.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N. B.) Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday, I beg to renew my inquiry respecting the New Brunswick Senate appointments.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that owing to the absence of His Excellency the Governor General to-day I cannot give him the information, but if he will renew his question to-morrow perhaps I will be able to satisfy him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to be very troublesome.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if the statement in the press is correct that Messrs. Ross and Beith have been appointed to the Senate of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to say to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), what I told my hon. friend from York, New Brunswick, (Mr. Crocket). that if he will renew his request to-morrow I will be very happy to give him some information.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL—WATER-POWER.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will lay on the table of the House the order in council under which the Beauharnois canal has been alienated. The matter is one of interest just now in the city of Montreal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will be happy to comply with the request of my hon. friend.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EMPLOYEE'S PROVIDENT FUND.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to establish a fund to provide life allowances to certain retired employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, and to authorize a contribution by His Majesty to the said fund, out of the gross earnings of the railways, of an amount not exceeding $100,000 per annum.

He said : Mr. Speaker, before formally moving the resolution which stands in my name and of which notice has been given, I would deem it perhaps desirable that I should explain briefly and as concisely as I may, the provisions of the Bill which is proposed to be introduced when this resolution has been approved by the House. The question of making provision for the employees of the Intercolonial Railway when they have reached a certain age, or when they have become disabled in the service, has occupied the attention of the Department of Railways for a number of years. Not only has it occupied the attention of the department itself but it has claimed a very large amount of attention from the employees of that railway. As early as 1902 the employees of the Intercolonal Railway, recognizing their condition, realizing what had been done by other railways not only in Canada but on this continent, met together and discussed the question of the desirability and the expediency of having some provision made in the event of their forced retirement from the service by reason of age or by reason of some disability. The matter claimed the attention, I think, of the then Minister of Railways and several schemes were proposed. These propositions involved a question of actuaries and the several schemes, one after the other, I think, were submitted to those who were expert in such matters and finally there was reached a basis of understanding between the department—that is the management of the Intercolonial Railway—and the employees themselves. This has been incorporated in the form of a Bill which, I trust, I will be in a position to introduce to the House. It will be found that its provisions are of the most healthy character, having regard to the interests of the employees and also having regard to the welfare of the railway itself. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a charitable scheme. The scheme involved in this resolution is not such as would place the employees of the Intercolonial Railway in the position of mendicants, of receiving charity at the hands of the people of this country, but it is a scheme which involves self-reliance, independence and self-respect on the part of the employees of the railway. a scheme which will make of them better citizens, better employees, and one that will, I think, by reason of its very provisions, claim the respect and esteem of every citizen in Canada ; that is the employees will stand higher in the estimation of the people than would otherwise be the case. To put the case in a nut-shell—and the provisions, as I will explain them later on, I think, will bear me out in this epitome—the proposition is that the employees of the railway themselves will lay aside each month out of their earnings one and one-half per cent, that they will contribute to a fund which will provide for assisting them in the days of adversity or when they are not able to earn that which they had earned in their more youthful days and that the government on its part, or rather the railway, out of its earnings, will contribute an equal sum to form part of this fund to assist in meeting the emergencies which will arise by reason of the retirement of these men when old age demands it, or when, by reason of some disability, they are obliged to sever their connection with the railway. The country proposes practically to increase the wages

of every employee in the service by one and one-half per cent and instead of paying that one and one-half per cent into the pockets of the employees monthly it will be set aside and form part of a fund from which these employees can, when they need it the most, draw their quota—an amount sufficient to provide for their old age. I have stated that this scheme or proposition had received the attention of the employees and that it had also claimed the attention of the department. There was precedent for it. It will be found that every railway almost, certainly every railway of any importance whatever on the continent of America has a similar scheme. It is not known as a pension scheme.

This scheme has been referred to generally throughout the country as a pension scheme, but it should rather be called a provident scheme in the interests of the employees and of the railway as well. Every railway on this continent has a provident scheme in connection with it, but every one of these schemes differs from that which it is proposed to inaugurate on the Intercolonial Railway, in that these American and Canadian railways alone contribute to the fund and the employees are not required to in any way make contributions. The railways in Great Britain also have provident schemes, but in the case of British railways the men are required to contribute; for instance one of the principal railways contribute two per cent monthly and the men themselves contribute two per cent. It may be asked why the Intercolonial Railway proposes to contribute and to require the men themselves also to contribute, and in reply to that I may state that the employees themselves throughout the system; the Prince Edward Island Railway employees and the Intercolonial Railway employees from Halifax, and Sydney, and St. John to Montreal, have unanimously asked that they be permitted to contribute to this fund. It is obvious that the adoption of this principle will make a better provision for them in the days of their retirement, and it will also strengthen their self-reliance. They will feel more independent in contributing to such a fund, they will not be in the position of mendicants receiving charity at the hands of the government, but on the contrary they will be self-respecting citizens making contributions which will enure to their benefit. On the other hand the interest of the railway itself will I think be promoted by its making that contribution which is necessary to implement the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway provident fund.

I know that there has prevailed throughout Canada the idea that the Intercolonial Railway has had an extravagant and excessive number of employees; I know that the idea prevails not only on that side of the House but on this. It prevails from one end of the country to the other and it more largely prevails in the west than it does in the east. It is due to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, it is due to the management, it is due to this House and the country that the real facts should be made public. So important is this subject deemed by railway corporations that there is compiled a book with the title Railway Provident Institutions in English Speaking Countries, and this book gives a synoptic statement with reference to every provident railway institution in Great Britain and America. Now, it is true that I stand here as a member of the government dealing with this matter; it is true that the operation of the government system of railways comes under the administration of a department of the government, and because of that very fact the position of the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways is *sui generis*. But it should not be forgotten, I hope it will not be forgotten, that apart from all that, these railways are business institutions in themselves. I shall not stop to quarrel with any hon. gentleman as to whether they have been managed as business institutions, I shall not occupy the time of the House with that question which is *quasi* political or perhaps wholly political; I am simply asking that it be borne in mind that apart from every other consideration the operation of the government railways is a business matter in itself and that it must be dealt with from that standpoint. Whether business principles have been applied or not is another question, but there is no doubt that business principles should be applied, and in dealing with this matter it is our duty to crystallize into legislation the provisions which we deem will best aid in the operation of our railways. I have said, that the general supposition is that the Intercolonial Railway has an excess of employees. I know for a fact that there are in the employment of the Intercolonial Railway many employees who were in the employ of the old Nova Scotia Railway and of the European and North American Railway before the days of the Intercolonial Railway, and who for fifty years have been in service. Many of these men have reached the age of four score years, I know men in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway who are over 80 years old, men far beyond the three score years and ten allotted by the psalmist as the span of life. Why have these men been retained in the service? I will tell why. For many years the government system of railways paid very low wages, barely a living sustenance, and the men in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick employed on these railways found it very difficult indeed to make both ends meet. Happily in later years the rate of pay has been increased. The very fact that the government of the country was

responsible for the payment of the wages of these men made it impossible for any management, I care not under what government, to set them adrift after they had served the country for a lifetime, and at a period when they were unfitted to take up any other occupation, especially as in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they had not laid up anything for a rainy day. Notwithstanding that fact, I think I shall be able to show from the statistics, and they are authentic, that proportionate to the mileage the Intercolonial has not as many employees as have the other railways in Canada or the United States. There is one railway in Canada which has a less number per mile, but only one. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a mileage of 8,183 miles; its total number of employees of all classes is 35,132 or 4·29 per mile. The Grand Trunk Railway system has a mileage of 4,176 miles, with a total number of employees of all classes of 27,520, or 6·5 per mile. The Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways have a mileage of 1,739 miles, with 8,089 permanent employees of all classes, or 4·65 per mile, a little above the average of the Canadian Pacific, and considerably under the average of the Grand Trunk. A certain number of temporary or extra men are employed during the months of July and August each year in connection with repairs, and a certain number occasionally in the winter time to keep the track clear of snow. The total number if permanent and temporary employees on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways is 9,589, or 5·5 per mile.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. Has the minister the number of employees on each railway separately ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not here, but I can furnish it. I think it will be found that the Prince Edward Island Railway, owing to its being narrow gauge, has not the same number of employees per mile ; that is my impression. I find that the following railways in the United States have provident schemes such as we propose to initiate on the Intercolonial, and each is the exclusive contributor to the provident fund : The Atlantic Coast Line, the Baltimore and Ohio Railway system, the Bessemer and Lake Erie, the Boston and Albany, the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, the Chicago and Northwestern, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, the Houston and Texas Central, the Illinois Central, the New York Central and Hudson River, the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, the Oregon Short Line, the Pennsylvania system, east and west, the Philadelphia and Reading, the Southern Pacific, the Sunset Route, the Union Pacific. The following shows the mileage of a number of the United States railways with the total number of employees and the average number per mile :

Railway.	Milage.	Total Number of Employees.	Employees per Mile.
Ann Arbor Railroad	291·9	1,563	5·4
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad	4,138·87	17,512	4·1
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad System	.....	.....	12·5
Bangor and Arostook Railroad	412·0	1,370	3·3
Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad	207·0	2,676	12·8
Boston and Albany Railroad	389·0	5,400	13·9
Boston and Maine Railroad	2,281·77	23,205	10·1
Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg Railway	500·5	4,454	8·8
Central Railroad Company of New Jersey	685·0	11,953	17·4
Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad	750·0	4,988	6·6
Chicago and Northwestern Railway	7,392·03	32,295	4·36
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway	8,324·0	38,350	4·6
Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton Railway	1,015·09	5,449	5·3
Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway	335·92	5,338	15·8
Cumberland Valley Railroad	163·15	1,784	10·9
Delaware, Lackawana and Western Railroad	965·30	33,307	34·5
Houston and Texas Central Railroad	690·0	5,391	7·7
Illinois Central Railroad	4,301·10	34,249	7·9
Lehigh Valley Railway	1,398·0	18,621	13·3
Long Island Railroad	391·76	5,415	13·8
Maine Central Railroad	815·83	4,172	5·1
New York Central and Hudson River Railroad	3,422·66	49,852	14·5
Norfolk and Western Railway	1,722·0	15,394	8·9
Oregon Railroad and Navigation Company	1,123·0	4,180	3·7
Oregon Short Line Railroad	1,266·0	4,700	3·7
Pennsylvania Railroad System (East and West)	10,913·89	172,024	15·7
Philadelphia and Reading Railway	1,467·8	23,721	16 1
Portland and Rumford Falls Railway	68·0	332	4·8
Southern Pacific Company (Pacific System)	5,831·0	31,766	5·4
Southern Pacific Company (Sunset Route)	1,621·0	11,672	7·1
Texas and Pacific Railway	1,827·0	8,177	4·4
Union Pacific Railroad	2,933·7	15,338	5·2

In the case of the Norfolk and Western Railway, the mileage corresponds very nearly with the mileage of the government system of railways in Canada. The average number which this railway has per mile is 8·9 whereas our average is 4·65 of permanent employees or inclusive of permanent and temporary an average of 5·5.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the hon. minister the earnings per mile?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that is another phase. I am only dealing with the number of employees which is what the resolution before the House deals with. The other aspect of the question I hope to deal with at a later period.

Mr. CROCKET. The earnings would be more relevant.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is very easy to have the earnings if you have the freight rates. The average of these railways I have named is 8·7 per mile, and as contra-distinguished from that, the average of the whole United States, as shown in the Interstate Commerce Commission's Report for 1904, is 6·11. I have stated that the average for the United States exceeds the average on the Intercolonial Railway. Of course it would naturally be expected that on this northern continent, where we have to deal with snow blockades and ice and snow obstructions, we would necessarily require a larger number of men on each section. Therefore if, in spite of these difficulties and necessities, the Intercolonial Railway system can show an average less than any other railway in Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and less than the average of all the railways in the United States, it seems to me that the contention that the Intercolonial Railway is over-manned is not well founded.

I have said that the employees on the Intercolonial Railway, of their own motion, voluntarily made the suggestion that they should be permitted to contribute to this provident fund, and it seems to me that the reasons are so obvious I need not discuss them. I simply accept it as their proposition. They are interested as well as the railway, and their proposition involves this, that the Intercolonial Railway shall become a partner with them to make provision for these men to meet the day that must come to all so that they may with a better heart perform their daily duties. Of course the immediate result of putting into effect the Bill which will be founded on this resolution will be to dispense with the services of a large number of men on the Intercolonial Railway who are to-day past the age when they can do adequate service for the wages they receive. Had there been any legal authority so to do, the management of the Intercolonial Railway would have been justified in themselves pensioning these men instead of paying them their full wage, because they have been practically pensioners on the earnings of the Intercolonial. They have received their pay in full and they have not been able to make adequate return for the wage which they have received. I think this is generally admitted by themselves; it is admitted by every one connected with the railway, and that there should be a change in this respect is certainly in the interest of the railway itself and does no injustice to these men. In many instances, as I know for a fact, the severance of their connection with the Intercolonial Railway or with the Prince Edward Island Railway will mean that they will not have to be replaced.

I have in my mind's eye to-day several men who are employed on the Intercolonial Railway, and if these men were to step out to-morrow, their places would not have to be filled because they have long ago passed the age when they could meet the necessities of the case and we have had to place young men in their positions to do their work. It may be said that it is wrong to do that; it may be claimed that the management of the Intercolonial Railway were not doing their duty when they continued in the service these men, but I hold that any management or any government or any administration in charge of the Intercolonial Railway, who would simply summarily dispense with the services of these men who, after a life-long service in connection with these railways, have found themselves unable to earn a livelihood, and have had, summarily severed, their connection with that institution, would have caused an outcry from one end of this country to the other. I do not think that public sentiment, I do not think the citizenship of Canada would have justified any such action, on the part of any one who would be responsible for the management of the Intercolonial Railway and in so far as I have to take responsibility for that, I am perfectly willing to take and frankly do take my share of the responsibility. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) when he was Minister of Railways had such men in his employ and he continued them ; some of them were in the service for years under him and under the present management. There are some of these men who are still in the service but others have been called to their reward and there is no necessity for making provision for them now. For those who are still living we do require to provide.

Mr. FOSTER. The government might attempt to repay.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps my hon. friend would seek to follow some of them and obtain their receipts if we were to repay them. In the first place a fund is to be created by a contribution from the men monthly of 1½ per cent on the amount of wage received by them for that month and the government will contribute an amount

equal to that, the whole amount to be contributed by the government in any one year not to exceed $100,000. Interest will be allowed on any balance of the fund held from time to time.

Mr. FOSTER. At what rate ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 3 per cent, the same as in the savings bank I think. This fund will be administered by a board of management consisting of five members. The board will include the general manager and two of the officials of the railway to be selected by the minister. The general manager will be a member of the board and chairman of it ex-officio and annually the Minister of Railways will select two from among the officials and they will be three members of the board. The other two members of the board will be selected by the employees themselves. That is to say the railway will be represented on this board by three of its officials and the men by two to be selected by them annually. This selection will be made by the employees all along the line. A provision will be made for the election of such representatives of the men on the board ; the Bill will make provision for regulations for that purpose. I may say that as now drafted it seems to me that that provision is not made and I shall have an amendment to suggest with respect to the first election to be held when this Bill comes into force. Of course the fund thus created, shall vest in and belong to His Majesty and it shall be managed and distributed from time to time under the direction of the board and under regulations to be framed by them. The head office of this board will be at Moncton. Those entitled to retiring allowances under the Act will be divided into several classes. I cannot do better than read the section which it is proposed to enact in this connection. It reads :

The following classes of persons shall, upon the recommendation of the Board and the approval of the minister, subject to this Act and to the rules and regulations of the board upon being retired by the minister from service, be entitled for the remainder of their lives to monthly allowances as provided in this Act.

Class ' A,' those who have attained the age of seventy years, after being fifteen years in the service ;

Class ' B,' those who have attained an age over sixty years and under seventy years, after being fifteen years in the service, and becoming physically or mentally incapacitated from performing the services required of them.

Class ' C,' those who have attained the age of sixty-five years, after being fifteen years in the service, and request to be retired from the service.

Class ' D,' those who, after being twenty-five years in the service, are permanently disabled from performing the service required of them as a result of injuries received while actually at work in the service.

Class ' E,' those who, previous to the coming into force of this Act, enter the service at such an advanced age as to cause them to reach the age of seventy years before being fifteen years in the service, provided that on attaining the age of seventy years they have been at least ten years in the service.

The allowance to be paid under the provisions of this Act should be a monthly allowance, and shall be at the rate of one and a half per cent on the average monthly pay received by an employee for the ten years immediately preceding his retirement, for each year of his service ; that is to say, that if a man had been in the receipt of an average salary of $50 per month during the last preceding ten years of his service, he would get one and a half per cent of that, which would be 75 cents, multiplied by the years of service. If it were thirty years service he would be retired with a monthly allowance of $22.50. Of course this is not a princely sum, but it certainly would be a protection to a man under such circumstances. He would be free to earn what he could in outside service, but not in the employ of the railway.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the minister state what status the employees of the Canadian Eastern Railway would occupy with reference to this fund ? Will the time served by them before that railway was acquired by the government count so as to qualify them for an allowance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That point had not occurred to me, but it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CROCKET. I trust the minister will give it his favourable consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Eastern became a part of the Intercolonial within the last two or three years, and the employees of that railway were continued in the service of the Intercolonial. I recognize that is a feature that is deserving of some consideration. These men would be required now to contribute to this fund.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister make no provision for disabling accidents that occur to employees ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, those are in a different class, those who have been disabled by accidents in the service.

Mr. DANIEL. I think that is only after a number of years of service.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is now in connection with the railway an employers' liability, or relief association. I might say with respect to this fund that it is estimated that the amounts to be derived from the employees yearly would be about $29,800, somewhere in the vicinity of $30,000. This includes those on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways who would probably contribute. From careful investigation into the conditions prevailing, I think that for the first year or two the Intercolonial would save money, would have money to its credit after paying its propor-

tion of the necessary pensions. I explain that in this way, that there would be stricken off the pay-list a certain number of men who are to-day receiving their pay, but who, under the provisions of this Bill, would only receive a proportionate amount. For instance, in the case of a man receiving $50 per month, he would receive $22.50. There is also a provision in the Bill that no man will be permitted to retire with an allowance less than $20 per month, that is, the minimum retiring allowance, is $20 per month and the maximum is two-thirds of his monthly wage, or his yearly salary.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister says that the minimum amount at which a man would be retired is $20 per month. He said a while ago that this pension fund would only realize $7.50 a month, that one and a half per cent in ten years of a wage of $50 would be only $7.50. How does he get up to $20 ?

Mr. EMMERSON The man may not have contributed that much, but it would be only one and a half per cent of his monthly wage. One and a half per cent of $50 for instance would be 75 cents.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose he has served ten years.

Mr. EMMERSON. He cannot retire in ten years, he must be of a certain age to enable him to retire at all, but in any instance where, under the provisions of this Act, he would be entitled to retiring allowance, the minimum amount is $20. I neglected to make another statement that involves a principle, namely, that if, after a man has paid in for a number of years his contribution to the funds, and he then finds it necessary to retire from the service, he would be entitled to a certain percentage of rebate, which would be paid back to him; or if a man pays in for a number of years and dies, his widow or children can receive a certain amount back.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point I am not clear on. Suppose this becomes law, and goes into operation on July 1, or January 1. An employee who has been in there for thirty years and has not contributed anything dies ; what provision is made for him?

Mr. EMMERSON. He does not participate in this fund.

Mr. FOSTER. He has not had time to participate. He has been there thirty years, and has got his wage; this law comes into effect. If he is there thirty years more he will contribute, but suppose he dies or is disabled?

Mr. EMMERSON. I would consider that his misfortune or the misfortune of his family.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose he is disabled and has to be retired; he has not contributed practically anything to the fund—what does he get? Is there any provision for that case?

Mr. EMMERSON. He has at this moment certain privileges under another institution which has been in force, but he would not have the benefit of this.

Mr. FOSTER. He has to earn the benefit of this?

Mr. EMMERSON. He has to earn the benefit of this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then this Act will be of no assistance to persons who have been a long time in the service and who will be retired?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; this Act is intended to retire from the service all those who have been in the service for a long time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the question that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked just now, and to which the minister said no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly did not understand him.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that was my question. My question was this: Suppose, when this Act comes into force, there are men on the railway who have been in the service for thirty years; they are eighty years of age, or they have reached that famous fourscore, and they are to be retired—what do they get? They have contributed nothing.

Mr. EMMERSON. No; there is the same provision for them as that which is made in the case of those who do contribute. You will find in the details of this Act that the very moment the Act comes into force all those who are of a certain age——

Mr. STOCKTON. It takes effect at once?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly; every man who has reached a period which would entitle him to a retiring allowance will receive it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I asked.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not so understand him.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, in so far as that is concerned, it is simply a government gratuity.

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely; just in so far as that is concerned, and to that end it is to the advantage of the railway. It is paid by the government for the purpose of ridding the railway of those men who are to-day not in a position to meet the requirements of them as far as they are concerned in the performance of their duties. To-day it is a government gratuity in many instances to pay them their full wage, and I justify before this House and

the country the statement that some provision should be made for these men. They have for a long time served the country, and provision will be made for them in this way. I submit that as fair and just, and I submit it also as a sentiment and opinion that will meet with the widespread approval of the people of this country who are in no way connected with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not put these in your schedule then? Why did you leave them out when you were reading it?

Mr. EMMERSON. You will find it in the schedule. You will find it in the section referring to that very matter.

Mr. HAGGART. You did not read that.

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I did not read it.

Mr. FOSTER. All we want to do is to get at the scope of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. All I want to do is to give it as concisely as possible.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this law be compulsory? Will every employee of the railway be compelled to avail himself of the provisions of the law?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; and the further provision is made that no man over the age of 35 years in the case of labourers and men who have not technical railway training may be employed in the service of the Intercolonial Railway in future, and that so far as those are concerned who have railway technical training they cannot exceed the age of 45 years. To that extent this Act is going to be beneficial to the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. One point more. Does the minister make provision for efficient medical examination for the entrance of employees into the service?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is provision made in the Bill whereby every one who goes into the service must submit to a rigid medical inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that would be absolutely necessary.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is absolutely necessary, and they must be within the age of 35 years in the case of men not having general railway technical training, and in the case of those who have such training they must not exceed the age of 45 years, while in every instance they must submit themselves to medical examination.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that provision that the minister just spoke of apply to all branches of the service?

Mr. EMMERSON. To all branches of the service.

Mr. BRODER. Then you expect to secure men who have been trained on other railways?

Mr. EMMERSON. If we require them. The Act does not prohibit us from securing the services of a man who has been trained on another railway, and it does not prohibit a man who has been thus trained seeking employment on this railway.

Mr. BRODER. Is the effect of it to do away with men who have not had training?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BRODER. Do you say that men who have not been trained will be able to be employed on the Intercolonial Railway if they are over 35 years of age?

Mr. EMMERSON. Any man who seeks employment on the railway without having had technical training in railway matters must be under the age of 35 years, or he must be 35 years or under before he can get employment, and he must submit to a medical examination. In the case of those who are experts, for instance, in some branch of railway work, he must be 45 years or under, or he cannot exceed the age of 45 years.

Mr. STOCKTON. That rule would not apply to the present employees?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; this, of course, refers to men who are hereafter to be employed by the Intercolonial Railway or Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that mean that no employee can enter the service of the Intercolonial Railway above the age of 45 years?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and participate in this fund.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men will have the advantage of this law which the hon. minister proposes now?

Mr. EMMERSON. When the Act comes into force all the employees who are engaged in the service of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are about——

Mr. FOSTER. Eight thousand and over.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are eight thousand men on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any system of the same kind in force on the other railways—the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; I stated that. There is a system in force on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway makes the whole contribution to the fund and do not require anything from the men. I think the Grand Trunk have some system. I am not quite familiar with it—but I understand that there is

notice already given for a Bill that is to be introduced at this session of parliament making provision for the men somewhat different from the one which has hitherto prevailed in connection with the operation of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this Act interfere in any way with the present provision as to the insurance of the employees?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this will not interfere only that hereafter employees cannot avail themselves of both provisions. With respect to the insurance they may continue in that, or they may join that because the present relief association of the Intercolonial Railway has an insurance provision. The men may continue in that. It has also a disability provision. The men may not continue in that and get a disability allowance and at the same time become parties to this scheme and get a disability allowance. I know that there has been an amount of money paid for many years out of the earnings of the Intercolonial. It has been going on for the last twenty years or more, certainly ever since the existence of this employees' liability fund. There has been the payment of a certain sum of money out of the earnings towards this fund in connection with the organization. Whether it is authorized by a vote of parliament or whether by a statute passed years ago I do not remember.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the government contribute anything to the insurance or disability fund?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have done so in the past. I think the amount is $6,000 a year. It was paid into that association and was distributed from time to time as cases presented themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If an employee should contribute for fifteen or twenty years to this fund and should die in the service, is there any sum payable to his family?

Mr. EMMERSON. In such a case it would be almost wholly refunded. I may say that almost all these provisions are the suggestions of the employees themselves who have met from time to time at the Intercolonial Railway centres and have selected representatives who framed the skeleton of a Bill which in almost every particular corresponds with the scheme now proposed. Of course there are some differences which may be properly taken into consideration.

Mr. STOCKTON. If an employee should contribute one and a half per cent for fifteen or twenty years and should then resign or be dismissed, is there any provision?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all provided for. If he is dismissed for cause, for wilful negligence or some offence——

Mr. CROCKET. Offensive partizanship.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that would come in. They do not usually get dismissed for partizanship not since 1878. If that had been the case in 1896, a great many of them would have gone out who are still in the service.

Mr. BARR. But there have been some dismissed for that cause.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was one party high up in the service, but he had issued so many shingles that it was necessary—to keep the rain out.

Mr. MORIN. If an employee works for a few days on the railway and is disabled by accident will this Bill provide for him ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know whether the House will be prepared to extend the scope of the Bill so as to include men who were temporarily employed on the railway.

Mr. MORIN. He has to live to win in this case.

Mr. EMMERSON. He has to be a permanent employee before he participates in the benefits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) was referring to the case of a permanent employee who was disabled after being only a few days in the service.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there is a provision in the Act which enables the board to determine as to whether an allowance shall be made to such an employee irrespective of his term of service.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another Act dealing with disabilities?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there is a provision in this Act also, but that is a detail which can be considered in committee.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister did not complete his explanation to what would occur if an employee was dismissed.

Mr. EMMERSON. If a man is dismissed for cause that man will not receive a refund. If a man wilfully walks out of the railway service after having been in a year or two he cannot recover. It would be unfair to the other employees if he could. He would have the benefits of the fund during his service and if he left the service through whim or caprice he could not ask that the amount contributed should be refunded to him. However, there is a provision under which if a man retires after a certain number of years he can have his case considered by the board. I think it will be found that the Bill is carefully drawn having regard to the interests of the railway as well as of the employees themselves. The question is dealt with on the co-operative principle, and it is dealt with in a fair and impartial way I think. I trust that the Bill will receive careful consideration and, indeed, I would invite suggestions. While I am in-

troducing this as a government measure it is of course not a party measure in any sense; it is not surrounded by any political considerations and as such it should be dealt with by the House.

Mr. MORIN. If an employee should contribute to this fund for fifteen or twenty years and then dies, would his widow receive any compensation from the fund?

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount the deceased had contributed would be paid back. This is not an insurance society; there is an insurance organization in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. This is simply to provide a retiring allowance for an employee when he is unable to work on the railways.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be more than a retiring allowance because you pay something after death.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is nothing paid after death.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to state, in answer to a question from this side, that in the event of a man dying after having paid into the fund for a number of years, the money due to him would be paid to his widow or heirs.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said the money that he had paid in.

Mr. SPROULE. The government does not supplement that?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is only the amount he paid in that goes back to his family.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does the government pay interest on that?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is the amount he paid, without interest.

Mr. LOGAN. Who pays the expense of the medical examination?

Mr. EMMERSON. That comes out of the fund.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, to the measure of the hon. gentleman, whether you call it a pension or a gratuity that he is providing for, there cannot be a great deal of objection. The employees of the railway are to contribute to the fund one and a half per cent of their wages, equalling about $29,000 per year, and $29,000 per year is to be contributed by the government. As the minister says, it is virtually an increase of wages to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway of one and a half per cent. The total sum of $58,000 a year is to be placed in a fund bearing interest at three per cent, and is to accumulate for the purpose of providing pensions or gratuities to the old employees of the railway. There is a good deal in what the minister says in regard to the difficulty of dealing with old men in the employ of the road in the absence of any provision for them in the event of their services being dispensed with. In these circumstances it is almost imperative to retain in the employ of the road for a considerable period men who have become practically useless. To that extent the measure will be a benefit to the road if it enables the management to retire men whose usefulness has ceased. If the minister had given us comparisons with the various railroads in the country which have adopted similar systems, we could form some idea as to whether the system proposed for the Intercolonial is in accordance with railroad precedents. So far as I could understand his remarks, he has only made comparisons with a couple of roads. One of them I think was the New York Central, which he said contributed 2 per cent, the employees also contributing 2 per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is mistaken. I made a comparison with a railroad in England. I stated that the railroads there always require the men to contribute, the company contributing an equal amount, and I mentioned the case of the Northeastern Railway, in which the men were required to contribute 2 per cent, and the railway contributed an equal amount.

Mr. HAGGART. I made a mistake in thinking the comparison was with a railroad in the United States. I would have liked to have had a comparison with the railroads of this country. The only one he mentioned was the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he stated contributed the whole of the fund for its pension system.

Mr. EMMERSON. Every railroad in the United States makes the total contribution to the fund; there is nothing asked of the men.

Mr. HAGGART. There are very few pension funds in America, if that is the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the list.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the minister will find that they are not pension funds, but disability funds, to make good losses to employees from accidents, and in many cases the railroad companies ask their employees to contract themselves out of claims for damages in consequence. However, the minister is more conversant with this subject than I, for I have not looked into it lately. The minister branched off for the purpose of stating that there is a feeling in all sections of the country, especially in the west, that the Intercolonial Railway is overmanned, and he brings a lot of statistics for the purpose of proving that that is not the case. He showed the number of men per mile employed on nearly every railroad on the continent. What in the world has that to do with the question whether there are too many men employed on the Intercolonial Railway? If one railway is a hundred miles long and employs six men per mile,

and another is a hundred miles long and employs thirty-six per mile, how can such a comparison between them show whether one is overmanned or not. The proper test is the amount of work they do, the amount of freight and the number of passengers carried. The mileage of the railway has nothing whatever to do with it. Why the minister went to the trouble of getting that sheet prepared, or why the department went to the trouble of furnishing him with such material, I cannot understand. There are some points the minister does not seem to be clear about. One is whether the employees of the Canada Eastern Railway, the employees of the Drummond Counties Railway, and the joint employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, in connection with the terminals at Montreal, are to come under the provisions of the Act.

The minister does not seem to have thought of these matters at all. He thinks however there might be such provision made. However when the Bill comes down we shall be able to judge for ourselves. I understood from the remarks of the hon. minister that the fund would amount to in the neighbourhood of $100,000. I am gratified to find from his statement that there is not much possibility of the government contributing in the near future to the extent of more than $30,000 or $40,000, and that the amount really which would be available likely for two or three years to come—taking the status of the Intercolonial Railway at present and the number of employees, and as taking the expressed intention of the minister to reduce his staff after the new Bill becomes law—will be in the neighbourhood of about $60,000 a year. This legislation, I may say, is in the direction I would advocate myself. It is legislation such as has been introduced in nearly every country for the purpose of providing pensions to employees in their old age—not only to employees on government and other railways. And my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle), I understand, intends that this system of pensions shall not only be applied to employees on government and other railways but to all the inhabitants of the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. By way of explanation, I would say to my hon. friend that I think there is a provision in the Bill whereby all the men in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway at the time the Act comes into force will come under its provision.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the services they rendered on certain railways before they became acquired by the government—for instance the Drummond county railway and the joint employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial Railway in connection with the terminals at Montreal—be considered in this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would anticipate that. If the provisions in the Bill are not sufficiently ample to cover these, I would have them made so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). It is obviously impossible to discuss the details, and indeed it would be improper to attempt to do so, on this resolution. The minister is not fully seized of all the details himself, as he has explained with regard to certain matters. The only subject we can discuss is the principle involved, and so far as that is concerned I am prepared to endorse it. It is a principle which has been applied, not only by railway corporations, but by many other large corporations throughout the country, namely, the principle of making some provision for the declining years of men who have spent long and faithful service in the employ of the corporation or, as in this case, in the employ of the government. My hon. friend gave expression to the opinion, on at least two occasions in his speech, that these men were not to be regarded as mendicants. I do not suppose it entered into the imagination of any one, except that of the minister, to so regard them. As far as I myself am concerned and I am sure other members, the idea would never have occurred to anyone of us had it not been suggested by the minister himself. My hon. friend introduced various arguments in connection with the scheme he proposed. He took up about one half of his speech in endeavouring to demonstrate that the Intercolonial Railway is not overmanned. What that particular proposition has to do with the establishment of this pension fund, I fail to understand. What particular bearing has it on the establishment of this fund whether or not the Intercolonial Railway is overmanned at present? That is a question of administration, entirely apart from the question of principle involved in this resolution. But the hon. gentleman did take up that subject and proposed to establish his contention by the most extraordinary logic I have ever listened to. He did establish it—very much to his own satisfaction but not to the satisfaction of any one else—by making a comparison based on the mileages of the different roads. Let us assume, for instance, that there are two roads, each of which is 500 miles long, upon one of which two trains are run each way daily, and upon the other 50 trains run daily. Yet, the minister makes a comparison between the manning of the two roads by saying that each one is 500 miles long and each one has so many employees per mile. Then when he had established, very much to his own satisfaction in this way, that there was no overmanning on the Intercolonial Railway, he went on to tell us that the Intercolonial Railway was overmanned and that one of the objects of the Bill he proposed was to get rid of that overmanning. That seems to me the most extraordinary argument I have ever listen-

ed to. The minister's argument, apart from that, did have some bearing on the subject. A small portion of his argument did have some bearing on it; but so far as that particular portion is concerned, if he had been in this House and had presented that argument with the same force and ability as characterized him this afternoon, he would have been strongly opposed to the superanuation Act of 1896 by the government of which he was a member, because many of the arguments he uttered this afternoon were exactly opposed to those presented by Sir William Mulock, then Postmaster General, in favour of the measure he introduced in 1897, and which was passed in 1898, abolishing the Superannuation Act which had been in force in this country for many years before that time. However this is a question apart. Suffice to say that there is for the civil service in this country to-day no provision by way of superannuation but in its stead there is a provision by way of a retiring allowance. The hon. minister, taking back what was urged on behalf of this government in the past, proposes now to establish a pension scheme for the employees on the Intercolonial Railway. So far as the principle is concerned, I am in favour of it, but as regards the details we shall have the opportunity of going into them much more fully when the minister brings down his Bill.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). I quite agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that this is hardly an opportune time to discuss this matter since we have not the Bill before us. However, I consider that the move is one in the right direction. The question of providing for the aged poor is one that has been given a great deal of consideration in many countries. The hon. minister used the word 'mendicants' several times during his speech. I fail to see why the employees on the Intercolonial Railway or any body of men who are entitled legally to a pension fund should be classed as mendicants. I rather agree with the language used by Prince Bismark, when introducing in Germany his Bill in 1881. This is what he said:

> The state must take the matter into its own hands, not as almsgiving, but as the right that men have to be taken care of when, with the best will imaginable, they become unable to work. Why should the regular soldier, or public official, have a right to a pension in his old age, and not the soldier of labour?

Now, the position in this country—and I regret to say in some other countries—is that while our judges and civil servants and soldiers and numerous other employees, even railway employees and those employed by large commercial bodies are provided with a pension fund it is left to labour and labour alone to be without that provision which is given to men in nearly all other classes or walks of life. As I said I am not on this occasion going to take up the broad question as to the proper provision for the aged and deserving poor. It is a subject which has been considered by the very best minds not only in European countries, but also in Great Britain and we have the report of the different commissions which were appointed in Great Britain, I think in 1899, in 1900, and lastly in 1903. We have the reports of these commissions in regard to the old age question in Great Britain and I am pleased to say that the report of the commission of 1903 was very strongly in favour of proper provision being made for the aged and deserving poor. It has been left, I may say, to the little British colony of New Zealand to put into practical effect a law which does provide for the aged and deserving poor. Most of us, I think are aware that that Act was brought into force in 1898, simply as a temporary measure for a period of three years, being a trial in that colony as to whether the measure would be a success or not. They had the example of Denmark, they had the example of a different system in Germany and of different provisions in Austria as well as the example of other countries. New Zealand in 1898 put a law on her statute-book and I may say that that law has been an unqualified success. I was reading the evidence given a while ago by a representative of New Zealand before the commission in Great Britain who were hearing evidence in connection with this question, and I was pleased to see that the evidence was that in New Zealand the Act had been an unqualified success. So successful has it been that in 1905 they had extended the system to a very large extent, increasing the provision which was in force from 1898 to 1905.

I am not going to discuss now the resolution which I have on the order paper to the effect:

> That in the opinion of this House the subject of improving the condition of the aged, deserving poor, and of providing for those of them who are helpless and infirm, is worthy of and should receive the early and careful attention of the government and of parliament.

I hope in a few days to bring this up when I shall be very pleased to hear a full discussion in regard to that question, because I believe the day has come in this country when it should be given very careful consideration. I am not unmindful of the fact that Canadians are a generous people, that they are to-day providing largely for the poor of their country. In the province of Ontario to-day we have our statute in regard to the establishment of poor houses and many of our counties have established poor houses which are giving great satisfaction in the localities in which they are established. Further, the provinces are assisting the municipalities by grants and aid to the poor houses and all these institutions throughout the provinces, but I believe the day has come when the

state as a whole should consider whether some general scheme could not be conceived which would accomplish the purpose desired and not put too heavy a burden upon the people of this country.

The Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) has referred to the pension or superannuation scheme in existence on the American railways and on some of our Canadian railways. I might say that I believe that in all these cases, the money is provided out of the surplus earnings of the railways, out of profits, and the men are not called upon to contribute any proportion of their salary or wages towards that fund. I may say that on looking into that matter I find that the different labour organizations and societies in Great Britain have condemned the principle of compulsory contribution towards a pension fund, and I was pleased to see that the report of the commission, I think Lord Aberdare was chairman of the commission, is directly against that principle.

The report had certain distinct merits, however, and these must not be overlooked. It showed conclusively the futility of all contributory schemes and ruled them out altogether.

Of course, I understand no pension fund can be supplied out of the surplus earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, and consequently the fund would practically have to be supplied by the country at large. At a later date, I may bring up the resolution which I have on the order paper, and I hope then to have a full discussion on the question of aid to the deserving poor.

Mr. HANCE LOGAN (Cumberland). I am sure that this resolution will be hailed with a great deal of delight by the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. The only great objection I can see is that this resolution was not brought down years ago. To any one who lives, as I do, upon the line of the Intercolonial Railway, the necessity of this legislation has been apparent. There are men working on all parts of that road, whom it is only necessary to see to realize that they are not competent, that they have passed the age at which they should be employed on railroad system. But no provision has been made for them, they have been paid a miserable wage in the days that have gone by. I have in mind now the cases of trackmen who have been there for 30 years, and who only within the last few years received the wage of $1.15; 20 years ago they received only about 90 cents a day. These men have brought up large families and have lived respectably in the community, but when they reach the age of 70 or 75 when they would naturally retire, no provision has been made to give them a retiring allowance, and so it has been that they have been hanging on to their work on the railway when it was neither in their interest nor in that of the railway that they should be retained in the service.

The only objection I have to the Bill proposed by the minister is the fact that the employees themselves are called upon to contribute an amount towards the fund.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is their own proposition.

Mr. LOGAN. If, as the minister informs me, this is their own proposition, I do not see that I should quarrel with it. There must be some reason for their making such a suggestion. I presume it is that by making a certain contribution this retiring allowance shall be greater than that given on other railways throughout America. My hon. friend wanted to know what other roads had established provident systems. I have before me a treatise upon railroad provident institutions, in which a list is given of those great railroads in America which have established such a system. I shall not read them all, but shall mention some of the larger roads in America that have established this provident system—and mark you, if I am well informed, there is not one of these railroads which compels or asks its employees to contribute a dollar to the fund. Some of these railways are: The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad system, Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad, Boston and Albany Railroad, Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg Railway, Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, Chicago and Alton Railway, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railway, Houston and Texas Railroad, Illinois Central Railroad, New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, Oregon Railroad and Navigation Co., Oregon Short Line Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad system, Philadelphia and Reading Railway, San Antonia and Arkansas Pass Railway, Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad. These are among the largest railroads on the continent of America, and they have all established this system of providing for the old age of employees who have worked on those roads. It is simply a matter of justice to the men on the Intercolonial who are faithful employees. It is pleasant to us who live on the Intercolonial to hear the praises that are sung of the employees on that road by people who have travelled over the government system of railways. They have the reputation of being courteous, of being faithful, of being industrious, and yet up to the present moment we have never provided for the sunset of the life of these men who have devoted their strength to the railway service. As a matter of fact a man who works upon a railway becomes incapacitated for almost any other kind of work. A man, for instance, who learns section work and does that work thoroughly and spends his lifetime at it, when the time comes that he should retire, is not able to do so because he is not able to take

up any other kind of work. This pension fund makes provision by which he will be able to retire from the service on the road because enough will be provided for him to keep away starvation at least, and he can, if he desires, engage in some other light occupation to augment the fund which he will receive from this pension. I am glad the minister has introduced this Bill, and I am sure the government should be delighted with the reception it has received at the hands of the leaders of the opposition. It seems to me, after listening this afternoon to the speeches made, that the only pensions that are not popular are the pensions to ex-cabinet ministers, because I am sure the pension system has been endorsed by both sides of this House. I think therefore that we should approach this question in the way suggested by the Minister of Railways, not in a partisan spirit, but in a spirit which will ensure the very best Bill possible in the interest of the employees of the government on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). There are just two points I would like to allude to for a moment. The first is the lack of information that I think we ought to have. If the minister, instead of going into the trouble of that mileage arrangement that he brought before us, and which really seems to have no bearing on the question, had put before us a digest of the provident systems which are in operation on different railways in the United States, in Great Britain and in Canada, he would have given us ground for comparing the present proposition with others. As it is now, we are shut up to this proposition, unless we are fortunate enough to have had time to look into the matter and see what systems other roads have. This must be easily at the hand of the Railway Department, and I would yet suggest that the minister get his officers to prepare us a digest of the plans of the provident systems which have been adopted and are in operation. Out of these we may get some useful hints which would help to make this measure somewhat better.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had in mind doing that, but I did not think it would be relevant in the discussion of the resolution, certainly not necessary, and would be taking up the time of the House. The mileage question seemed to me very pertinent, because I wanted to show that in making provision for the old age of the men in the employ of the railway, we are not necessarily making provision for an extra number, that is, for a number of men who should not be there. That was the point of my illustration taken from other railways as to the number of men per mile employed on each railway.

Mr. FOSTER. If that was the minister's intention, I cannot understand that it was pertinent to this subject at all. Take the question put by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Did not that question impress itself upon the minister? Is it a question of mere mileage? Does that prove anything? If, for instance, as was said, you have two roads a hundred miles long, and on one road there are two trains a day, while on the other there are twenty, thirty, or forty trains a day, what do you gather by a comparison of the number of men per mile on each of these roads to prove that either the one is undermanned or the other is overmanned.

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the average on the whole line.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot carry it out unless you get the number of trains that are moved, the size of trains, the freight that is moved, the passenger trains, and the number of passengers that were moved. The call for employment makes it necessary to have empolyees. If there is ten times the call on one road to what there is on the other there may not be ten times more labour required, but more labour is required, and will be found on the one system than the other. But the information which the minister is to bring down will give us a basis for comparing the systems, and may be we can improve the system the minister has introduced by looking into the facts as they are on other roads. But I want to call the minister's attention to another thing which I think is of sufficient importance to be remedied. What reason is there in the wide world, because the management of the Intercolonial has been over merciful, or over negligent, or ever parsimonious, and have consequently kept on that road men whose period of useful service has long since passed, and now when you introduce a system by which every able bodied earner on the road is to pay in one and a half per cent of his monthly wages, you should take a forced contribution from the men of to-day and use it to pension off and retire the men who have been kept on for the last twenty or thirty years. That is unjust. The government should not ask the earning men of to-day to put their money into a fund the major part of which for the first years will be used up in retiring men who have been kept beyond the period of service. These men of to-day are not responsible for that. It was because the government, as I said, was merciful and did not wish to dismiss these men, or because they neglected to make a proper provision for their retirement. Now if I were a railway employee and at work with my pick or my shovel, or as a conductor, or as a freight man, I would consider it a hardship that I should be called upon to contribute one and a half per cent of my

monthly wages, not to retire and pension men who commenced with me, with earning powers equal to my own, and who consequently contributed on an equality, and for an equality of contingency in way of retirement, but that my contribution should be used up, for the greater part, the first, second or third years in retiring men whose careers of usefulness extending from twenty to thirty or forty years, had gone by, and they were therefore really men who ought to be on the pension list. I think the government ought to clean up the slate, they ought to make diligent examination, and in the case of men whose period of usefulness is passed, whom they have kept from motives of mercy, and who are consequently clogging the service of the road rather than assisting it, the government should retire those men with a gratuity out of its railway earnings, should clean up the slate, and then you would start with men who are able to work and give service, and who contribute according to the wages that are paid, that is, according to the value of the service which they render.

Now, it strikes me that when the minister thinks it over he will see that the provision of his Bill in reference to that phase of the question is an unfair thing and that it would be much better for the government to make its equable and proper disposition for these older men who have outlived their usefulness and not allow them to be a burden upon the earnings of the serviceable men in the employ of the road. I quite agree with the minister and the men in the departments here in this city, on this hill, know exactly what it means. You take a good man, he has been at service as section man, or as conductor, or brakeman on a freight train, or conductor or brakeman on a passenger train, he has performed his 30 or 35 years of service, he has been a good serviceable man ; it goes against the grain to say to him at his advanced age : Here, sir, you have given your service to the country or to this railway, now, you can do no more and are not fit for anything else; you will have to take your place on the street. If you have not been able to save, and you could not save much out of your earnings considering the expense which you had to meet, well, that is your misfortune. It is impossible for a man to approach his fellowmen in that spirit ; consequently, you have to make provision to meet that case or you have to have bad service and it is more economical by far to make provision, and I think the government ought to make provision, straight and square for all that class of men, retire them, and then go on with this system on a fair and square basis for the benefit of all those who do give good service for the wages they get. Here we come back to the old question. You may get up a little popular furore if you like against what is called the pension system or the gratuity system, but the experience of every government comes straight up against it sooner or later. You need some such system for an efficient service. It is not human to throw out the older men when they have exceeded their time of good service on not very generous pay, and it clogs the service and results in inefficiency if you keep them in. What are you going to do about it ? The country is big and strong enough and ought to be brave enough to pay these men what is their proper due. Some kind of a superannuation or gratuity system is absolutely necessary. You may bend to what you may think is the popular breeze today, but from a straight business, economical, humanitarian point of view you will come up against that question and in the end it will be solved by the country taking proper care of its valued and serviceable men who have been its salvation and strength.

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

Mr. SPROULE. According to the wording of the resolution it provides for a retiring allowance simply for those who are employed on the Intercolonial Railway. Will it provide as well for the widow and orphans in the event of an employee's death ? The wording of the resolution would not appear to convey that idea.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a provision under the present organization in operation on the Intercolonial Railway for that. This is not an insurance scheme. The suggestion of my hon. friend would involve insurance. It is simply the counterpart of a retiring allowance scheme which is in vogue all over this continent and very generally in Europe. This is apart from any consideration of life insurance.

Mr. SPROULE. The resolution says :

> That it is expedient to establish a fund to provide life allowances to certain retired employees on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways, and to authorize a contribution by His Majesty to the said fund.

That is simply to give a retiring allowance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. During the discussion, the question was put to the minister : Suppose a man had been in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway for a length of time and had died before he was retired, what would become of the fund that he had contributed under the provisions of this Act? I understood him to say that that would be paid to his heirs. There is no mention in this resolution of that feature of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. That will appear in the Bill. The resolution is affirming a principle. The details of the principle will be considered when the Bill is in committee.

There is or may be a return to the widow of the amount which has been contributed by an individual.

Mr. SPROULE. It cannot be a retiring allowance for him after he is dead.

Mr. LENNOX. I call the attention of the hon. minister again to the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Of course, this is merely the affirmation of a principle but the Bill must be within the scope of the principle which is here affirmed. Does the minister think that the Bill is within the scope of this resolution when the resolution not only says 'to establish a fund to provide life allowances'—

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not mean death, that is life.

Mr. LENNOX. Life allowances.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is for life.

Mr. LENNOX. I am coming to that. The resolution says that it is expedient to establish a fund to provide life allowances which has nothing to do with payments after death to the heirs of certain employees. A man who dies during the currency of this matter is not a retired employee and the payment to his widow is not a payment of a life allowance. So, I think that what my hon. friend from East Grey called attention to is worth the minister's consideration in order that he may determine whether the Bill as he explained it this afternoon will be within the principle of this resolution. I would think it would not be.

Mr. EMMERSON. The payment to the widow is simply a return made to the widow of certain payments which her husband had contributed to this fund in the expectation that he would be retired during his life and be enabled to receive a retiring allowance. A provision is contained in the Bill whereby equity may be done in such a case. The man having died, the contribution having been made, and no benefit having been received by him or his family they simply make restitution of the payments which he made to his widow without interest and less charges of management. But it is not to be placed in the same class as the retiring allowance, which is to be passed upon by the board to be paid monthly by the man in the event of his severing his connection properly with the railway.

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

Mr. EMMERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 68) to establish the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Provident Fund.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE UNREVISED STATUTES.

Bill (No. 19)—respecting the revised statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 3,

Mr. AYLESWORTH. With regard to the wording of the first subsection of section 3, in the first place the date appearing in line 10 could not now be the first day of January. I move that it be so amended that the statutes shall come into force on the 31st of January. I propose also the omission of all the words after '1906' in the first line to the words 'sixty-one' in the third line, so that the subsection will omit all referenece to the roll mentioned in section 1 of the Act of 1903, that reference being unnecessary.

Mr. BOURASSA. Would the French text be ready at the same time as the English text, namely, the 31st of January ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I should think it hardly probable. The French text is in manuscript at present and I should think they would not be likely to have it in print at quite so early a date.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not see why one text should become law before the other. I do not see why they cannot wait until the English and French text become law at the same time. However, when we come to section 10, I propose discussing that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the provisions of the Act of King Edward the VII. referred to ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is the statute of 1903 which provides for the appointment of the commission to revise the statutes, and which provides that on the commission concluding their work the certified roll is to be deposited under the signature of the Governor General and such roll shall be held to be the original of the said statutes, so revised, classified and consolidated. That roll has been prepared, has been attested by His Excellency under his own hand, has been deposited, and by virtue of this enactment is constituted the original of the said statutes so revised.

On section 4,

Mr. AYLESWORTH. These sections from 4 to 9 are repetition of sections which are now in force as part of this Act of 1903, and which it is desirable should continue to be in force, and which are here repeated because this measure provides by its concluding section for the repeal of the whole Act of 1903 as no longer serving any useful purpose.

On section 9—as to effect of insertion of an Act in schedule A—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this language the same as that employed in the case of the former revision?

Mr. AYLESOWRTH. I have no doubt it is practically the same. It is the same as was provided in the Act of 1903. We propose to repeal that Act, and to substitute this for it.

On section 10—Governor in Council to appoint translators—

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are some words which have been inserted in this section in the Senate which were not in the section as it was drawn when the Bill was presented for consideration there, and which it seems to me must have been inserted without an understanding of the view in which the clause was drafted. I move therefore that this clause be amended in three respects; first, in the second line, to strike out the words 'translators to revise,' and to substitute for them the words 'persons to prepare,: then, in the third line, to strike out the word 'translators' and change the preceding word 'the' to 'they'; and finally, in the fifth, sixth and seventh lines of the second subsection, to strike out all the words after the word 'deemed' down to and including the words 'chapter 61 and'; so that the section will read thus:

10. The Governor in Council may appoint two or more competent persons to prepare the French version of the said Revised Statutes, and they shall proceed as speedily as possible to make and complete such revision and report the same to the Governor in Council.

2. The Governor General shall thereupon cause a printed roll of the revision so made and reported, attested under the signature of the Governor General and that of the clerk of the parliaments, to be deposited in the office of the said clerk, and such roll shall be deemed to be the authentic original French version of the said statutes, and as such shall have the force of law as if herein enacted.

Perhaps, in view of what has passed in another place with reference to this section and of the observations which a few minutes ago fell from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I might without disadvantage explain the view in which this clause was inserted. This is, so far as I know, the first time in the history of the various revised statutes of this country that any provision whatever has been made for an original or authentic copy of our laws in the French language. Always we have taken care, and from the standpoint of a lawyer I should say necessarily taken care, to provide an original standard, so to say, as the authentic version of the statutes, in the English tongue. In each instance when our laws have been revised or consolidated there has been provision for the depositing with the clerk of parliament, of an original roll which should be attested by the signature of the Governor or some other dignitary, establishing that roll as the authentic document, the volume of our law, to which recourse could be had at any time if any question were raised as to what the true law of the country was. Practically we have dealt always with the printed copies which have been in general circulation; but each one of these copies is but a copy. None of these copies which circulate in dozens or hundreds about the country is of any higher validity than any other copy. If there were mistakes, error in printing or inaccuracy of any kind, in regard to which it were desirable to refer to some standard of authenticity by which the error might be corrected, that standard could be found in the English language, and in the English language alone. That, it seemed to us who were considering the preparation of this statute, was not in accord with the system which obtained in this country. The French text of our statutes is of absolutely equal potency with the English.

It is a matter of indifference in which language the proceedings of parliament are carried on or in which language the laws of this country are expressed, and I do not doubt that if any board of revising commissioners should happen to be composed of members whose mother tongue was the French language we should have the revision of the statutes expressed, in the first instance, in that language and afterwards turned by translation into English. That being the position, it certainly seemed to me of some practical importance and value that there should be, authenticated by legislation, a standard of our laws in the French language to which, in case of necessity similar to that to which I alluded a few moments ago, recourse could be had by any one more familiar with that language than he might happen to be with the English and by which reference any person, desirous of knowing what the law of the land was, as expressed in the French language, could be guided and could satisfy himself. It was with that view entirely that this provision was inserted in the statute, even though now, for the first time in the history of the laws of this country, there should be in our statute-book a recognition of that standard of accuracy and authenticity in the French as well as the English. But greatly to my astonishment it appears to have been considered by some of our friends of the French nationality that the proposition to make this official, statutory recognition of their language upon the face of our laws, was in some sense a reflection upon the standing which the French texts of our statutes should have in the country. It was with exactly the opposite idea that this provision was prepared and inserted, and it was exactly in order to supply a lack which always heretofore seemed to have existed that this proposition was made, and in spite of all the discussion I have noticed in regard to it, it does seem to me—looking at the question perhaps from the point of view

of a lawyer—that it is a necessary provision. We have the revised statutes in both English and French. It may be that the meaning of some sections, as expressed in the one language, does not quite tally with the meaning as expressed in the other, and it would need some one equally familiar with both tongues to be able to show which best expresses the intention of parliament, but the one version casts light upon the other. There may be reference to either in any court in Canada. It is not infrequent for the French version to be referred to in the English-speaking courts of Ontario as casting light upon and showing the true meaning of what might perhaps have been obscure in the English text. Each one helps to elucidate the other, and the fact that we have our laws expressed in the two languages in that way serves to emphasize what to my mind is the advantageous position this country enjoys—a position perhaps unique in the whole civilized world—where we have two great languages, each of which is equally recognized as official. Here, then, we are proposing to have an enactment upon the face of our statutes by means of which —just as there is a standard of weight or of measure or of any other nature established and deposited at Westminster to which recourse can be had to know the true length of a yard or the true weight of a pound or of any other standard of authenticity—recourse may be had to the original roll in either the English or French language. Then section 10 provides that taking the work of the commissioners—which is already authenticated by the signature of His Excellency, which is on deposit, and which, by virtue of the statute passed in 1903, has thereby been declared to be the original of the said statutes so revised, classified and consolidated—the gentlemen to be appointed for this work shall prepare a French version of the said statutes. On their completing their work of preparing that version—I avoid the use of the word translation—upon the completion of their work of preparation of the French version of the text, the roll which they have prepared—being similarly attested, not merely by His Excellency, but also by the clerk of the parliament in whose custody the original of the said statute, as defined by the present law of 1903, has been deposited—shall in turn be the original French version of the said statutes and as such shall have the force of law exactly as in the case of the English text

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose you enter a court and find one lawyer pleading that the French version is correct and it differs somewhat from the English version, or vice versa, what would be the result?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That position has arisen to my knowledge in the case of statutes which are passed here from year to year. Every statute is passed in both languages and occasionally there is some slight difference of meaning between them.

Mr. SPROULE. Then which do you follow?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The court has to determine, from examining the two versions, what was the true meaning and intent of the legislature.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the one which was declared to be the only and original version the one to determine?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Neither is declared to be the only and original version. Each has absolutely equal force and effect.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that that had not been the case heretofore. I understood him to say that there only had been one original version, and now it is proposed to have two. I have heard it said frequently, by both French and English speaking members in this House, that you cannot translate from the English to the French and then, no matter how good may be the translators, translate the English back to the French and have the English translation exactly the same as the original.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I was apparently not correctly understood, owing no doubt to my not having explained my meaning with sufficient clearness. The situation in 1886 was simply this: When the statutes were revised in that year the work was done in the English language. The roll in the English language was deposited, and was, by the legislation of that year, declared to be the original of the said statute. That roll was translated into French———

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. By whom?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. By persons appointed to do the work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under statute?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot for the moment answer. But from that day to this the French translation of that English roll has been received and acted upon practically in the courts. I do not know if such a case ever arose, but if it ever did happen that any one questioned the validity or accuracy of an expression, either in the English or French version of the revised statutes of 1886, he would have no standard to go to in order to make sure what was the law, except the one printed in the English language. We got along, both our English and French-speaking citizens, with the law expressed in that way. But it was thought desirable that there should now be two rolls deposited—one in English and the other in French.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not inclined at all to criticise the Minister of Justice as far as that part of it was concerned, al-

though I would think that the difficulty was not quite so serious in that respect as he pointed out. If I am not mistaken, under the Canada Evidence Act, the Canada statutes, and I suppose the same rule would apply to the revised statutes, are prima facie evidence in any court of what the law is, and therefore they being prima facie evidence no difficulty could arise unless you would be able to demonstrate that a statute did not accord with the original. Thus probably the person attempting to attack the accuracy of the printed statute would experience more difficulty than my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) seems inclined to think. I did not read very carefully what was said in another place, I glanced at it, and the objection, as far as I recollect it, is that until that French version is prepared there will be no opportunity for those in this country whose mother tongue is French to know exactly what the law is. That is to say you bring the law into force on the 1st day of January, or on the 30th day of January, as the minister has suggested and before the French translation has been prepared; there are about 2,000,000 people in this country who use the French language as their mother tongue and these people would have no French version of the law of the land by which they are bound until this translation is prepared and distributed. That is the objection as I understand and not the objection to the establishment of a French standard with which I do not think any one could find any fault, although perhaps the lack of that has not been attended with any serious difficulty in the past. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice just what his view is in that regard. The proceedings of the courts in the larger part of the province of Quebec, I suppose, are conducted in the French language and sometimes they are conducted by persons who have not perhaps a very perfect knowledge of the English language, perhaps no knowledge of it at all. When these persons seek to apply and interpret the law how are they to do it in the absence of any authorized French version? That would seem to me to be the difficulty which confronts us in dealing with the particular section we are examining just now.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. With regard to the advisability of enacting this particular section, in the first place, let me say in answer to what the hon. gentleman has just pointed out, that while it is true that each copy of the statutes, whether they are the revised statutes, or the statutes of any particular year, is by law made to be prima facie evidence of what the law is or what the statute was which parliament passed, it is not made conclusive evidence of it. The one thing which is conclusive evidence in the case of the revised statute is that original official roll, and therefore it seems to me that there should be that conclusive evidence of what the law was, provided in the French language as well as in the English.

With reference to the other point that has been raised as to the situation if the statutes come into force on the 31st of January or upon any other date——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And before there is a French version.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Before the French version is printed for general distribution, there is no doubt there may be inconveniences occasionally until the French version is circulated generally and distributed in all quarters where it may be desired. In that respect the question of inconvenience reduces itself to a consideration whether it would be in the general public interest to delay the bringing into force of these statutes and getting the benefit of the work of the Commission all over the Dominion of Canada until the completing of the printing of both French and English versions. The practical situation in that regard I take it, would simply be that any one using the statutes in a court where the proceedings are carried on in the French language would rely on the law as it stands at the present time, when the coming revised statutes have not yet been brought into force. There are no substantial changes, the work is really a consolidating and bringing together of the general body of the law as it has stood upon the statutes, the revised statutes of 1886, and the amendments made since that date, and the new statutes that have been passed since then. It would be inconvenient of reference, many volumes would have to be consulted instead of one, and there would be inconvenience to the practitioner, but no practical result except that inconvenience. If any question should arise in such a court where the proceedings were carried on in French as to what the law was, say on the 1st day of February, or any time after these statutes come into force, there would be the original roll in the French language to which reference could be made at the cost of a letter to Ottawa.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask whether the argument the minister has just now addressed to the committee would not be equally a good argument for postponing the operation of the statutes? The English-speaking part of the country can look up the statutes and do what my hon. friend has suggested can be done by the French-speaking people.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is precisely what I had in mind by saying it is a question of convenience or inconvenience. If it is thought advisable by this committee that the revised statutes should be held in abeyance perhaps for months until the French version is printed, compared with the original and distributed, it is for this committee to decide. It would seem to me it would be of advantage to the country to get the

benefit of the revision as soon as we can by bringing into effect the English version.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did it happen that the French version was not got under way before, why is it there has been so much delay?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only answer that since I have had charge of the Department of Justice, as far as the matter has come under my notice, the work of revision was not completed until about the month of August or September; in fact the Commissioners did not completely finish their work until the end of October and the work of translating, by taking their English revision and putting it into French, was begun some time in September or October.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it anticipated that will be completed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understand that the work is completed now, and that a roll in manuscript not in type can be deposited at any time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, I see, the French version is completed, but not printed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is not printed, and the printing is, of course, laborious.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that the delay will not be a very long one in any case.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 52) to confirm certain Agreements between the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal and Richard B. Angus; and between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal and Richard B. Angus.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ratz.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. G. H. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

THE REVISED STATUTES, 1906.

House in committee on Bill (No. 19) respecting the revised statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof.—Mr. Aylesworth.

On section 10, and amendments of Mr. Aylesworth thereto:

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say with regard to this, that it seems to me we are making a new departure from what has been the established custom from confederation up to the present time. In the last revision of the statutes we did not do it this way. We made only one original copy of record, and of course that was the only standard of law in the country, the only one which could be relied upon by either English or French in an endeavour to interpret the law. But now we appear to be desirous of making two standards either of which will be official. Now it is the usual custom when you try a case before a jury, that if the jury disagree the prisoner gets clear. I do not see why the same rule should not apply just as well in case of the interpretation of a law. If there was a difference in the interpretation of a law, the English meaning one thing and the French meaning another, and if each interpreter had the same right as the other to say: Mine is the record, and it must prevail; then I should think, following the usual principle, that law would fall to the ground. Now I am told it is a fact that some such trouble has arisen in the courts with regard to cases in the past. In the city of Montreal one such case at least was cited, I think, in the other chamber, where the law was differently interpreted in English and in French. It was with reference to the old revised statutes I believe, and therefore there was only one standard to fall back upon. The judge, I presume, might put a different interpretation on the law himself, but there was one standard to fall back upon. Had there been two standards, I do not know how he would have decided, or how justice could have have been equitably administered to both parties. I think a custom which has obtained so long—since confederation up to the present time—ought to be carried out in the future. Nor do I think that the provision in the British North America Act contemplated that, as I read the English language there. Clause 133 which refers to the use of the English or French language, reads:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the parliament of Canada, and of the Houses of the legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses——

I presume it will be claimed by some that this roll is one of the records of the House.

—and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

Now then we come to the statute itself:

The Acts of the parliament of Canada——

It does not say that a law shall be enacted.

The Acts of the parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

It simply says they shall be printed and published in both those languages, but no more. Now it seems to me that we are going beyond that to-day in the change that is proposed, and that it is likely to cause a good deal of trouble to the courts in future, and perhaps a miscarriage of justice in many cases.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is taking a view of the question that is entirely unlikely, just as I think the hon. the Minister of Justice this afternoon perhaps gave the position a colour of novelty which is not altogether warranted by the facts. If I am not mistaken, the remarks he made this afternoon applied only to the revised statutes. I suppose that in so far as any law adopted by this parliament is concerned, there are two official versions, the French and the English. Any Bill adopted by this House is adopted at the same time concurrently in French and in English. Now the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is, I think, making somewhat of a mistake when he takes this as being a new law. It is the revised statutes and not a new law. It is nothing else than a revision of the existing law and a declaration that this new text is taking the place of the old text.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I referred more particularly to the roll that is to be deposited with the clerk of the House, and to the fact that we are proposing to have two different rolls instead of one.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am coming to that. After all the roll in this case of the revised statutes is to take the place of both official texts of every law contained in the statutes. The roll is nothing else then a reprint, or a recast if the word is better, of every statute enacted by the parliament of Canada. Once in a while, such as we did in 1886, and likewise in 1903, the parliament of Canada thinks proper to have a recast of all those laws; so that there must be something corresponding with the two official texts which have been in existence for every law adopted by this parliament. The English and French rolls are nothing else than a recast of all the official texts which have been adopted from session to session of all the public and private Bills which have been enacted by this parliament.

All we have to do is to put into force these rolls and I think there is no doubt—and I would like to have the attention of the Minister of Justice on this point—that these rolls form part of the records of this House. May I ask the hon. Minister of Justice if I am right in this? I would like to understand this point clearly. Do these rolls which are mentioned in the Bill now under our consideration form part of the records of this House?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am afraid I am not able to answer the question categorically, but if I may be allowed one remark what strikes me is this—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are records of parliament.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Any statute which is under the consideration of this House must, by the rules of the House, be printed both in French and English. When it is enacted and agreed to by the other House and when it is assented to by His Excellency it is expressed in each language and neither version nor text can be said any more than the other to be the official voice of parliament in the matter. That is the position we are proposing to take in regard to the revised statutes.

Mr. BOURASSA. Quite so, but as each version of every Bill that has been passed by both Houses and assented to by the Governor General becomes part of the records of parliament both rolls of the revised statutes of Canada become a part of the records of this House and therefore they must conform with section 133 of the British North America Act, which provides that the records of both Houses shall be worded in the French and English languages. Whether that was done in 1886 or not is of no consequence. If the parliament of 1886 failed to do its duty under section 133 of the constitutional Act that is no reason why the parliament of this year should not do its duty. Because parliament may have failed to fulfil its obligations in one year it does not follow that it is something extraordinary or abnormal that parliament should do what it ought to do, under the constitution of Canada in another year. Now, the difficulty which the hon. gentleman has pointed out in regard to the revised statutes is one which might arise in regard to any statute which might be adopted from year to year. As the Minister of Justice has just stated one text is no more official than the other. Of every statute we pass there are two texts—the French and the English. Both are kept as records of the parliament of Canada under the signature of the clerk of parliament and both are equally official, so that the difficulty which the hon. gentleman has pointed out may have arisen in the interpretation of any statute of Canada by any court, and if it were of sufficient importance the difficulty would have arisen before now.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman, if he had been reading the debate which took place in the Senate, would have seen that a case was cited where it did take place.

Mr. BOURASSA. One case may be cited and perhaps ten cases may be cited. But after all we are not going to go over that ground again. The British parliament has decided and the people of Canada have agreed that both languages, in so far as this parliament is concerned, are equally official and they are on the same basis. That has been adopted by the Canadian people and I suppose it is no longer a ground for discussion. That has been stated by the former leader of the hon. gentleman, Sir John A. Macdonald, who said positively that there was perfect equality between the two languages in this country and that this had been accepted by the people of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not denying that at all.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, if the hon. gentleman is not denying it he must be prepared to accept the consequences of such a state of things and the consequences are not so abominable, after all. The laws of Canada have been working very well for the last forty years and it is not enough to say that one or two or even ten cases may have arisen in which there have been discrepancies between the two texts that are used, to justify an anticipation of trouble in so far as the working of these statutes is concerned; because the operation of this statute would simply be the same as the operation of any statute of Canada that has been passed from year to year, since the present statute will be nothing but the revised accumulation of all these statutes

But there is something more than that. I will now turn to the argument that has been made by the Minister of Justice. I fully grant that the Minister of Justice, in his explanation this afternoon, gave utterance to views which are entirely acceptable. I have no doubt that the idea of the minister, when he framed this clause, was to do full justice to both languages in the matter referred to. But, at the same time, I cannot accept the view, and I do not think whether taken from the French Canadian point of view or from the English Canadian point of view, that anybody in this House or outside of it should be under the impression that we are doing something new or something abnormal. It is true that the Act which put into force the revised statutes of 1886 did not contain any provision like this, but it was not necessary that any Act should contain a provision like this. The obligation to have an official French as well as an official English text of every law of Canada is contained within the bounds of the constitution and I do not think it is proper that we, the parliament of Canada, should make, in any law that we pass here, a declaration that would appear to be something new, when, in fact, we are doing nothing else than putting into operation a disposition of the constitutional Act by which we are bound. As far as that is concerned I have an objection to the title of the present Bill. I do not think it should be entitled 'An Act respecting the revised statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof.' There is no need of parliament providing for the French version of any statute. It is provided for by the constitution of Canada. We are bound to have the French version of every statute we pass here, and I do not think it is proper that we should make a new law when the law is already in existence, a law which we cannot amend or change, but which we must accept as it is. Therefore, I would suggest to the minister when we come to adopt the preamble to do away with these words.

Mr. SPROULE. If you have not a French version of the roll when this is passed will it not appear that it would be requisite to say something in regard to it?

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not think so. I do not think it is necessary that we should declare to be law that which the British North America Act should put into force. I think it is better to leave the constitution as it is. After all, as the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) once stated, the constitution is the rock upon which we all stand, and I do not think it is proper that we should place in the statute what is already the law which every citizen of Canada is bound to obey. In so far as clause 10 is concerned—the clause which is under consideration just now—of course I have no objection to the amendments which are moved by the Minister of Justice and I think they are proper because the text of the Bill which has been sent to us from the Senate contains some absurdities. The first text provided for the appointment of translators by order in council; but it is not a question of translators; it is a question of having the two texts prepared at the same time. The idea of having 'translators to revise' also falls under that criticism. I would also take the liberty of suggesting that since the minister has changed the word 'translators' to 'persons' and 'revise' to 'prepare,' he should also change the word 'revision' on the fourth line of the clause and report the same to the Governor in anl report the same to the Governor in Council'; also, in the 31st line it should read: 'The printed roll of the version so made and report,' so that it will read consistently all through. I object to the language of the first line which says: 'The Governor in Council "may" appoint two or more competent persons to prepare.' Although in practice it might not make much difference, I do not think we should take it for granted that the Governor in Council 'may' be at liberty to do what it likes in

a matter of this kind. I think it should read : 'The Governor in Council "shall" appoint.'

Mr. BRODEUR. It is already done.

Mr. BOURASSA. If it is already done it is not necessary to give power to do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You must have something to validate.

Mr. BOURASSA. Then there is no objection to make the word 'shall.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It means that.

Mr. BOURASSA. It may, but I do not think it proper that a legal text should leave the Governor in Council at liberty to apply the British North America Act or not to apply it.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is a well known canon of construction among lawyers that when the word 'may' is used in this sense as empowering something to be done, and saying such a functionary 'may' do it, he may not do anything else.

Mr. BOURASSA. Or he may not do it at all. This is a question of interpretation upon which I shall not pass judgment, although I think it would be better had it been expressed as I suggest. To come back to the question of the two official texts ; as I understand it, the French version is ready, but it is not printed. As to that, however, we do not know. The leader of the opposition has touched on a point which I should like to have made clear. Reference has been made in the Senate and by the leader of the opposition in this House to the inconvenience which will result from the two texts not being ready at the same time. We do not know when the French text will be ready. I have gone to the office where these texts are prepared in an endeavour to ascertain, and I find that although there is an immense amount of work done, there is still a good deal to be done. It does not seem to me that the government has taken the most elementary precaution to see that both texts should be ready simultaneously. In my opinion unless insuperable inconveniences should arise, there is no reason why one version should come into force before the other. The Minister of Justice has spoken of the inconvenience to lawyers of having to go through the different statutes of Canada passed since 1886—if I were to descend to a small argument, I might say they are well paid for doing that kind of work—but that inconvenience has existed for a good many years and the inconvenience will not be very much greater if it has to continue for three months longer. On the other hand, if you put into force these revised statutes in the English text, if you repeal all the Acts mentioned in section 4, then French speaking lawyers practising before French courts will have no text at all unless you force them to use the English text. At present both French speaking and English speaking lawyers are on the same footing ; all lawyers have to go through the different statutes passed since the revised statutes of 1886, but if this law is passed in its present form, then from the 31st of January until the French version is printed and distributed there will be no French text whatever; and if the old statutes are relied on the objection may be made that the text has been changed by the revised statutes, and so the French speaking lawyers and the courts in the province of Quebec will be forced to use the English statutes. And while the number of French speaking judges who do not understand English is much more limited than the number of English judges who do not understand French, at the same time I do not think it is proper to deprive them of the text of law to which they are entitled under the constitution. I cannot see why there is such a hurry in this matter. To my mind there is no reason why the Minister of Justice should not so amend section 3 as to cause the statutes to come into force by the proclamation of the Governor in Council the moment both texts are ready. I think it is an injustice to do otherwise, and therefore, I trust that the Minister of Justice will give some consideration to my suggestion. I must say that the government should have used less red tape and should have taken more practical means to have the French text translated and printed much sooner. It would have been the easiest thing in the world, whilst the commission was sitting, to have a number of competent translators who would have translated chapter by chapter as it came from the revisers, so that the French text would have been prepared within a few days after the English text was ready. That is all the more true, in view of the fact that for most of the work it was simply a matter of taking the old French text and transferring such changes as were made by the revisers of the English text. It is not as the Minister of Justice said, a question of translating from the first word to the last, and it was not necessary to wait until the whole work of revision was completed. Instead of waiting till the month of September to begin the work completed in the month of August by the English revisers, the French translation could have gone on pari passu with the English text. As to the printing, the government could very well have gone to a few well selected printing offices which could have done the printing expeditiously. Not to go outside of Montreal, there are two or three printing establishments who do as good work as the Printing Bureau, and which could print the statutes concurrently, one office doing a certain number of chapters and another office doing a certain number. In that way the work would be performed in a much shorter time than it would be if it were left entirely to the Printing Bureau.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I will go a little further than my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I think we are creating to-day a most dangerous precedent, if the construction put upon the British North America Act by the Minister of Justice is correct. The provision of the constitution that there shall be a French roll of the revised statutes is imperative, and there is no reason for parliament enacting clause 10, providing for a French version and a French roll. As my hon. friend from Labelle has pointed out, if in 1886 parliament did not do its duty, it is not necessary for us to-day to pass a new law. A law already exists in the constitution of this country providing for a French version of the statutes. In a few years, with the foreign element that is coming into this country from the United States and other countries, we may have an entirely different majority from what we have to-day, a majority which may not have the same national ideas that we have, which may not be composed of the broad-minded men like the leader of the opposition or the Minister of Justice. I will not speak of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because I know he has not given us the real thought which he had behind in his head.

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to dissent from that remark. I have given my thought in language that conveyed my meaning as clearly as I could use the English language to do so.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I must say the hon. gentleman has conveyed his meaning to me, but I do not know that he has conveyed it to the whole House. I think the real thought of my hon. friend was to do away with the French roll of the revised statutes.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am glad to know that. Nevertheless, in twenty years hence we may have an entirely different majority in this country, and if we establish now the precedent that parliament may or may not revise the French version of the statutes, there may then be a parliament which may not give us the French version to which we are entitled under the constitution. So far as clause 3 is concerned, I think we have no right to pass it if the British America Act means anything. In section 133 of that Act, the second clause reads thus :

> The Acts of the parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

This clause is imperative, and it decides that neither version shall be published before the other, but the two shall be published at the same time, and parliament has no right to go against the constitution and give us one version before the other. Therefore it seems to me that the Bill, although I am sure it is drafted in a good spirit, is doing the minority in this country a very bad turn. According to the constitution, the French version is as official as the English and the English as official as the French, and before the eyes of parliament they are only one.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not want to insist factiously, but it seems to me that we are entitled to more explanation and more accurate details as to the time when the government expect the French version to be ready, and as to the means that have been taken so far to have it ready.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the publication of the French version, for my part I think that all the time should be taken that is necessary to produce a very good text of the French version. I would be inclined to give as much time as possible to the translators to enable them to give us a splendid work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that all that work had been completed.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but there are always some corrections to be made. I do not want to pass judgment upon the version of our statutes which was published in 1886, but I found when practising at the bar that some parts of it were not as good as might have been expected. As we are going to have a good French version this time, I think all the time required to give us a first-class version should be given to those who have the charge of the work of making the translation.

Mr. BOURASSA. This very honest declaration from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries just exemplifies the point I mentioned a moment ago, that we do not know when that French version will be ready. The Minister of Justice, undoubtedly in good faith, stated a moment ago, that the whole work was done, that it was only a question of printing, and now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that we should not hurry because there is a great deal of the work yet to be done. That has been my contention all along. I do not want to go back to that in order to criticise the government, but there is no doubt that the proper means have not been taken to have the French version ready in time. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it is desirable that the work should be done properly; but the work of preparing the English text has, I understand, been going on for over two years, and my contention is that the revision of the French text should have gone on simultaneously with the work of the English revisers. Not only would it have been more practical for the purpose of having the French version ready and published at the same time as the English version, but also for the purpose of ensuring a proper translation; because the gentlemen charged with the work of preparing the French text could then have taken advantage of the

presence of the revisers whenever they were in doubt as to the interpretation of the English text, and thus be able to render in French exactly the same idea as was intended by the English text. But instead of having the two versions prepared at the same time, the government has had the whole work done in English, and then appointed certain gentlemen to do the translation in French. As far as the printing is concerned, if no better means are taken to have the printing done properly and as rapidly as it should be, it will be months, perhaps a year, before we have the French text; so that that slight inconvenience to which the Minister of Justice has referred will amount to this, that all the French-speaking lawyers in the province of Quebec will be deprived of the French text of the statutes for months and perhaps a year. I cannot let that pass without entering my strong protest against it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. In addition to what my hon. friend has said, suppose there would only be the difference of a day between the publication of the two versions, that would be contrary to the British North America Act. The section 3 of the Bill is ultra vires. We have no right, under that Act, to promulgate the one text before the other. Section 133 is imperative. It says:

> The Acts of parliament of Canada and the Quebec legislature shall be printed and published in both these languages.

That means that the printing and publishing of both must be done at the same time. In referring to the records of the House, the British North America Act provides that both languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of both houses. We have therefore no right to give one text force of law before the other. But if there be only a slight inconvenience, as the Minister of Justice says, why not leave matters as they are and wait until the two texts are ready so that we may give each the force of law at the same time. Why should the English lawyers have the English text at their disposal while the French lawyers are deprived of the French text? To leave the matter stand as it is to-day would not cause anybody to suffer because we would have the laws just as they have been since 1886, and therefore there is no reason why we should not wait until we can give, as provided by the British North America, the two versions force of law at the same time. In acting otherwise, we shall be creating a dangerous precedent for the minority. When the minority entered into the pact of 1867, it was understood that the rights of the minority would be respected, and it is the duty of whatever government may be in office to respect those rights and promulgate our laws according to the spirit of our constitution, namely in English and French at the same time.

Agreed to on division.

On section 12,

> The laws relating to the distribution of the printed copies of the statutes shall not apply to the said revised statutes, but the same shall be distributed in such numbers and to such persons only as the Governor in Council directs.

Mr. SPROULE. To whom will these statutes be distributed? I have had several inquiries regarding those who are entitled to get the revised statutes. I understood that a sufficient number of copies would be distributed to the clerk of the court in each county.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no special provision for the distribution of the clerks of the court. The distribution is simply made to the members of both Houses and then only in such numbers as may be directed by the Governor in Council, and also to such public departments and administrative bodies and officers throughout Canada as the Governor in Council may from time to time direct. That is according to the present law governing the distribution of the revised statutes of 1886. Practically speaking, this section 12 is purely and simply the same as that embodied in the revised statutes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then all I can say is that there must have been a provision made to supply the clerks of the courts. I know that on application made by myself for certain copies of the revised statutes, I was informed that the clerks of the court had been supplied with a sufficient number for the county.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is according to the discretion of the Governor in Council. He may or may not decide to send copies to those officials. There is no change in the existing law.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some information as to whom they will be supplied. That would save a great deal of trouble in making inquiries.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How many copies of each version are being printed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot personally answer. The printing is being done in the office of the King's printer, under the direction of the Secretary of State, and I cannot answer categorically. As to what has been said by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), this section 12 in the Bill under consideration is a reprint word for word of section 12 in the Act of 1903.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the explanation given by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) to which I replied by saying that there must have been an order

in council to provide certain parties with copies, because on making inquiry I was informed that the clerk of the peace in my county was entitled to so many. All I desire to ascertain is whether any change has been made or whether the same parties will receive the same distribution as before. I think we might very properly go further and state who were entitled to get these, apart from those likely to get them through the act of the Governor General in Council, so that others would be saved the trouble of making inquiries through members of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has indicated rather than raised an interesting point which concerns the construction of the Act of 1903. Section 1 of that Act provides as follows:

So soon as the said commissioners or a majority of them shall report in writing the completion of the said consolidation, including therein such Acts or parts of Acts passed during the present session and subsequent thereto as the Governor General may deem advisable to be so included, the Governor General may cause a printed roll thereof, attested under his signature and that of the clerk of the parliaments to be deposited in the office of such clerk; and such roll shall be held to be the original of the said statutes so revised, classified and consolidated.

There is no reference in this section to either the one language or the other, and the British North America Act provides that the records of parliament shall be kept in both languages. It also provides that the Acts shall be printed and published in both languages. I venture to put forward the opinion that section 1 has not been complied with unless that roll has been deposited both in English and in French and therefore when the Minister of Justice says that section has already been complied with he has not perhaps considered the full effect of that section taken in connection with section 133 of the B.N.A. Act. Suppose that roll had been deposited in the French language only, and under the constitution it might as well have been deposited in the French as in the English language, could we say that the Act of 1903 had been complied with? Are we not proceeding on a rather false assumption in saying that this has been complied with by the depositing of the printed roll to which reference has been made? In this case it seems to me that the situation is not so entirely satisfactorily as we might imagine. The enactment which we are now passing in section 3, if I may be permitted to refer to that for a moment, is as follows:

The Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, are hereby ratified and confirmed and declared to have had, on, from and after the first day of January, 1907, the force of law as if herein enacted.

Now, the revised statutes thus ratified are contained in the roll mentioned in section 1 of chapter 61 of 3 Edward VII., but that Act does not seem to me to contemplate a roll printed in both languages as required under section 133 of the British North America Act. Therefore, we are perhaps raising some doubt, or at least giving ground for a doubt, as to the validity of that roll in as much as that roll if correctly described by the Minister of Justice, does not seem to me to comply with the Act of 3 Edward VII.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not appreciate the difficulty. We have deposited the roll as that roll was contemplated by section 1 of the statute of 1903. That section speaks of one roll and one roll only; a roll in two languages would necessarily be two rolls. There is, however, no practical difficulty, because not only is there a roll, duly attested, now deposited with the clerk of the parliaments, being expressed in the English language, but there is also in existence and capable of being deposited and needing in no respect legislation to validate it, a roll in the French language which may be deposited at any time upon its being attested, and upon that being done, long before the statute we are now considering would have the force of law, before it could be assented to, the full provision of section 1 of the statute of 1903 would have been complied with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not take exactly the same view as the Minister of Justice, although it is with great deference of course that I differ from him. The records of parliament are printed in both languages, but there is only one record of parliament as I understand it. There is a roll of the statutes under the constitution. As I understand it that roll must be expressed in both languages, and that is the roll that is provided for, it seems to me, by the statute of 3 Edward VII.; the statute does not mention of one language or the other. Does the Minister of Justice think that section would be complied with by the depositing of the roll in the French language alone? That certainly would be quite as valid as the roll that has been deposited. It seems to me as neither one language or the other is mentioned in that statute, and as the constitution under which the records of parliament are printed requires that the record shall be printed in both languages, that the roll is not complete until it is expressed in both languages. However, I have made the point, and I shall not urge that further; that is the view I would entertain at present. I might change it on further consideration, but it is certainly the view that presents itself to me at the present time.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is that fact not further elicited in such cases as mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)? When the two texts appear to be contradictory, and are quoted before a court, is it not then the fact that the court

will say that the law is not either the French or the English version, but that the law must be interpreted according to the one language or the other, that there is only one law, although framed in two languages. Likewise the roll means the complete roll, that is a roll having in itself a French version and an English version. I will not call it two rolls, but one roll in two languages, just as the records of this House would not be complete without every statutory enactment in this parliament being placed on record in both languages, although every law is only one law; there is only one statute from every Bill, but the basis of that law is a text composed on one side of the English version and on the other of the French version. More than that, every day an objection might be taken at any stage to any Bill unless it is printed in both languages and no Bill can be sanctioned unless both texts are there to bear the signature of the clerk of parliament, although it is but one law.

I do not say this to argue with the Minister of Justice from a legal point of view; but from the point of view of common sense, it seems to me that since every record and every law enacted by this parliament must, according to the British North America Act, be printed in both languages, a roll of this parliament cannot be completed unless it is in both languages.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If a layman might make a suggestion it would appear to me that after the use by the Minister of Justice of the expression 'English version' and by some other members of the expression 'French version,' the law of this country is something different from the English version and something different from the French version and that the law of this country is something impalpable and invisible and that there are two versions of it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It appears to me that there can only be one law, but it does not seem possible to record or to file it. I cannot quite agree in the use of the term the 'English version.' Now, I have no objection to using the expression 'French version' if hon. gentlemen care to use it. But apparently there is an English version —of what? And a French version—of what? If you will tell me what they are versions of I would be glad.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is a French version of the English version, and an English version of the French version.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then what is that impalpable thing the hon. gentleman is dealing with?

An hon. MEMBER. It is a metaphysical question.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It may be, and as there are metaphysicians on the other side, I would like to have their definite opinion in regard to it. I do not object to the contention of the hon. member for Labelle, I say his contention in regard to these statutes being printed in both languages is correct. I understand that the English version is now printed but not the French. I think the objection should have been raised earlier when the Bill was first brought in, and that it should not have been allowed to go through the House unless it was accompanied by the French version. Any member could have risen in his place and called the attention of the Speaker that it was not printed in the French language, and the proceedings would have stopped forthwith. I would like somebody to tell me what it is that is a matter of record, what this roll is. Apparently there is an English version of it, and apparently there is a French version of it, but what is it that they are versions of. I would like some of the metaphysical lawyers in the House to explain to me what this impalpable thing is, in order that we may see it.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman were living in a country where respect is shown to both languages, where they are put on the same footing, as for example in Belgium and Switzerland, he would not be embarrassed at all. In Switzerland they have three languages, in Belgium two. I remember having read not long ago in a report of some interview which the Prime Minister of Canada gave some foreigner, that he quoted Switzerland as an ideal country as regards the use of more than one language. In Switzerland such difficulties do not arise. No law of the federal council of Switzerland appears before the Swiss people unless it is printed in two languages, and as regards the three or four cantons on the Italian border, it is printed in the Italian language too. No official document, no postal card or stamp emanating from the federal government appears unless it is in two languages. Yet nobody seems embarrassed about it; because there is not always an idea in the minds of some people that unless other people are trodden upon a law cannot be carried. The inhabitants pay more attention to doing their duty, and I hope that feeling will increase in this country, and there will not be so much quarrelling about languages. If we accepted the Act in the same spirit that Canadians manifested forty years ago, there would be no such talk as we are hearing now upon the fine point raised by the member for York. After all, language is but the interpretation of the thought of man. The law of Canada is the enactment of the will of parliament, and in order to be legal in Canada it must be worded in two languages instead of one, as it might be in some other countries, just as the law of Belgium must be worded in two languages, and the law of Switzerland in three. I do not see any difficulty. It seems to me the simplest thing in the world, provided

we possess the spirit of our own constitution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope the hon. member for Labelle does not imagine that I object to having the law printed in both languages. I am entirely in favour of that, and I agree that it ought to be printed in both languages, and made acceptable at the same time to those who speak both languages.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that we have struck a snag which may give rise to considerable difficulty later. Have we the power of promulgating the law in French or in English? I think not. The article of the constitution is perfectly clear, we can only do it simultaneously in both languages. Under these circumstances it seems to me that what we are doing now is ultra vires. That is a point of great importance, upon which I would like to be enlightened by the Minister of Justice, or somebody else who has given the matter consideration. If we have not power to pass this law, it may give rise to difficulty later when we come to apply the revised statutes. It seems to me the government had better wait until we get the French version before promulgating the law at all, it would prevent all difficulty and as has been said, it would have been a very easy matter for the government to have both versions published simultaneously. It would be very easy, because the texts are almost the same, and the printed copy of the statutes in French would have served the translators, they could have proceeded just as fast as the original text in English was prepared. But that other point, it seems to me, cannot be got over, that we have not power to promulgate a law of this kind, we have not power to promulgate the revised statutes in one language only, nor can we cure this defect by the Bill now under consideration. I think the point is so important that it should be examined more closely. It is quite possible that if we can do this, we can do it in any statute, we can declare in any statute passed either in English or in French that a French version shall be prepared within a certain limited delay. It is quite conceivable if we establish this precedent that, under changed conditions in this House, there might be a tendency to use that power, if we admit that we have it. There is the further inconvenience that we may have to wait several months before having the French version of the revised statutes. I do not see any necessity for that at all. I do not think we have power to remedy the laches or negligence of the government in not having a French version prepared. I think we are laying down a very dangerous precedent if we adopt the principle of this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that we are giving a great deal of attention to a very minute point, if there is a point at all. My hon. friend raises the contention now that we have no power to pass this Bill. But if we have not power to pass the law, then the law becomes null and void. After it becomes null and void, what is the result? This law creates nothing, it simply condenses present laws, and if a statute, which is passed here has no effect at all, if it becomes null and void, the old law remains in force. That is all, and nothing else. If any court of justice will decide that the parliament of Canada has no right to pass this law because it was not promulgated in two languages at the same time, then the court will say, the old law remains in force, and we will apply the old law. We are changing nothing by this law, it is simply a law for convenience. This law creates nothing, it does not give any right to anybody, but simply provides that when a person wishes to consult the laws of Canada he shall not have to wade through fifty volumes to find out what the law is, but only one volume. Now I come to the point raised by my hon. friend, why should we not have the French version at the same time as the English version? Certainly we will have a French version, but the French will suffer nothing if it is not promulgated at the same time as the English version. What will be the consequence of the passing of this Bill? At present we have this volume printed in English, and it is ready for those who study the law in English. Well, that is so much to their advantage. But it is no disadvantage to those who speak the French language if they have not got their volume at the same time. They will only have to wait a little longer, they will have to go through those fifty volumes a little longer, and that is all. Are they so selfish that they will not allow their English fellow-citizens to use this volume in English until they can get the volume in their own language? That is really the point.

Mr. MONK. If I may be allowed to say so, I have heard such a strange argument before. My hon. friend says that nobody will be injured, because if this question is raised in the courts, and it is decided that we have proceeded illegally, then the revised statutes will fall to the ground, and nobody will suffer. And as regards the delay in printing the statutes in French, well, it seems a very selfish contention that the French lawyers should growl at having to wait three months or more for the French version after the English version is ready. I do not think these are answers to the objections which have been raised. The question is: Have we power to pass this legislation? The right hon. gentleman has not answered that question at all and it seems to me that the point is well taken. We have not the power to promulgate a law in French or English. It must be promulgated simultaneously in both languages under the constitution under pain of penalty.

Why should we embody the whole body of law as we do in the revised statutes—two large volumes summing up the legislation of the last twenty years—when, with a little hurry and expedition we could conform to the constitution? Is it selfish to raise that point? There is no selfishness in it at all. The man who raises that question and points out that a piece of legislation is adverse to the constitution and cannot be legally enacted is surely not doing a selfish thing. Even if that consideration were not well founded is it not well to point out that this may become a precedent? Surely it is. If we can legally promulgate the revised statutes in one language only, why cannot we promulgate any other law in one language by putting in a proviso that it shall be translated into English or French within a certain time which shall become the legal version by proclamation of the Governor in Council? What is to prevent us from doing that? The revised statutes are exactly in the same position as any other law. The question is this: If what we are doing now is illegal, is ultra vires, may it not be a question in the courts and is it not possible to find a court of law which will say that we have proceeded irregularly and therefore to find that the law which we have promulgated is null and void? Can we avoid this? Certainly; very easily. Is it right that we should lay down this precedent? It seems to me that it is not. It appears on the surface that this is a small matter but in reality it is not. Every article of the constitution is an important article and it is essential that we should guard carefully everything that is laid down in that Act for the advantage of the country, not allow any violation of it to go by without pointing it out and endeavour to see that no violation takes place. It seems to me that the answer of the Prime Minister that there is a basis of selfishness in these remarks or else that it does not matter anyway because if the law is ultra vires it cannot do any harm is puerile.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It seems to me that we have drifted rather far from the tone of the speech delivered by the Minister of Justice this afternoon. He was, in his speech, trying to give the minority of this country their rights, but it reminds me of the old Latin phrase timeo Danaos et dona ferentes—I fear the Greeks even bringing gifts. It seems to me that the gift of the Minister of Justice is going to be disappointing. The right hon. leader of the House says we are not creating anything by this law, but on the contrary I think we are creating a very dangerous precedent, a precedent that can bring in anything as the official language of this House within twenty years and if it is selfishness to rise and ask the government and the Minister of Justice to state that we are not passing a law which is ultra vires and dangerous, or a law that means nothing in so far as it gives us nothing that the constitution does not give us, then I am proud to say that I am selfish and I will be selfish in so far as it is necessary for me to endeavour to protect the rights of my countrymen in this House. This is a very important question. It is a question that extends to the very heart of the country, to the spirit of the constitution and is a question whether there are two races, one superior and one inferior, or whether there are two races occupying a position of equality in this country and receiving equal justice. That is the first principle of the Liberal party to which I belong but I am sorry to say that we seem to find Liberal principles on the other side of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) that what is occurring now occurred last session, namely, that the Liberal party which was at one time the champion of provincial rights, having mowed down those provincial rights last year in connection with their Sunday Bill, propose to mow down a similar principle in connection with this proposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must say that I cannot assent to the lighthearted remarks of the Prime Minister that we should go on and pass this Bill and that if the courts should find that it was invalid no harm would be done. I think we should look at it from a more serious standpoint than that. The Prime Minister says that we are really not effecting any change. He does not seem to take into consideration the fact that the revised statutes which we bring into force repeal the revised statutes of 1886 and every Act passed since then consolidated in this volume.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well then the prime minister says we should pass this, and it may be valid or it may not be valid. If it is valid everything will be all right and if not we will take it up next session, I suppose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we pass this law and if the courts decide that we have not the right to do so what will be the consequence? We have not repealed these statutes? They are all in force. If this law were to create new statutes there would be a very serious point but this Bill does not create anything. It is simply to condense what is the existing legislation and if any court, which I do not apprehend, were to decide that this new law is invalid, of course, it would follow that nothing would be done, and all the legislation which it proposes to condense would remain in force.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister knows that in any ordinary consolidation of statutes some change of verbiage is always made. The commissioners may do that if no change in the meaning is made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's reasoning at all. The objection of the consolidation is to create nothing but is simply to condense what is already in existence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And to remove inconsistencies and do other things. We will look presently at the Act constituting the commission and see if my hon. friend is absolutely correct in that. But let me point out the result of his own reasoning. Questions affecting the rights of property, questions of imprisonment, or liberty, may come up and will come up under the provisions contained in these statutes. My right hon. friend says that we shall run some risk of having these statutes declared to be utterly invalid, but that we need not take the trouble to do what is to be done in a perfectly valid manner. It does not seem to me that parliament should deal with a serious matter in the way my hon. friend suggests.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that this discussion has been extremely technical and I simply meant to use this argument upon the ground of its technicality. I said in answer to the use of the technical arguments which were brought forward that we had not the power to pass this law now, that if it were passed it would be a nullity, that there was nothing in those arguments because, if the law is a nullity, the law is not changed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I deny that any argument which I made on the subject is in the slightest degree technical. If the argument is technical then section 133 of the British North America Act is technical, which makes it obligatory that the records of this parliament shall be kept in both languages. I applied that to the Act of 1903 and I said that the roll mentioned in the Act of 1903 must be a roll expressed in both languages. I do not think there is anything technical in that argument at all. It seems to me to be entirely plain. You have the provision that both languages shall be used. You have a provision that the roll containing these statutes shall be deposited, you have no provision that it shall be deposited either in one language or the other, and it seems to me to follow clearly that you must deposit that roll in both languages, just as you must keep the records of this parliament from day to day in both languages under the same clause of the British North America Act. There are not two records; there is one record, it is in both languages; there are not two rolls, there is one roll expressed in both languages. When we pass a statute of this parliament do we say that we pass two statutes because it is expressed in both languages; it is one statute expressed under the law of this country in both languages. And so there is one roll provided for by the Act of 1903 which must be expressed in both languages. I do not see any defect in that logic; and, if it be correct reasoning, then the roll which has been deposited under the Act of 1903 is not a roll in compliance with that Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not dispute what is said by my hon. friend, but the conclusion of his argument was taken by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who stated that in consequence of the failure to have the law expressed in the two languages the present Act would be null and void. I said that if this present Act is null and void, nothing is law, and we will remain just as we are at the present time.

Mr. BOURASSA. There is more than that. Subsection 2 of clause 7 states:

> 2. If upon any point the provisions of the said revised statutes are not in effect the same as those of the repealed Acts and parts of Acts for which they are substituted, then as respects all transactions, matters and things subsequent to the time when the said revised statutes take effect, the provisions contained in them shall prevail, but, as respects all transactions, matters and things anterior to the said time, the provisions of the said repealed Acts and parts of Acts shall prevail.

Therefore, this is new law to that extent, and the argument of the Prime Minister which applies to the general scope of the revised statutes does not apply to cases where there is a difference between the revised statutes and the repealed Acts. You are now putting a law into force which repeals all previous statutes adopted by this parliament, and if there is any discrepancy between the repealed Act and the new Act the new Act shall prevail, and that new Act you are not putting at the disposal of the French-speaking Bar of this country. There is no doubt whatever that as to the changes which have been introduced by the revisers, we shall have no law in the French language. Not only as to the revised statutes but as to all the previous statutes whether French or English repealed by this Bill, there will be no law in the French language to be used in the province of Quebec so long as the French text is not published.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can assure every member of the House that it is with sincere deference to those who may think otherwise, that I venture to make the remark, that we are taking up some hours of valuable time discussing what is in reality a very trivial matter. I wish to repel altogether the inference that might otherwise be drawn from

the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) when he indicated that there was some reason to fear the offer which I made this afternoon when introducing this measure. I assure him, and I assure the House, that I was speaking with absolute sincerity when I said that this provision of the Bill which seems to have raised all this difficulty was prepared entirely with the view that we might have legislative sanction for what we had never before any legislative sanction for, namely, the depositing of the roll of the revised statutes in the French language as well as in the English language. Now, are we not making difficulty over a matter in which no practical difficulty exists. We have, as the result of the expenditure of many thousands of dollars and of several years of labour on the part of several learned gentlemen, a compilation, a revision and a consolidation of the statutes of this Dominion covering a period of twenty years and more. We have that prepared in the language with which the gentlemen who were engaged in that work happened to be the more familiar. I take the position that it made no difference whatever as to the validity of that legislation whether the revision were prepared in the first place in the English language or in the French language ; it was to be prepared in both languages sooner or later. There is nothing in the British North America Act which speaks of any simultaneous action as to the preparation of legal documents or official records in both texts. The provision is simply that either of the languages may be used by any person in any pleading or process in any court of Canada established under that Act, and in all or any of the courts of Quebec ; that either the English or French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of parliament of Canada and in the legislature of Quebec, and that both these languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of these Houses. There is no enactment that the one is to be used first of the two, or that one is to be used only simultaneously with the other, but each is to be used. Both are to be used and it is proposed in this case to use both. Now, the statute law of Canada as it stands today (supposing this Bill had never been introduced or supposing this Bill were rejected) as it has stood since 1903 provides for the revision of the statutes and provides for a roll of such revision being deposited with the clerk of parliament (which has in fact been done), and the Governor in Council after such deposit of the said last mentioned roll may by proclamation name a day, on, from, and after which the same shall come into force and have the effect of law. And even if this legislation had not been provided, there is provision in the statute law of the country as it stands today for the bringing into force of this revision of the statutes by simple act of the Governor General in Council. Now, what is proposed to be done, as has been repeatedly stated, is to supplement the filing of the roll in the English language (which has already taken place) with the filing of a like roll in the French language as soon as may be, and, that being done, it is perfectly competent to the Governor in Council—even if it were not competent to the Governor in Council before the French version was deposited—to proclaim the coming into force of the roll so deposited, and upon that being done it has, under existing legislation, forthwith from that day full effect as law. In the circumstances it does seem that it is almost the old story of tossing the apple of discord upon the table to make so much ado about a difficulty which to my mind does not in the least exist. It is not proposed by any person to do otherwise than to have these rolls deposited one in each language, and to have these statutes printed for distribution in each language. The whole discussion seems rather to have been driven down to the point, of the day when the revised statutes shall come into force and have effect as law. I pointed out that under the statute of 1903 the selecting of that day rested with the Governor in Council, that it so rests with the Governor in Council to-day, and that irrespective altogether of this legislation which is before the committee for consideration the Governor in Council is in position at any time to proclaim the coming into force and to fix the day of his own pleasure. But if it is a question for consideration here whether that day is to be one of comparative nearness, whether that day is to be the 31st of this month as I have proposed, or whether that day is to be three months, or six months hence, until the printing of the French version of the statutes can be completed, is it not plain that no benefit is being done thereby to those who prefer using the French version ? They are placed under no additional disadvantage ; no detriment is occasioned to them. It may be that they have not the convenience which those have who would more naturally use the English version ; but that is no harm to them, and no advantage can be gained to the French legal practitioner by preventing his English speaking confrere from using the revision that has already been prepared. It is entirely in that sense that I understood the right hon. leader of this House to ask the question which has been referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as being hardly a question of selfishness. The publication of the English version at an early day is of great assistance to those who resort to the English version, and I am very happy to think that there are very few of our French-speaking confrères who would not utilize that advantage themselves.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I can assure the Minister of Justice that I am entirely convinced of his sincerity, and I am

quite sure that he was trying to do the minority a good turn. But what surprises me is the hurry to promulgate the English version of the statutes while allowing the French version to remain for three months or six months or a year before it is promulgated. What is the hurry ? This is what nobody can find out. But even if it were only one day of delay for the French version, as I said before, we would be violating the British North America Act, which is imperative in declaring that the Acts of the parliament of Canada shall be printed in both languages. That means that they shall be printed at the same time if it means anything. Now, we do not need any Act of parliament to make the French language official in this country, because section 133 of the British North America Act makes it official. I say this is no trival matter, but a very important matter. It is no argument to say that we have been spending a great deal of money to have these statutes prepared. A great deal of that money came from the province of Quebec, and that province has a right, according to the agreement passed between the two races in 1867, to have the laws published as the constitution provides in the two languages and at the same time. The Minister of Justice says that even today the Governor in Council may at his own pleasure promulgate the law. He may, but he has no right at his own pleasure to promulgate it in English only; he is obliged by the constitution to promulgate it in the two languages. There is only one record of this parliament, but there are two official versions of that record; there is only one statute passed in this House, but there are two official versions of it, and it is our right and the right of the province of Quebec and the right of every province and every citizen of this country to stand up and force the government to promulgate the law according to the constitution, that is in the two languages. The government has no right to do otherwise, and if it did, the law would be ultra vires.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say there is no intention on the part of anybody to deprive the province of Quebec of any of its rights, and I am surprised at a member coming from my province and uttering such words in this parliament. The government of this country is ready to give to every citizen of this Dominion all the rights to which he is entitled, and if we had a little less of these appeals to racial and national prejudices it would be very much better for this country.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I rise to a question of privilege. I made no racial appeals.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we follow very closely what was done with reference to the statutes in 1886 we shall find that only one roll was deposited. That roll was printed in the English language. No French roll, if I am correctly informed, has ever been deposited. Those statutes were printed in both languages, and during twenty years they have been used in this country, and so far as I am aware nobody has ever raised the question that the statutes of 1886 were not valid, though if the argument of my hon. friend is correct those statutes were not valid because they were not deposited in both languages. We have gone further this year. We have provided for the printing of the French statutes as well as the English statutes. In that respect we have simply copied to a certain extent the provisions contained in the revised statutes of Canada concerning the publication of statutes. It is provided in section 9 of chapter 2 that the Acts of the parliament of Canada shall be printed in two separate volumes, and that copies of such volumes shall be printed in the English and French language respectively by the Queen's Printer. Now, there is no intention by the provision contained in this Bill of depriving any section of the community of the use of the French language—quite the reverse. But we are providing that the statutes which are already printed should come into force, and after some time, when the other version is printed, it shall also be considered as being valid. There has been some talk of convenience and also of illegality. We must not forget that the statutes every year come into force immediately after they are sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor General, but those statutes are not printed some times for five or six months, and in the meantime there might for that reason be serious inconvenience in some cases. However, the country has been going on without serious difficulty, even though those statutes were not printed. And because in this case the French version is not published on the same day as the other, they say that the rights of the province of Quebec are seriously affected. Well, that kind of an appeal is not very serious after all when we take into account the inconvenience, which, I have just shown, has existed all along with regard to the printing of the statutes. No one in my province will complain very seriously that the French version cannot be published on the same day and at the same hour as the other. It is merely a question of convenience, and I do not see why we should try to exaggerate that inconvenience and make it the basis for exciting racial feeling in this parliament, especially when we consider the fact that our statutes are usually printed several months after they come into force. Some times the most important Acts are published in the Canada Gazette,' and sometimes they are not, and yet in spite of any inconvenience which may result the country is satisfied with the situation as it is. Under the circumstance I can see no reason for seriously objecting to the Bill going through, and I am convinced that the provisions of this Bill are absolutely legal.

Mr. BOURASSA. It seems to me that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has undertaken the task of replying to his colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). The Minister of Justice told us that the French text was ready but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has told us that it will not be ready for months.

Mr. BRODEUR. I simply said that I wanted the French text to be absolutely correct even if that took some months.

Mr. BOURASSA. I agree with my hon. friend as to the necessity for absolute correctness even though the promulgation of the statutes should be delayed for some months, but in that statement he has replied to the Minister of Justice who said that would only take a few weeks. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has also effectively replied to his colleague as regards the inconvenience in not having the two versions ready now. If there be no serious inconvenience, as he pointed out, in not having the statutes promulgated within six months, what is the inconvenience of waiting until both versions are ready before putting them into force? If it be no inconvenience to the province of Quebec not to have the French statutes ready on time, it would be no inconvenience to any one, on the same principle, to delay the promulgation of both versions. My hon. friend has gone somewhat beyond the scope of this discussion in making his paternal appeal not to excite any racial feelings. I do not see that any such question was raised, but probably because for many years the hon. gentleman was one of the most rabid radicals we had in our province, he imagines that others are following his footsteps. With his official responsibilities he has gained wisdom, and I congratulate him, but others are not as excited as he thinks they are; and I fail to see that either in the remarks of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) or the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or my own, there was anything which could be described as an appeal to race. Are we, every time we ask that the constitution of our country be respected, to be denounced as demagogues appealing to racial prejudice? But, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has said, suppose the French text were printed first and it was proposed to have the French text enacted before the English was ready, could it be described as an appeal to racial jealousy if an English member should rise and point out that such a proceeding was contrary to our constitution? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) fails to understand our point of view when he makes a comparison between what was done in 1886 and what is done now. He says that in 1886 there was no provision for a French version. It may or may not be that no French roll was then deposited; but as a matter of practice, everybody used the French as well as the English text without inquiring whether or not there had been a French roll deposited. There was nothing in the statute of 1886 which spoke of the English or French text, whereas now you are providing, for the first time, for putting into force a statute, with the inference that the text is the English text, and then providing by another clause for the French version. This is being done for the first time, and in protesting against this we are not making an appeal to the French or any race. As a matter of fact this question is not going to affect very many people in the province of Quebec, and therefore is not a matter on which to excite racial or national feeling. It is simply a matter of constitutional principle. We claim that, according to the spirit of our constitution, both languages being official, all the laws of this country have to be promulgated, published and printed in both at the same time; and it is not according to the spirit of our constitution that a law should be passed by this parliament which provides for putting both texts on a different footing. That is the only principle on which we have raised any question and entered our protest, and with due deference to the kind and paternal advice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) we shall persist in that protest without making any appeal to racial feelings.

Mr. MONK. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has become wise. He appears very wise here, but when I heard him lecture the House on the necessity of not raising racial questions, I asked myself if he were the same Mr. Brodeur whom I heard only a few days ago in the county of Nicolet. I attended a large meeting there and had to leave before the close of the meeting, but on driving past on my way to the train I heard my hon. friend, in strong and eloquent language, accuse me of being an Englishman. So that there is either some truth in the theory of Mr. Stevenson, when he portrayed the dual personality of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, or my hon. friend has not become so wise as he would lead us to believe this evening. I do not think that the Minister of Justice has answered satisfactorily the question—what my right hon. friend the first minister calls a technical question—which has been raised. I may say at once that, for my part, I entirely exonerate, not only the Minister of Justice, but the government from any sinister motive in this matter. It is simply a question of principle, which may appear a small one at first but which I think is very important. If we have the right to promulgate a law in the one language, as contended by the Minister of Justice, under his interpretation of the British North America

Act, which requires that our records should be in both languages—if, as he contends, we could record a law here in the one language and then have it afterwards translated into the other, we can proceed with this legislation, and we are indebted to the government for procuring by special legislation a translation of the revised statutes. But that is not the law as I read it. As I read our constitution, we cannot validly record a law unless it is in both languages. According to the Minister of Justice we might promulgate a law in the one language provided we immediately took the necessary measures to have it translated. We might legislate in one language, and as we are doing in this instance provide for the translation of that legislation. I do not think we can read section 133 of the Constitutional Act in this way. To be valid it must be promulgated or recorded in both languages, otherwise it is ultra vires. I do not think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), I say so with all respect, has controverted, has refuted that proposition, not with arguments at least that I could see, and if that is the case, if now for the first time we sanction the principle that we can promulgate a law recorded in one language, if that is invalid there will be a great deal of litigation. There is no doubt whatever that in many respects the text of the revised statutes differs from the original statute. It may be only a word but the House knows that lawyers will hang a very considerable lawsuit on a word or a phrase, and if it is decided that we have not that power why then the revised legislation is altogether void and we will have to begin all over again and it will be impossible for us to right the confusion and trouble, and repair the damages we have caused by this hasty legislation. I think that point is worthy of consideration. For my part I will undertake to say I can procure the opinions of men very competent in constitutional law who will find that we cannot record our legislation in one language and have it translated afterwards, and I think that is a reasonable view. The translation of a law after its enactment would be a matter which would rest with the executive and might be indefinitely deferred. It is in the power of the executive to defer it indefinitely. That was not the intention of the framers of the constitution at all. That is a legal point and I would like to hear arguments going to show that we have the power to promulgate or put forth a law in one language only which would be a valid law under the constitution.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend is surely not overlooking the fact that nobody is proposing to do any such thing.

Mr. MONK. What we are sanctioning now is that the roll deposited in the English language will be law and we are providing for the translation of that law.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Providing for the preparation of a second roll which shall be deposited.

Mr. MONK. But the revised statutes will be recorded in the English language only ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, not at all, in both languages.

Mr. BRODEUR. Section 10 provides——

Mr. MONK. No, there is the question of inconvenience that has been insisted on by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne). I do not think it is quite trivial, I take it my hon. friend does not urge that point for political purposes. I do not think it is a trivial point, it is very important that all the safeguards that have been laid down in the constitution shall be carefully maintained and watched in this House and the safeguard of language is one which has quite a history in our country. It was insisted upon, it was obtained, it was granted, and I think it is fair ground to say that we must carefully guard any invasion of that right.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has made a personal reference to what has happened in the election of Nicolet lately, I am exceedingly surprised to hear my hon. friend state that I have charged him with being an English-speaking man, he is absolutely mistaken in that respect. I never said anything of the kind in Nicolet, I never charged him with being an English-speaking man, that is making it a crime on his part to be an English-speaking gentleman. Quite the reverse, At one of the meetings in connection with that election the hon. gentleman's own friends—not himself, I must give him credit for that, I am going to be very fair with him—his own friends started a campaign against my hon. friend the new member for Nicolet (Mr. Charles Devlin), whom we are so glad to see to-night with us——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR—they made strong appeals to my compatriots in Nicolet, asking them to not elect my hon. friend the new member for Nicolet (Mr. Charles Devlin), because he was an Irish-speaking gentleman. My hon. friend will not deny that. I know very well he is too sincere, too frank, to deny that his own friends, he was very frank in connection with that, because though his friend Mr. Marechal started a campaign against my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Charles Devlin) by stating that he was an Irish-speaking gentleman, an Irish gentleman, he should not be elected——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A fine old Irish gentleman.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) stated it was not the kind of thing that should be done ; I reiterated the same thing which was said by my hon. friend

(Mr. Monk), I said we should never make any racial appeals of that kind in any part of our country; it might exist in some other parts of Canada but not certainly in the province of Quebec. I spoke of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and said we were always glad to see him, a man of his importance, who was elected in a county which is entirely French, although he is himself, English-speaking, and we never thought of reproaching the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for not belonging to the race which forms the majority in his county. That is the way we carry on elections in Quebec, and my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) knows it very well. We never make appeals to religious prejudices, quite the reverse. The majority of the county of Jacques Cartier who are French are glad to elect him because he is a man who never makes appeals to racial or national prejudices, and I am glad to give him that testimony before the House to-night, and I hope he will do me the justice of stating that I have never attributed to him as a crime the fact of his being English-speaking.

Mr. MONK. I shall not quarrel with my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) as to the words he used, but I would like to justify some of my friends who are not here, in regard to the reproach uttered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The ground the two ministers who were in the county of Nicolet took was——

Mr. BENNETT. Who was the other?

Mr. MONK. My good friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). The ground they took in order to urge the county to elect Mr. Devlin was that he was going to enter the government in order to represent the Irish element. Some of the gentlemen I heard speaking on our side, remarked that it was very strange, if he was going to enter the government in order to represent the Irish element, that he should come down to be elected in a purely French constituency. As to what my hon. friend said about myself I may say that I was hurrying to catch a train or else I should have gone back to give some explanation there.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN. Mr. Chairman, I happened to be present and a very interested person indeed at the meetings to which reference has been made here this evening. I was present during the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and I was also present when my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) spoke, and I may say this, Sir, that never for an instant, during the course of the speech delivered by the hon. member the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was the slightest appeal made to racial feeling. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) knows perfectly well that the whole basis of the campaign made against me in the county of Nicolet was a racial one. He knows that perfectly well, because he was present when I spoke and when I answered some of the charges made against me in this respect.

The Conservative party as represented by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), by Mr. Marechal, and by many other gentlemen belonging to that party, were present when appeals were made against me because I happened to be of Irish descent, a fact of which I did not in the slightest degree feel ashamed. But I thought myself that the attack was an exceedingly unfair one. When these attacks were made by the gentlemen sent into the county by my hon. friend's party, there was never a question as to my entry or non-entry into the cabinet. The whole cry was this: Will you French Canadians elect as the representative of Nicolet county an Irishman, a man who dropped yesterday from Galway into Nicolet county? That was the attack. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am here to-day, I am here in spite of him, I am here to-day in spite of the army that he and his friends brought into the county, because I was the candidate of a good and honest government. The French Canadians, when they passed their verdict on the 29th of December, did not consider whether I was an Irishman or not. They rose high above such appeals and they simply considered the issues which my hon. friends and the Postmaster General and myself put before them throughout the campaign. As to the statement that I am an Irish speaker, I regret very much that I am not an Irish speaker. I regret that during the few years which I spent in the land of my ancestors I did not learn the Irish language. But whatever my defects I was enabled to preserve my affection for my Canadian home, and I am glad that on my return I am not forgotten by my Canadian friends, and that they returned me again to this House where I formerly sat.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend has by his speech greatly strengthened his chances of entering the government as the representative of the Irish element. I deny that the campaign made against him was a racial one. As I have stated, it was urged on his behalf that he was going to enter the government to represent the Irish element, as a recognition of the importance of that element in this country, and I think that consequently it was fair ground for his adversaries to say that if that were the case, if he were to enter the cabinet in order to represent the Irish element, he should be elected in a constituency composed largely of Irishmen. I think that was fair ground. Had he come, not as a stranger, but as a man familiar with the county of Nicolet, claiming an election on any ordinary ground, that objection would not have been raised. But I think that is

a fair ground, by no means a racial one, a fair and legitimate objection to raise in an election campaign in the county of Nicolet, where I do not think there is a single Irishman, to say that if this gentleman is going to enter the cabinet as a representative of the Irish element surely he should not seek election in the county of Nicolet.

Mr. BOURASSA. If it would settle this question and allow the debate to proceed, I would suggest that an article be inserted in this Bill providing for an Irish version of the revised statutes.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. I am not going to allow the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to get off. He cannot possibly escape the fact that the campaign, so far as his side was concerned, was conducted on racial appeals. The hon. gentleman may not know anything about the campaign, he was only at one meeting, and even then he did not wait for the end of the meeting; on his own admission, he went away. But there were a great many other speakers belonging to the party for which the hon. gentleman is spokesman in this House and I have some of their names here. There were Mr. Bambray, Mr. Primeau, Mr. Laliberté and Mr. Marechal. I will let the three first names go, as they are not of much consequence, and we will take the last, Mr. Marechal. Mr. Marechal is a big figure in the Conservative party in the city of Montreal, he is the life and hope of the coming generation. Mr. Marechal simply stated: We do not want an Irishman to represent the county of Nicolet—these were his words. I ask the hon. gentleman in the face of such statements, how can he now try to get out of the very nasty situation created for him and his party by his friends?

Mr. MONK. I am not disposed to allow the accusation brought by the hon. gentleman against absent gentlemen to go entirely unanswered. I did not follow the campaign very carefully, but I was there on one occasion, and I know the gentleman of whom he speaks. The objection raised in the county of Nicolet against the hon. gentleman was made on the ground I have mentioned. There was also the ground raised that the county should find within itself some candidate, Liberal or Conservative, to represent it. The hon. gentleman was a complete stranger to the county, never set his foot in it, so far as I know; and it was claimed that his election was only justified in case no other man in the county was capable of representing it. Was that sentiment confined to the Conservative party? By no means. It found violent expression in the ranks of my hon. friend. There was a candidate before the public, an inhabitant of the county, a Liberal, who presented himself upon the ground that it was not fair to the county to impose upon it an entire stranger. This gentleman proceeded in his candidature so far that the government determined that my hon. friend, the present member, should disappear. The local member for the county issued a circular.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. I rise to a question of privilege, I issued no circular.

Mr. MONK. The member for the county in the local legislature, Mr. Marchildon, issued a circular. That circular I have not with me, but I can lay it on the table of the House. It was undoubtedly issued by authority, and it stated, that is, the local member, the leader of the Liberal party in the county, stated, that it had been decided that both my hon. friend and Dr. Legris, who was the other candidate, were going to withdraw, and that a new convention would be held in order to select another candidate. Mr. Marchildon, the local member, the man who had charge of the campaign, issued that circular, and a special paragraph was included stating that the new candidate would not be a stranger to the county. Now my hon. friend is very exultant to-day, but he had his fears, because he travelled several times between Nicolet and Ottawa, and it was after one of his trips to Ottawa that this circular was issued and distributed. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, to whom is largely due the credit of this victory of which the hon. member for Nicolet is so proud, will not deny that that circular was issued with his knowledge. I read it at the meeting, and I called upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say whether that circular was authentic or not, and he did not deny that it had been issued with his authority. Therefore we have a recognition from the leader of the Liberal party in the county, a recognition countenanced by the government, that the nomination of my hon. friend was a mistake, and that in deference to the general sentiment throughout the county among the Liberals that no stranger should be elected it was promised that a new convention would be held, and a guarantee was given in that circular over the signature of Mr. Marchildon, that no stranger would be selected. What happened after that I do not know. The Liberal candidate, Dr. Legris, disappeared. My hon. friend was elected. But, I do not think he was elected under circumstances which gave him such a right to be so very proud. We pretend that my hon. friend had given up the county of Wright which he represented, that he had gone to Ireland and that he had given up the county of Ireland. He seemed to be a gentleman fond of giving up, of resigning, of departing. I think that was a fair ground to urge against a stranger in the county of Nicolet because we supposed that he would resign there also.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the question of relevancy is raised I will have to enforce the rule. We are on section 13 of this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which Bill?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Letter B of the Senate.

On section 14,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before we get through with the Bill I would like to make an inquiry with regard to the index if it has not already been made. That is a very important part of the statutes. Has it been prepared?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think the preparation has been completed. It will be ready at all events before the statutes come into force.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statutes are to be published in three volumes. Will the index be inserted in them?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is the intention.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a complete index of the whole?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes.

On section 16,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 16 be adopted?

Section agreed to on division.

On section 17,

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I propose, with the assent of the committee, to make a verbal change in the last section in this way: Make clause 15, 14; make clause 16, 15; bring clauses 14 and 17 together, making clause 14 the first subsection and clause 17 the second subsection, and making clause 17, as the second subsection, read in this way: 'The last mentioned Act and the Act amending it are hereby repealed.' That is striking out the words 'entitled an Act respecting the revised statutes of Canada, 3 Edward VII., chapter 61.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Objection has been suggested to the phraseology of the preamble. I shall be entirely content, with the approval of the committee, that the Bill shall be entitled 'An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906,' striking out the remainder.

Preamble, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is carried, I move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole in order to amend section 3 by striking out the first subsection and replacing it by the following words:

So soon as the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, shall have been printed in French and English, the Governor in Council, may, by proclamation, declare the day on, from and after which the same shall come into force and have effect as law by the designation of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

He said: This does not need much explanation. It is practically the text of the statute of 1903 which I make applicable to this case. Of course, if it were adopted I think that one or two of the other sections would need to be amended. I have explained the object of this amendment fully in committee. It simply provides that this statute shall be treated as any statute enacted by the parliament of Canada, that whenever both versions are ready they will be put in force. It seems to me that if we want to be true to what I really believe to be the intention of the government this should be done. As a matter of fact the inconvenience will not be such that it would warrant us in not accepting this amendment which is putting practically into operation section 133 of the British North America Act as far as this statute is concerned.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The general question has been, as my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) states, discussed so fully in committee that probably it is not necessary or advisable to continue the discussion at any length. But let me point out simply the difference between what is now proposed and the provisions of the law as it stands. Under the statute of 1903, which is now in force and which will remain in force until and unless the statute we have considered in committee to-night should be assented to by His Excellency after being passed by the House, the proclamation of the Governor General bringing into effect the revised statutes may be made at any time after the deposit of the roll. The proposition now is that the date of the proclamation should be postponed until after the printing of both versions, not only the one but the other, and it therefore might involve a delay of several weeks if not of some months. It would depend, of course, upon the condition of work in the office of the King's Printer as to the date when the printing of the French version could be complete. The printing of the English version is now complete. Several hundred copies of this, no doubt—I do not know how many—have been struck off. The arrangement of these statutes and the arrangement of the sections in them is something that cannot be interfered with even to the extent of a single word or a single line without creating a great deal of expense that I am sure every one would wish to avoid.

The greatest inconvenience, perhaps, which the postponing, in the way suggested, of the day when the proclamation of the Governor in Council could be issued, would have, is simply this: we shall be passing statutes no doubt during this session of parliament, statutes making amendments in the statutes as they exist to-day, and statutes containing necessarily references to previous enactments. Every one of these references would be at fault if instead of referring to the revised statutes the reference had to be to the Act of 58 Victoria, or 2 Edward VII., as the case may be, or some other previous statute. In that way there would be unnecessary inconveniences not merely to legal practitioners who use the statutes daily but to this House itself. And to what end? Merely in order that before the English-speaking portion of the country could have the right to refer officially to this volume as being the volume of the law, our French-speaking friends should have the statutes before them in the language with which they are more familiar. Happily it is the case—at all events so far as this House is concerned; and I am glad to think so far as a very large portion of the French-speaking people of Canada is concerned—that they understand the English language and they are not put to any serious inconvenience by having to refer to the version of the statutes in the English language. The whole effect of delay will be greatly to inconvenience one section of the country without doing any benefit that I can appreciate to any other section of the country, and very greatly to increase the inconvenience to this House itself, and to create confusion in regard to legislation which may be passed at the presesnt session.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Bourassa).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Lennox,
Armstrong,	Leonard,
Avery,	McLaren,
Barr,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Bennett,	Monk,
Blain,	Paquet,
Borden (Carleton),	Porter,
Bourassa,	Reid (Grenville),
Cockshutt,	Robitaille,
Gunn,	Roche (Marquette),
Herron,	Sproule,
Hughes (Victoria),	Staples,
Lake,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Lavergne	White,
(Montmagny),	Wilmot,
Lefurgey,	Worthington.—31.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,	Macdonald,
Béland,	Maclean
Bickerdike,	(Lunenburg),
Bole,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Borden	McColl,
(Sir Frederick),	McCool,
Broder,	McIntyre (Perth),
Brodeur,	McIntyre
Brown,	(Strathcona),
Bruneau,	McKenzie,
Burrows,	McLennan,
Campbell,	Marcile (Bagot).
Carney,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Chisholm	Martin (Montreal,
(Antigonish),	Ste. Mary's),
Clarke,	Martin (Wellington),
Crawford,	Mayrand,
Crocket,	Meigs,
Cyr,	Miller,
Daniel,	Oliver,
Delisle,	Pardee,
Demers,	Parmelee,
Devlin (Nicolet),	Pickup,
Devlin (Wright),	Proulx,
Dubeau,	Roche (Halifax),
Emmerson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Ethier,	Savoie,
Finlay,	Schell (Glengarry),
Finlayson,	Sinclair,
Fisher,	Sloan,
Gauvreau,	Smith (Oxford),
Geoffrion,	Smith (Wentworth),
Girard,	Stockton,
Hall,	Talbot,
Harty,	Telford,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Templeman,
Johnston,	Tobin,
Kennedy,	Tolmie,
Knowles,	Turgeon,
Lapointe,	Verville,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Walsh (Montreal,
Lavergne	Ste. Anne),
(Drum. & Arth),	Watson,
Lemieux,	Wilson (Lennox),
Loggie,	Wright (Renfrew),
Lovell,	Zimmerman.—84.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

TREATY BETWEEN CANADA AND JAPAN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved second reading of Bill (No. 23) respecting a certain treaty between Canada and Japan. He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill comes from the Senate, and the object of it is to give the force of law in Canada, so far as may be necessary, to a treaty of amity and commerce which has been recently made between His Majesty the King and the Emperor of Japan. The object of this treaty is to bring Canada within the scope of a treaty between her late Majesty Queen Victoria and the Emperor of Japan made in 1894 and amended a year afterward by another treaty. That treaty provided that it should apply to both empires with the exception of certain countries specified. Canada being among the countries so excepted, and it was left to the option of Canada whether we would come under that treaty or not. The late government did not think it advisable at that time to accept the treaty. When the present government came into power we took the same attitude. But after the exhibition which was held at Tokio some three years ago, and at which Canada

was represented, it was thought that there was an opening for Canadian trade in Japan, an old country, it is true, but one rising rapidly to a new civilization. Overtures were made to the government of Japan, with the result that a new treaty was made whereby it is provided—and this is the only provision—that the disposition of this treaty shall apply to Canada. I may say at once that the only advantage which Canada gives to Japan is that we bind ourselves to give to Japan the treatment of the most favoured nation ; our obligations do not go further than that. Japan also gives us the advantage of the most favoured nation. In addition, a special tariff for Canada is provided, of which we shall have the benefit immediately. The treaty of 1894 provided that we should have a reduction of so much ad valorem upon the tariff which was then in existence, and in the treaty of 1895 another special tariff was made applicable to Great Britain, and therefore to Canada. If hon. gentlemen will look at the appendix to this treaty, they will find there the tariff of Japan which will be applicable to Canada. If they were to look at the schedule alone, however, it would not convey to them a true idea of all the advantages we get under this treaty. For instance, the first item is manufactures of caoutchouc, 10 per cent ad valorem. I may say that the existing tariff of Japan on that article is 40 per cent. The next item is Portland cement, ·065 yen on 100 catties. The present tariff is 16½ cents, whereas the tariff we get is 3¼ cents. The cattie, which is the standard measure in Japan, is equal to 1⅓ pounds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the value of the yen ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is about 50 cents. I may say also to the House that Germany has a treaty with Japan which I understand was negotiated subsequently to our own treaty, and that treaty is more advantageous than the one we have at the present time ; but as we have the treatment of the most favoured nation, if the treatment given to Germany on any article is more advantageous than the treatment given to us, we shall have the advantage of the Germany treaty. There is also a treaty in existence between Japan and France, and on one or two articles, notably paper, the treatment given to France is preferable to the treatment at present given to us, and there also we shall have the benefit of the French treaty. But the main practical advantage of this treaty to Canada is that it will put our merchants and manufacturers upon a footing of equality with their American competitors, and remove the disadvantage under which they have been labouring in the Japanese market up to the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not observe any mention of grain or flour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, grain is not included in the treaty. The general tariff deals with grain, lumber, butter, cheese and many other articles. I understand that no nation has any advantage in these articles, as there is only one tariff on them.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before the second reading of this Bill, I would like to make a few remarks, not so much with the object of finding any fault with the Bill as to get the people of British Columbia as far as I can right before the House. The very first article of the treaty reads :

> The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel, or reside in any part of the dominions and possessions of the other contracting party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

This looks very simple and very plain, and so it is ; but at the same time there is a vast difference between the two countries in this connection. Both Great Britain and Japan have each a large surplus population, but whereas Great Britain has plenty of outlet for hers in her own possessions, Japan has not. Consequently Japan is very likely to pour her surplus population into British possessions ; and British Columbia, being the nearest to Japan, of course has to bear the brunt of all this immigration. It is not a very desirable class of immigration in all cases. People in the east have a very limited idea of the class of people sent to British Columbia from China, Japan and India. Those specimens of Japanese and Chinese who are seen on the streets of our eastern cities down here are not the kind we complain of. They come here in their individual capacities, as independent individuals, able to transact their own business, whereas the hordes of Japanese and Chinese who pour into British Columbia are brought there more as slaves than anything else. They are brought out by other parties and are not able to transact business for themselves. If any man employing a large number of labourers, such as a railway contractor or a factory owner, wants a lot of these men, he does not go and pick them up individually or send his foreman to do it, but he goes to some Chinese or Japanese boss and engages at a certain wage the number of men he requires. He does not pay the men individually but pays the boss, and he does not know what wages the men get or whether they get any wages at all. That is a species of slavery which should not be tolerated in a country like Canada, which makes the proud boast that slavery has never had a hold within her borders. The people of British Columbia, particularly the labouring classes, have been very harshly criticised for objecting strongly to any immigration from these nations—for objecting strongly to the Japanese being al-

lowed to enter that province in the numbers they do and also the Chinese, as they did until a few years ago, when the $500 tax was put on each Chinaman. But let any fair minded man take up a position in any one of our factories or sawmills at the hour of noon or six o'clock and see the hordes of Japanese and Chinese or Hindoos going out from these works, let him follow them to their quarters and see how they live and look closely into their habits, and then ask himself whether it is fair and honourable to expect a white labourer to keep a family, as it should be kept, dress his children properly, furnish them with school books, and take his place as a citizen, and yet have to compete in the labour market with these creatures who are huddled together like sardines. I think he will agree it is not a fair deal at all. I think he will admit that a white man cannot be expected to compete in the labour market with Chinese, Japanese and Hindoos and live as a white man should and have to compete with these other creatures living as they do. Not only are the labouring population hurt by this immigration but the country in general. Let the same man who watches these hordes go out from these factories ask himself the question: If only one-fifth of them were white men with families, keeping houses as a white man naturally would, would it not be much better for the neighbourhood and the community in general? These foreigners huddle together in one or two buildings. As many as a hundred or two hundred will go into one building, which one man with his family in this city would consider small enough. A couple of hundred will go into that building and live in it, and all the inmates pay is the taxes levied on that building with the exception of the poll tax imposed on each man in British Columbia and the municipal road tax. Whereas if they were white men occupying houses as white men do, just look at the amount of taxes which the municipality would secure and look at the general good which would result to the general community at large. If any fair-minded man will look at the question in that light, I do not see how he can criticise the people of British Columbia, particularly the working classes, for objecting as strongly as they do to the immigration of these Japanese or Chinese or other orientals. I mention these facts because I know the people of my province have been very harshly criticised by people in this section of the country who know nothing of the actual state of affairs existing there. I should like those people, before passing these harsh criticisms, to inquire into the matter for themselves, and look at it as one man should look at another's business. If they were in the same box as labouring men in British Columbia, would they not feel as we do and object just as strongly to being asked to compete with people of that description?

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there is a sufficient number of white people in British Columbia to perform all the work that is going on there. I see by the papers that the Grand Trunk Pacific and other railways are endeavouring to bring in foreign labour for their works on account of not being able to get white labour. Is there a sufficient number of white people out there to perform the work that is required?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad my hon. friend put the question because that is a matter I omitted to touch upon. It is my opinion and the opinion of most labouring men out there that a sufficient number of white men could be got from the old country if a proper move in that direction were made —men who would be of some use to the community after they had done their railway work, men who would be likely to become permanent residents and citizens in the true sense of the word. There is just this trouble. I hear the cry of cheap labour wanted. To my mind that means degraded labour. Let our railway contractors and our mill and factory owners be willing to pay decent wages to white men, and in a very short time they would be able to get all they want. But so long as they are so anxious to make piles of money, so long as our railway contractors are becoming millionaires and our manufacturers also by paying their labourers low wages, and so long as the labourers are becoming poorer and poorer, it will go hard with them to get decent white labour.

Mr. J. D. REID. What wages are paid white men in British Columbia on railway work?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know. I am not a railway man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House once more a question which has for many years been the cause of much agitation in British Columbia. There is not only in British Columbia, but in every Anglo-Saxon community, quite an aversion to any kind of Asiatic labour. I would, however, observe that, so far as Japanese labourers are concerned, my hon. friend will agree that for the last five or six years there has been no Japanese immigration to speak of into British Columbia. Some few years ago when we increased to $500 the poll tax which had been in existence for many years, against Chinese immigration, we persistently refused to extend the same prohibition against Japanese immigration. The reason which we gave at that time was that Japan was an ally of Great Britain, and we could not treat Japanese, as we had treated the Chinese population. This was accepted by British Columbia itself and I may say that our task in that respect was made easy because the Japanese government has restricted the immigration of their own

people. At the present time the Japanese government do not allow immigration from their own provinces, with the exception of a very few from each province, I think it is not more than four or five from each province, that is all that the Japanese permit to leave the empire of Japan and therefore practically there has been no emigration to British Columbia from that country. There has been of late some immigration from India, but that subject will come up later on for consideration. There has been very little immigration from China either, but I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) and my friends from British Columbia generally to the fact that at the present time there is a tendency to improve our trade relations with the nations of the Orient, with Japan, with China and with India. Japan has undergone a revolution, it is no longer a country of Asiatic tendencies or Asiatic civilization, it is fast becoming a European country and we have a growing trade with Japan, a trade which must be improved, and which will assume in years to come and in the very near future, very large proportions. I want our friends from British Columbia to remember this that if we are to trade with Japan we must treat Japan as a civilized nation. We cannot afford to treat the Japanese population with anything like contempt, we must recogize their value, we must recognize that they are allies of Great Britain, we must realize that they are a European and civilized community, and if we are to have any benefit from the trade we expect to have, we must take these facts into consideration. I noticed this morning in looking at the votes and proceedings this resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) :

That in the opinion of this House it is advisable for the Canadian government to take active steps towards the establishing of terminal elevators at the port of Vancouver, for the better handling of the grain crops of Alberta and other western provinces, whose natural outlet is the Pacific coast.

If we are to build elevators at Vancouver, it is because we expect we shall have a trade on the Pacific, and if we are to have a trade on the Pacific where is that trade to go ? To those Asiatic nations I have mentioned, Japan, India and China. I do not want to prosecute this theme any further this evening; the matter must come up for discussion again, but I would like to have my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) and all the gentlemen from British Columbia remember that we are undergoing a revolution, that conditions are not to-day what they were yesterday and that they will not be to-morrow what they are to-day, but that there is a large tendency, an always increasing tendency, for a more intimate communication between the nations of the east and the nations of the west.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

TREATIES RESPECTING CANADA.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 17) to amend an Act respecting commercial treaties affecting Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend explain the effect of this Bill?

Mr. FISHER. This is a very short Bill, simply to insert in the first section of the Act Respecting Commercial Treaties Affecting Canada, chapter 3, of the Statutes of 1895, after the words, 'treaty is' in the seventh line, the words 'or may thereafter be.' That Act is an Act dealing with our commercial treaties which enacts the favoured nation clause practically.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister be good enough to read the section as it is amended?

Mr. FISHER (reading) :

So soon as the French Treaty Act, 1894, chapter 2, of the statutes of 1894, is brought into force by proclamation of the Governor General, the advantages granted to France by the treaty with that power mentioned in the said Act with respect to its commerce with Canada shall extend to any and every other foreign power, which by reason of the operation of such treaty is—or may hereafter be—under the provisions of a treaty with Great Britain, entitled, in whole or in part, to the same or to the like advantages with respect to its commerce with Canada, to the extent to which in manner aforesaid such foreign power is entitled thereto; and such advantages shall continue to so extend to such other foreign power so long as the said Act remains in force, or until the right of such other foreign power to such advantages under its treaty with Great Britain is sooner determined.

This is really to carry out the intention of the treaty with Japan so that the treaty with Japan having been enacted the Act in question will put the treaty into force, giving the rights to Japan which are guaranteed to France in the French treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In other words, this Act is necessary to give to Japan the same rights as are enjoyed by France under the French treaty and by reason of the most favoured nation clause.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It would require a new Act of legislation to enact that with regard to a certain list of articles that may be exchanged under the most favoured nation schedule with Japan.

Mr. FISHER. This only provides for the old French treaty, the goods which are entitled to certain treatment in Canada, when coming from France; goods coming from

France under certain rates of duty shall be entitled to the same treatment when coming from Japan. It carries out the intention of the Japanese treaty which gives the Japanese the right to the most favoured nation treatment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think what the hon. member for Grey meant was this, that the principle upon which you are acting would give to Japan the benefit of the intermediate tariff if you extended that intermediate tariff to any other nation.

Mr. FISHER. Any advantage which we gave to any other foreign nation would accrue to Japan.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 16, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec Oriental Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

QUESTIONS.

YUKON—PAYMENTS TO KELLY, DOUGLASS & CO.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked :

1. What amount of money was paid Kelly, Douglass & Co., for provisions and supplies, and charged to maintenance of the telegraph lines in the Yukon system ?

2. Were these provided by tender and contracts ? If so, were Kelly, Douglass & Company, the lowest tenderers ?

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

1. In 1900 . . . . . $31,325 95
1901 . . . . . 36,599 28
1902 . . . . . 8,621 85
1903 . . . . . 11,438 29
1904 . . . . . 14,368 86
1905 . . . . . 16,817 22
1906 . . . . . 18,229 47

2. Prices based on tenders received in 1900, of which that of Kelly, Douglass & Co. was lowest.

EXPENDITURE AT RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

How much has been expended on capital and consolidated accounts, respectively, on construction, maintenance and furnishing of Rideau Hall, in each year since 1896 ?

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

EXPENDITURE incurred in connection with Rideau Hall since 1896 and up to June 30, 1906.

	Charged to Capital, Construction.	Charged to Consolidated Accounts.		
		Construction.	Repairs and Furniture.	Maintenance.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1897	Nil.	Nil.	19,401 83	11,770 94
1898	"	"	15,276 68	11,305 58
1899	"	"	14,466 38	11,391 85
1900	"	19,273 22	15,324 40	11,917 39
1901	"	11,792 21	23,426 67	9,218 00
1902	"	4,833 42	19,091 23	14,632 06
1903	"	7,514 43	21,753 71	16,873 30
1904	"	2,972 50	17,171 36	14,723 41
1905	"	11,598 75	24,573 29	15,620 19
1906	26,713 35	.....	38,123 17	16,894 17
Totals	26,713 35	57,989 53	208,608 72	134,346 89

EXPORT OF AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

What was the total value of mowing machines, reapers, harvesters and binders, and parts of same, exported from Canada in each fiscal year from 1894 to 1906, inclusive ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The articles mentioned are not classified separately in the export returns, but are included under the general heading of agriculture implements.

The following are the exports of agricultural implements during the undermentioned fiscal years :

Fiscal years.	Value.
1894	$ 465,682
1895	663,718
1896	593,464
1897	761,842
1898	1,443,140
1899	1,863,468
1900	1,692,155
1901	1,742,946
1902	1,814,730
1903	2,284,904
1904	2,556,834
1905	2,313,620
1906	2,497,601

REGINA POSTMASTER.

Mr. McCRANEY asked:

1. What is the salary paid to the postmaster at Regina ?
2. How many clerks are employed in the Regina post office?
3. What are their names, and salaries paid to each?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The salary of the postmaster at Regina is $1,800 a year.
2. There are ten clerks employed in the Regina office.
3. The names and the salaries are as follows : Stockvis, D., $700; Stringer, G. A., $580; Bridge, W. M., $450; McIntyre, W. C., $800; Wilson, V. E. C., $580; Watt, T. R., $580; Faulkner, C. F., $580; Edgar, R. R., $450; Anderson, J. F., $580; Labelle, L. J., $600.

PRINCE ALBERT POSTMASTER.

Mr. McCRANEY asked :

1. What is the salary paid to the postmaster at Prince Albert?
2. How many clerks are employed in the Prince Albert post office ?
3. What are their names, and salaries paid to each ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The present salary and allowances of the postmaster at Prince Albert, Sask., are as follows :

Salary	$2,584 00
Night allowance	60 00
Forward allowance	230 00
Box rents	395 00
The commissions paid the postmaster on money order, savings bank and postal note business during the year ended June 30, 1906, are as follows :	
Money order business	181 08
Savings bank business	6 92
Postal note business	35 47
Total	$3,492 47

Mr. PATERSON.

2 and 3. The department does not know how many clerks are employed, or what salary they are paid.

The postmaster employs his own staff, and pays them salaries out of the amount he receives from the department, under the head of salary and allowances.

IMMIGRATION FROM FRANCE.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked:

1. What propaganda is being carried on in France by the government to draw immigration to Canada ?
2. How many immigration agents has the government in that country?
3. What are their names and when were they appointed?
4. What is the salary of each one?
5. What is their occupation and what are their duties?
6. How many immigrants have they sent to this country since 1896 ?
7. What has been the annual cost of such immigration to the country ?
8. In what parts of France do they more especially carry on their propaganda ?
9. In what localities have such immigrants established themselves ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Personal canvas by agents, lectures, distribution of literature and newspaper advertising.
2. Two.
3. Paul Wiallard, September 1, 1903; P. Foursin, April 1, 1905.
4. P. Wiallard, $2,500 per year; P. Foursin, $1,000 per year.
5. Conducting the work referred to in answer to first question.
6. Following is a statement of French immigration to Canada from January 1, 1896, to November 30, 1906 :

Calender year 1896	382
" " 1897	370
" " 1898	267
" " 1899	332
First 6 mos. of 1900	180
Fiscal year 1900-1	360
" " 1901-2	431
" " 1902-3	937
" " 1903-4	1,534
" " 1904-5	1,743
" " 1905-6	1,648
Five mos. of 1906-7	956
Total	9,140

7. (approximately) :

1896-7	$3,360 00
1897-8	4,802 00
1898-9	4,245 00
1899-1900	2,050 00
1900-1	3,122 00
1901-2	4,234 00
1902-3	2,047 75
1903-4	7,856 00
1904-5	9,251 50
1905-6	7,027 00

8. Devote their attention to the whole of France, but have found their most promising fields of work in Normandy and Brittany.

9. In various localities in the province of Quebec; in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario and the maritime provinces.

GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Is it customary for the Department of the Interior to insert in all grazing leases a clause empowering the minister to exact, when rental is not paid upon the date when it becomes due, a further sum of fifteen per cent on the amount overdue ?

2. Since how long has this been the practice of the department ?

3. In how many instances and from what persons or corporations, since 1900, has such additional sums been demanded? In how many and in what cases has it been paid ; and in how many and in what cases has the demand been waived by the minister ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. and 2. By order in council of January 3, 1901, it was provided that every grazing lease should contain the following provision:—

'And that in case payment is not made within ninety days from the date on which the rental becomes due, the Minister of the Interior may require the lessee to pay an additional sum equal to 15 per cent of the amount of the rental due.'

And the provision has since been inserted in all grazing leases.

On March 22, 1904, a departmental rule was made to the effect that the 15 per cent additional should not be charged to any lessee for the first time the rental was not paid within ninety days.

On August 22, 1905, a further departmental rule was made to the effect that if notice to make payment of rental due was not sent to lessee thirty days prior to the expiration of the ninety days, the 15 per cent was not to be charged.

3. To answer the questions in paragraph 3 would require the production of voluminous statements and I would ask my hon. friend to move for a return.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

What has been the total expenditure on the Ottawa post office since the fire, and how much will it require to complete the building, and when will the work be finished ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). $201,583.96, including removal of debris and temporary fitting of building; an additional sum of about $6,750 will be required to complete work. It is expected that the work will be completed in about six weeks

CUSTOMS DUTIES AT PORT STANLEY.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked:

What was the amount of customs duty collected on goods entering Canada by Port Stanley, Ontario, for the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The amount of customs revenue collected at the outport of Port Stanley, Ontario, for the fiscal years ending June 30, was as follows:—

1900	$ 8,095 12
1901	9,038 65
1902	20,230 99
1903	39,178 03
1904	36,326 24
1905	25,669 93
1906	65,306 16
	$203,845 12

PORT STANLEY DOCK.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked:

1. Did the Dominion government build or assist in building a car ferry slip dock at Port Stanley ?

2. If so, what was the amount paid by the government ?

3. What was the total cost of the dock ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). The car ferry slip dock, at Port Stanley, was built by the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway, to which an assistance of $10,000 was given under the authority of order in council dated February 14, 1898, the amount having been voted by parliament.

W. H. HEPBURN.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Is there a man named W. H. Hepburn in the employ of the Department of the Interior?

2. If so, when was he appointed, what are his duties, and what is his salary ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is no record here of the employment by the Department of the Interior of any one of that name, nor have the officers of the department at headquarters any knowledge of such person being employed.

BRANDON POSTMASTER.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked:

1. What is the salary paid to the postmaster at Brandon ?

2. What other allowances were paid him for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906?

3. How many clerks are employed in the Brandon post office ?

4. What are their names, and the salaries paid to each ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1 and 2. The present salary and allowances paid the postmaster at Brandon, Man., are as follows:

Salary	$6,840 00
Night allowance	60 00
Forward allowance	2,000 00
Box rents	993 00

The commissions paid the postmaster on money order, savings bank and postal note business, during the year ended June 30, 1906, are as follows:

Money order business	417 07
Savings bank business	65 79
Postal note business	112 89
Total	$10,488 75

3 and 4. The department does not know how many clerks are employed, or what salary they are paid.

The postmaster employs his own staff, and pays their salaries out of the amount he receives from the department under the head of salary and allowances.

WHARF AT PANMURE ISLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked:

1. Has the government constructed a wharf at Panmure island? If so, at what cost?
2. When was the work begun and when finished?
3. Has a public road been opened to the wharf, and when? If not, why not?
4. What was paid for the road and right of way?
5. What is the depth of water at the head of the wharf?

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

1. Yes, at a total cost of $1,981.40, up to June 30, 1906.
2. Work commenced in May, 1905, and continued on till the end of last season.
3 and 4. A right of way for road purposes was purchased for the sum of $150.
5. About 2 feet at low water and 6 feet at high water.

RAILWAY TIES FOR NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Has the government given contracts for railway ties for any of the sections of the Transcontinental Railway, west from Quebec, and east from Winnipeg? If so, to whom granted, and at what prices?
2. How many tenders were received, from whom, and at what prices?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1.

	1st. Class.	2nd Class.
John G. Hern, Quebec	$0 50	$0 46
" "	0 57	0 44
*Robertson & Brown, Kenora	0 37	0 30
Robert Bates, Kenora	0 40	0 35
Frank Gardner, Kenora, tamarack	0 41	0 36
Frank Gardner, Kenora, pine	0 39	0 33
John Gardner, Kenora, tamarack	0 42	0 37
John Gardner, Kenora, pine	0 39	0 34
E. Guilbault, St. Boniface	0 67	0 60
" " 25,000	0 75	

*Note.—Robertson & Brown, John and Frank Gardner, refused to sign contracts at prices tendered.

2. Twenty-five tenders were received from the following:

	1st. Class.	2nd Class.
James J. Murphy, hemlock	$0 43	$0 35
Frank Gardner tamarack	0 43	0 38
" pine	0 40	0 35
David L. Mather, cedar	0 47	0 33
" Jack pine	0 44	0 30
Thomas Demarais	0 50	0 46
R. Balfour	0 60	0 40
James Murphy	....	0 48
Amherst Lumber Co., hemlock	0 30	....
Napoleon Dion	0 35	0 33
Auger & Son, yellow pine	1 00	....
Rat Portage Lumber Co.	0 73½	0 56½
Rat Portage Lumber Co., switch ties	33 00	M.B.M.
Eustache Tremblay	0 50	0 40
G. C. Hurdman	0 55	0 45
Thomas Demarais	0 50	0 46
T. H. Massicotte	0 56	0 52
John G. Hearn	0 57	0 44
R. Balfour	0 60	0 40
Brown & Walsh	0 34½	0 28
M. S. Brown	0 36	0 33
Robertson & Brown	0 39	0 30
Wm. Robertson	0 40	0 33
Frank Gardner, tamarack	0 41	0 36
" pine	0 39	0 33
John Gardner tamarack	0 42	0 37
" Jack pine	0 39	0 34
Robert Bates	0 40	0 35
E. Guilbault	0 67	0 60
"	0 75	....
J. D. McArthur	0 88	0 60

MINING CLAIMS IN THE YUKON.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked:

1. How many mining areas, or mining claims in the Yukon are held by: (a) companies incorporated out of Canada, (b) companies incorporated in the United States, (c) aliens?
2. Is the government satisfied that the following statement, contained in the last report of the commissioner of the Yukon Territory, is correct, namely: 'Foremost in these operations was the Yukon Consolidated Gold Fields Company. This company acquired practically all of Bonanza Creek, from the town of Grand Forks down (including many of the adjoining hills), a large portion of Eldorado Creek, and much of Hunker Creek'?
3. Is it true that the Yukon Consolidated Gold Fields Company is an alien company, incorporated in New Jersey?
4. What is the total area of mining claims in the Yukon owned by this company?
5. What portion of these areas owned by this company are being worked annually in the same manner and to the same extent as they

would require to be worked by individual miners ?

6. Is the government aware that the purchasing agent of claims for this company is A. N. C. Treadgold, of the Treadgold Concession ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Under the Placer Mining Act of the Yukon Territory, and under the Quartz Mining and Placer Mining Regulations, entries for claims are granted by the mining recorder for the district in which the claim may be situated, and all assignments and mortgages in connection with mining property are registered with the same officer. The department is only furnished with a statement of the fees collected in connection with such entries. The department, therefore, has nothing to show how many of the mining claims in the above territory are held by companies incorporated out of Canada, or incorporated in the United States or by aliens. Under the provisions, however, of the Act to amend the Companies Act, chapter 49 of the statutes of 1898, provision is made that any joint stock company or corporation duly incorporated under the laws of the parliament of the United Kingdom or under the laws of any foreign country, for the purpose of carrying on mining operations may, on receiving a license from the Secretary of State of Canada, carry on the mining operations in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories.

2. The government is satisfied that the statement contained in the last report of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory is correct.

3. There is nothing of record in the Department of the Interior to show that the Yukon Consolidated Gold Fields Company is an alien company incorporated in New Jersey. Under an ordinance of the Yukon Council, entitled 'The Foreign Companies' Ordinance,' provision is made that any company or corporation incorporated otherwise than by or under the authority of an ordinance of the Territory or an Act of the parliament of Canada, desiring to carry on business in the territory, must obtain a license to do so for which a fee is charged.

4. The department is unable to state what area of mining claims in the Yukon Territory is owned by the Yukon Consolidated Gold Fields Company. Under the regulations all records of grants and assignments are kept by the mining recorder for the district in which the mining property is situated, and while returns are made monthly to the department at Ottawa showing the fees collected for grants and assignments, no alphabetical list of the names of claim holders in the several mining districts of the Yukon Territory is kept by the department.

5. The department is not in a position to furnish this information. Under the Placer Mining Act work to the value of at least $200 must be done on each placer mining claim during each year, and in case such work is not done, and evidence thereof furnished, the claim becomes absolutely forfeited and is open to relocation. Claims, however, may be grouped and the owners of such claims may perform on any one or more of them the work required to be done to entitle the owners of the claim to a renewal grant for each claim so held.

6. The government is not aware that the purchasing agent of claims for the Yukon Consolidated Gold Fields Company is Mr. A. N. C. Treadgold, of the Treadgold concession.

YUKON GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

What has been the total cost of maintaining and furnishing Government House at Dawson, during each of the fiscal years ending, respectively, 30th June, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, including fuel, light, maintenance, repairs and all other disbursements ?

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

Government house at Dawson was built in 1901. The total cost of maintaining and furnishing during each of the fiscal years has been : In 1900-01, $6,209.89 ; in 1901-2, $13,342.54 ; in 1902-3, $8,635.26 ; in 1903-4, $21,165.91 ; in 1904-5, $10,316.37 ; in 1905-6, $13,596.42.

EMERSON COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. What arrangement has been made respecting the difficulties in connection with the continuance of the collector of customs (Mr. Gagnon) at Emerson, Manitoba ?

2. Is Mr. Gagnon still collector at Emerson ? If not, what is his present position in the customs ?

3. Who is the customs officer at Emerson ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1 and 2. L. G. Gagnon, customs collector at Emerson, was transferred to Winnipeg, under order in council, 23rd July, 1906, and is now a customs preventive officer at that port.

3. Mr. William Conolly, formerly customs preventive officer at Winnipeg, is now collector of customs at Emerson, under order in council of 23rd July, 1906.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. W. WRIGHT—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. When was the Ottawa post office damaged by fire ?

2. How many years have the works of restoration been under way ?

3. What has been the total cost to date?

4. When will the work of repairing be completed ?

5. What will be the total cost ?

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

1. On the 4th January, 1904.

2. Three years. The removal of debris and the temporary fitting of the building were commenced immediately after the fire.

3. $201,583.96.

4. It is expected that work will be completed in about six weeks.

5. $208,335.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS —PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amounts were paid by the Department of Railways in the fiscal year 1905-6 for printing and advertising, respectively, to the following contractors: 'Chronicle' Publishing Company, Halifax; J. T. Hawke, Moncton; 'The Herald' Company, Montreal; 'The Soleil,' Quebec; 'The Daily Telegraph,' Quebec; 'The Sun' Printing Company, St. John; 'The Globe' Company, St John; 'The Telegram' Publishing Company, St. John?

2. What amounts have been paid to the above contractors for the same services since 30th June, 1906?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1.

Name of Paper.	Printing, 1905-6, Amount.	Advertising, 1905-6, Amount.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Chronicle Publishing Co., Halifax	7,046 31	846 55
J. T. Hawke, Moncton	10,665 51	5,065 05
The Herald, Montreal	4,600 71	2,009 25
The Soleil, Quebec	1,906 28	600 20
The Daily Telegraph, Quebec	3,025 24	648 15
The Sun Publishing Co., St. John	2,945 25	23 70
The Globe Printing Co., St. John	5,579 81	769 53
The Telegraph Publishing Co., St. John	Nil.	41 6

2.

Name of Paper.	Amounts paid since June 30th, 1906.	
	Printing.	Advertising.
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Chronicle Publishing Co., Halifax	2,841 89	415 60
J. T. Hawke, Moncton	4,437 16	4 80
The Herald, Montreal	3,514 08	571 75
The Soleil, Quebec	1,543 38	183 15
The Daily Telegraph, Quebec	1,376 25	287 00
The Sun Printing Co., St. John	4,469 03	657 27
The Globe Printing Co., St. John	1,901 98	417 20

Mr. FISHER.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW SENATORS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In answer to a question which was asked yesterday by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), it has pleased His Excellency the Governor General to call to the Senate for the province of New Brunswick the Hon. John Costigan, of Edmundston, and Mr. Daniel Gilmour, of St. George; for the province of Nova Scotia, the Hon. A. H. Comeau; and for the province of Ontario, the Hon. George Wm. Ross, of Toronto, and Mr. Robert Beith, of Bowmanville.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence during the past year in connection with the leasing of any lands adjacent to Lake Manitoba for sporting or other purposes.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a return showing: 1. What amounts were paid into the office of the Receiver General during the fiscal year 1905-1906 on account of contractors' deposits for security, and by what contractors these sums were paid.

2. The deposits forfeited to the government during the said fiscal year, names of the contractors, and the amounts so forfeited.

3. Cheques received as security from contractors during the said fiscal year, held by the departments which received them, and from whom they were received.

4. The total amount now in the hands of the Receiver General and of the several departments, respectively, belonging to this account. —Mr. Foster.

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Committee on Transportation (of which J. H. Ashdown, Esq., is chairman), should forthwith be taken up, considered and acted upon by parliament.

He said: This motion is similar to one moved by me last session and also the previous session. While it may not have the merit of novelty, it at least has the merit of importance. Hardly a day passes in this House when some question is not discussed which is incidental to and dependent upon this question of transportation. Yet we are in this position, that while during the last ten years every private corporation has been reaching out for the increasing business, the government has practically stood still and done nothing to improve our transportation facilities. It cannot be said that the government has not had due notice from all quarters of the necessity for doing something. On all sides we have had during the past ten years evidences of prosperity. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in the great Northwest, have been extending north and south of their main

line. The Canadian Northern is rapidly constructing its railways in that country. So, too, in turn, the Grand Trunk Pacific have launched a great enterprise, but the federal government at Ottawa has in the past ten years practically done nothing towards facilitating the transportation business of this country. True, a few hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent at different points in dredging, whether on the great lakes or at Montreal, but there has been no definite fixed purpose in the minds of the ministers, or no purpose fixed in the minds of the public by any action of the ministers, for supplying the lack of transportation facilities which is plainly evident. No doubt this is mainly due to the fact that the Department of Public Works has not been filled for any length of time by the same minister. One set of views has been launched by one minister at the head of that department and then brushed aside by his successor; and it is quite probable that when the time comes, which should come shortly, when the present minister nominally at the head of the department will have to be replaced, we shall no doubt have another set of new plans and policy adopted. The government are not lacking in examples to incite them to do something in this matter.

Our neighbours, the great people of the United States, by a fixed and determined line of policy in the matter of transportation, have secured to themselves not only all the carrying trade of the great northwestern states to the sea-board and for distribution in their own country, but they have come right into our own country and taken from Canada the transportation trade which should be ours; and, to our mortification and annoyance, we have this result, that from Fort William and Port Arthur we have between 10,000,000 and 15,000,000 bushels of grain annually going, not to Canadian lake ports and thence to Montreal, which should be the great seaport of this Dominion, but to Buffalo, simply because this government has stood still, has marked time while the trade has progressed and gone to Buffalo. That has been the course of the government for the last ten years, and that is what has conduced to that condition. Only the other night we heard complaints of the dying away and decay of the shipbuilding trade of Canada, and before I resume my seat I shall refer to this question and endeavour to show the government that if they waken to their opportunities, it is not a question of bounties on ships but of a transportation system that will put our ships on the great lakes and give them that trade which is rightfully theirs. It is not only a question of the movement of grain from the west to the east but a question of the movement of manufactured goods from the east to the west. Any gentleman who has paid attention to what is known as the Canada Atlantic system of railway and who has been at Depot Harbour, their port on the Georgian bay, will bear witness to the fact that one of the great factors in the trade of that railway system has been not only the carrying of grain from the west to the east, but the carrying of the manufactured goods of the east from the east to the west. Not the manufactured goods of Canada, but the manufactured goods of the United States have been carried over that system of railway, and I think that other plans and improvements might be adopted by which we could not only possess ourselves of the bulk of the carrying trade of the western states of the Union, but we could also possess ourserves of the whole trade of the Northwest Territories. Nay more, we could also have a large part of the trade which is now going by American means of communication from the east to the west, in the transportation of manufactured goods.

What is the system of communication today in the United States, the result of many years of experience, a system which has been handed down to them as a successful system? It is simply this that you shall transport by means of railway commodities to points on the great lakes, whether Superior or Michigan, that you shall then, in the largest lake carriers, carry that grain to Buffalo and from Buffalo you shall distribute that in the diverse ways in which it is distributed. It is a fallacy for men to imagine, as many do, that the great bulk of the grain that goes to Buffalo, is for export to the old country. That is not at all the case, because an immense portion of that grain finds its market in the eastern and northern states, and that is a trade that directly appeals to Canada because we see to-day that even with the imperfect system we have we are distributing by means of the Grand Trunk system, millions upon millions of bushels of grain which are brought to Midland and Depot Harbour through the eastern states.

What has experience shown in reference to this Buffalo system? We find that the quantity of grain passing through Buffalo annually has been:

	Bushels.
1902..	124,626,438
1903..	140,438,822
1904..	100,838,000

I have not been able to ascertain the figures for Buffalo for the past year owing to the fact that no report of the Buffalo Board of Trade is to be found in the library and I have no reason to believe that the trade has been a decreasing trade, that it has decreased from what it has been in the past. This American system has one advantage, and I am glad to say that the system I am going to advocate has the same advantage, that is that when the vast millions of bushels of grain reach Buffalo, the grain does not have to depend simply on rail competition but has the benefit in the

summer months, of water competition by the Erie canal, and the Erie canal is not such a system as the Trent Valley canal will be when it is completed. Yet in the face of the fact that the Erie canal has a depth of ony 7 feet, and can accommodate vessels of a capacity of only 7,000 bushels, as compared with 20,000 bushels on the Trent Valley canal when completed, we find that the Erie canal last year carried 20,605,000 bushels of grain, showing the great advantage where you have water and rail competition. It may be asked is the system via Buffalo and by way of the Erie canal, and the many railways which run eastward, the only system that the American people avail themselves of? It is not, because as a matter of fact the figures show that at the port of Montreal last year, there were brought to the port of Montreal last year no less a quantity than 5,959,000 bushels of grain from American ports and I want to call the attention of the House to this fact that of that quantity of American grain that was received at the port of Montreal no less than 4,586,407 bushels was brought through from the head of the lakes, taken to Kingston and Prescott, and there transferred to barges and hurried on to Montreal, and the lesser quantity of 1,372,653 bushels of grain was taken through in unbroken bulk from American ports at the head of the lakes to Montreal. The answer to a question which I put in this House contains no figures showing how much Canadian grain was carried through from the head of the lake to Montreal, whether in bulk or by barges, and I am therefore unable to state that amount. We have this fact apparent, that this huge trade, of upwards of 140,000,000 bushels of grain—and in that is not included flour in barrels or in sacks but simply grain by the bushel—in view of the fact that that large quantity is going through by Buffalo we find that the Canadian route, the Welland canal, and the St. Lawrence canal system, is taken advantage of by the Americans to the extent of nearly 6,000,000 bushels, or was taken advantage of to that extent last year. What have we been doing in Canada in the last ten years? I remember very well some six or seven years ago when the hon. Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, he spread upon the table of the House a vast map that contemplated improvements at Port Colborne, and when the minister made the statement that the government contemplated the expenditure of upwards of $5,000,000 at that port, ministers and members on that side of the House stood aghast, yet what has been done? Witbin the past few years there has been expended at Port Colborne no less a sum than, in round figures, $3,000,000 by the government of Canada, and for what? First for the construction of a breakwater, and in addition to that blasting of the rock there, dredging and the construction of an elevator. And what are the people and the government of Canada to have there after all is said and done? We are told by the minister what we may expect. At the present time the Welland canal is capable of accommodating vessels with a carrying capacity of about 70,000 bushels.

We are told that when the propesed elevator is constructed there either American or Canadian boats can go to Port Colborne, vessels will be accommodated with a draught that will meet the requirements of boats carrying from 300,000 to 400,000 bushels of grain, such as are, of course, to be found on the great lakes to-day. This grain will then be transferred to barges carrying 70,000 or 80,000 bushels of grain, or even perhaps a trifle beyond that figure, because, when it is considered that these will be tow barges not having any propelling machinery in them, it will be seen that they will be capable of carrying a greater amount of grain, and it may be that ingenuity will devise the construction of a tow boat capable of carrying 100,000 bushels. The argument in favour of the expenditure of this $3,000,000 at Port Colborne is this: Canada will be in a position to accommodate at that port propellers carrying 300,000 or 350,000 bushels of grain. This grain will be transferred to tow barges and these barges in turn can be taken to Montreal, three or four behind a powerful tug, and as a result the grain rate will be cut down to Montreal to a lesser amount than it is to-day. And so, while the government are carrying out this scheme at Port Colborne, and while millions of dollars are being spent in that direction, no man will spend a dollar of his own money there because the investing public have no confidence in the plan, and the reason they have no confidence in the plan is that they see the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway at the Port of Midland embarking on great enterprises for the carrying of grain. The public are satisfied that these Companies are right and that the government are wrong. For that reason private capital is not finding investment at Port Colborne. It is a notorious fact, and it has been so stated in business circles, that the government have proffered to private capitalists constructed docks at Port Colborne if they will build elevators on them at their own cost, and yet private capital is not forthcoming. Contrast that with the supply of capital at Midland, where the Grand Trunk say to capitalists: There is a piece of land that you may have, and private capital comes in readily from the United States and constructs elevators at that point. However, $3,000,000 are already expended at Port Colborne. It is no use to say anything about that or to attempt to disparage it if anything could be said. The money has been expended, and all we can hope for is that it will be a factor, and a favourable factor, in the transportation trade of this country. Now, it may be argued in favour

of this Port Colborne route that these vessels will come to Port Colborne with grain, and that instead of returning light they will get cargoes of coal at different points on the south shore of Lake Erie. The answer to that can be found in the fact that if any man can go to the city of Detroit or the town of Windsor and watch the almost endless procession of magnificent vessels, Canadian and American, that pass by there during the months of navigation, he will be struck by the fact that hundreds upon hundreds, I might say thousands, of them are going up light. Why are they going up light? They are going up light because the only trade that is offering is the coal trade, and when I tell hon. gentlemen that from the ports of Lake Erie to Port Arthur or Fort William coal has been carried for the trifling sum of twenty-five cents a ton, it will be readily seen that this is not a very desirable trade. It pays the expensive vessel, the large iron freighter, better to go up light than to take the small consideration of twenty-five cents a ton for coal. At all events, there is not sufficient coal going up the lakes to freight all these vessels. The coal, however, will go into the lighter and cheaper class of vessels, for the reason that there is of necessity a long detention in the unloading of coal vessels. You cannot unload them like you can a grain vessel with the same amount of despatch, and, as a result, the coal is to-day being carried in inferior tow barges, and the great freighter goes up practically free of freight during the summer months. So much I have said in reference to Port Colborne, and I do not propose to lay any stress upon that fact, except to say that it cannot be, in my opinion, or in the opinion of the writers of the articles I have read, or in the opinion of men who, I think, are competent to judge on the question, any fighting factor as against the American people in diverting the trade from Buffalo.

The Welland canal has been perhaps, and will be at all times, a factor in holding the railways in check, but it will never be the easier way or the way that will undoubtedly win out in the competition for the carrying of grain either from the western states or from the Northwest provinces. Now, let us review the next competition that is presented, and I will refer here to the report of the committee known as the Royal Commission on Transportation, of which Mayor Ashdown, of Winnipeg, is the chairman. Summarized, the committee, on page 19, says this:

> Your commission are of the opinion that the Canadian routes hereinbefore mentioned, viz.:
>
> 1. Via Midland, including the Grand Trunk Railway (double tracked as Mr. Hays purposes), the Trent Valley waterway, and in all probability the Canadian Pacific Railway.
>
> 2. Via Depot Harbour, including the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railway;
>
> 3. The all-water route, via either the proposed French and Ottawa rivers canal system, or the enlarged Welland canal;
>
> Should be taken and considered as the main Canadian routes by which the products of the west will reach ocean navigation.

Now, having regard to these three, I do not propose to discuss at any length the French and Ottawa river canal system. I have nothing to say in disparagement of that, except that I do not think this country is going to stand pledged to the expenditure of millions of dollars on a canal system which, on the face of it, is impracticable, for the reason that the time of the year you want the carrying of grain and the desirable time is the fall, every man knows that a canal system will freeze up much sooner than lake navigation. I think that we need hardly to-day consider the question of this Ottawa river canal. It is ahead of the times many years, and the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are, as Mr. Ashdown and these gentlemen indicate in this report, reaching out for a system by way of the Georgian bay and that private capital is being invested to that end to an enormous extent will demand from this country recognition in the form of reasonable assistance to meet the necessities of the country and these railway companies in developing that situation. Now, as to the other system of enlarging the Welland canal, or the Welland canal as it is, the government has already spent, as I have already pointed out, on the improvements at Port Colborne, $3,000,000, and so, if we are to take the report of this commission, it all comes down to this that the grain must find its outlet by way of Midland harbour or by way of Depot Harbour to Montreal. I did not propose to say one word to-day in disparagement of Depot Harbour as a harbour because it is unnecessary when one contrasts the claims of Midland harbour as against Depot Harbour as to the establishment of the ultimate grain carrying route from the west to the east. The Grand Trunk Railway own the line from Midland to Montreal and they own the line from Depot Harbour to Montreal.

If hon. gentlemen study the question they will see that the Grand Trunk are to-day doing nothing towards equipping and developing the Depot Harbour route. The railway from Depot Harbour to Montreal is not a high class railway. It was built by Mr. Booth, who exhibited great enterprise in the undertaking, but it was built as a private enterprise and it was not constructed as a first-class road. Probably Mr. Booth had not the wealth of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway behind him, and under the circumstances he deserves great credit for his enterprise and energy. We find that the Grand Trunk is not making any improvements on that system. I refer to this because some gentle-

men may advocate the claims of Depot Harbour owing to the fact that it was mentioned in the report. A glance at the map does not disclose the actual position of Depot Harbour. It is not, as Midland is, on the skirt of the bay; it is a little arm or basin behind some ten or twelve miles of reefs and islands through which vessels can only navigate under the most favourable conditions. As a matter of fact, in the fall of the year when there are snow storms, and at the very time when it is necessary to rush the grain from the west to the east, I have more than once seen vessels destined for Depot Harbour compelled by stress of weather to make for Midland and be discharged there. I wish to say nothing in disparagement of Depot Harbour, but the fact remains that the Grand Trunk is not spending money on that port or on that line of railway. The betterment of the railway from Depot Harbour to Montreal would involve an enormous expenditure, because it is now a low class road, while on the other hand the betterment of the railroad from Midland to Montreal simply means improvement between Midland and Peterborough or Belleville where it connects with the high class main line track. Contrast what the Grand Trunk is doing at Depot Harbour with what it is doing at Midland. Let me preface this by saying that the development of Midland as a port is not of to-day or yesterday. Over twenty-five years ago when there was simply a local railway running from Midland to Port Hope, the railway company had such confidence in Midland that they constructed an elevator, long before there were any grain shipments from the Canadian West via the lakes. A very considerable trade was done for a number of years from Chicago to Midland, thence to Lake Ontario, and on by vessels to Montreal or across the lake to Ogdensburg. Time went on; the Grand Trunk leased the Midland Railway and then came a change. The railway and the elevator accommodation were improved by the Grand Trunk, and of late years the port has taken tremendous strides so that to-day Midland is what Mr. Hays foreshadowed it would be in his evidence given some two or three years ago. As an instance of the improvements which are being made by the Grand Trunk, I may say that at one point of the railroad they have for one third of a mile cut out a grade of twenty-six feet, and at another point where the railway swung around the bay they have built an immense breast-work at a great expense of money, and in this way shortened the road upwards of one-third of a mile. More than that, they have given, at a reasonable price to American capitalists, land on which elevators may be constructed and last year the Aberdeen Company, of Chicago, have gone to Midland (not to Port Colborne) and they have erected at Midland an elevator with a capacity of one and a quarter million bushels, not with the view of storage, but with a view towards rapid handling. Hon. gentlemen will have some idea of what that handling is when I tell them that it elevates 30,000 bushels an hour on the dip. More than that, another American elevator company has erected, on ground leased from the Grand Trunk, another large elevator of one and a quarter million bushels capacity, and I am glad to be able to say that a third American company is making preparations to construct a two and a half million bushel elevator immediately below the elevator of the Aberdeen Company. This proves that American capitalists realize that Canada has a system of grain transportation by rail and water which is destined to be a far more advantageous route than the route via Buffalo. This is quite apparent when we remember that if two vessels leaving Chicago or Duluth, one destined for Midland and the other for Buffalo, the vessel destined for Midland will reach that port fifteen hours before Buffalo is reached by the other vessel. When we remember that in the fall of the year vessels capable of carrying 400,000 bushels of grain are paid four and five cents per bushel freight we can easily recognize the advantage which a vessel has in plying to a port which is fifteen hours better than Buffalo in point of time. Let not hon. gentlemen be carried away with this idea of back cargo. From Buffalo to the north there are practically no back cargoes to-day. A great grain freighter is not going to be delayed for the paltry consideration of 25 cents per ton, any way the coal is carried in the summer months and not in the fall. There is therefore no question of back freight between Buffalo and the north, there is no question of back freight from Midland to the north, the question is simply the carriage of grain from the west to the east and in that trade Midland beats the Buffalo route by fifteen hours. Little wonder is it then that large capitalists come from Chicago to Midland and invest their money there rather than in Buffalo. I have referred to the efforts which the Grand Trunk were making to develop Midland. There are few railway systems in this country which will cut down a grade of 26 feet for a third of a mile, and there are few railways which are casting aside their existing system and building enormous steel bridges for the sake of saving one quarter or one half a mile in distance as has been done by the Grand Trunk on the Midland road. I quote from the statement of Mr. Hays before the Transportation Commission :—

Grain comes directly down by our Midland railway and comes to the Grand Trunk at Belleville and thence to Montreal. Our plans are for the reduction of our four per cent grade from Midland to our present maximum standard grade of four tenths of one per cent, and to double track the line to our main line at Port Hope.

That will give you an idea of what the Grand Trunk is doing at Midland, and also as to what American capital is doing at the same port in erecting elevators. Mr. Hays was pressed by one of the commissioners on this question of storage and in answer to Mr. Ashdown he said :

Here is what Mr. Hays says in answer to a question by Mr. Ashdown (vol. 3, p. 167):

Mr. ASHDOWN. Do I understand you, the policy of the Grand Trunk would be to join in a system of elevator bonds and to guarantee the government the cost of the elevator ?

Mr. HAYS. That would be our inclination upon some fair, equitable plan. We of course would want to have some voice in the control of the expenditure, and we would want a say as to the size and location and a voice in the cost of the plans.

And so, while Mr. Hays is advocating that the government should give some assistance for the construction of elevators, private capital is coming forward, and, without a cent of inducement from the people of Canada, is building elevators at Midland instead of going to Buffalo, despite the fact that there is at Buffalo to-day 140,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels of grain, so convinced is it that the advantageous route is via the Georgian bay and on to Montreal and Portland. Let us take another phase of the question to show that the Georgian bay end of the route is regarded favourably not only by the Grand Trunk, but by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway have had for many years their chief port on the Georgian bay at the town of Owen Sound. They have carried a large quantity of passage freight through that port. They have not carried a large quantity of grain, because of the handicaps to which they are subjected there, both as to distance and gradients. What is the position of Owen Sound as to distance ? From Owen Sound to Toronto is 120 miles, and from Toronto to Peterborough, 90 miles ; so that a train leaving Owen Sound traverses 210 miles in its transit from west to east to reach Peterborough. But the distance from Midland to Peterborough is only 90 miles. Is it any wonder that to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are looking for a harbour at or near Midland ? What have they done in that respect ? At the town of Midland they found the whole harbour front, for a distance of three or four miles, secured by the Grand Trunk with great astuteness and foresight. The Canadian Northern Railway is only eighteen miles from Midland, but it is shut out of that waterfront as well. What did the Canadian Pacific Railway do ? Unable to go to Midland, they cast their eyes in another direction, and some six miles down the bay, at Victoria harbour, a village of some 1,200 population, they secured for $15,000 or $20,000 a considerable portion of the waterfront. I am not stating this as a fact, because I know it not ; but I know that Mr. Hyman, the Minister of Public Works, has made the statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplated works at Victoria harbour at an initial expenditure of over $1,000,000. The reason of that is this, that it is stated that a large amount of money will have to be spent there in order to make a harbour, and I believe the government is being asked by the Canadian Pacific Railway to expend that large amount of money there to-day. It may be asked, what is on the other side of the harbour of Midland, which is a great natural harbour ? The trouble is that the town of Midland is surrounded by a cordon of hills, and in order to obtain access to the other side of the harbour the Canadian Pacific Railway would have to make an ascent of the hills pretty nearly as bad as those at Owen Sound, where, for a distance of fifteen miles, they are unable to take out more than seven loaded cars at a time, so that they have been utterly unable to establish a grain trade through that port. This question is one not only of local interest to Midland, but of most vital importance to the farmers of the west. What they want to-day is cheap transportation. They are between the millstones of an imperfect system through Canada and the competition by way of Buffalo. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that there are only two seasons of the year when the farmers of the Northwest are particularly interested in the question of transportation. The principal season is the fall, about the time when the Erie canal is closed by reason of being frozen up. As a consequence, the farmers of the west are squeezed between the railway system of the United States and the railway systems of Canada.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). What time in the fall of the year ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think the large movement of grain from the west to the east is not experienced until about the 15th of November, and from then on till the 10th of December. That is my opinion, from what I have seen at Midland, and at that time of the year the Erie canal is pretty well frozen up. What is the position of the western farmer to-day with regard to transportation ? When his grain reaches Port Arthur he is told by the shipper ; we can take this grain to Buffalo in the great freighters carrying 300,000 bushels, and able to break through the ice all the way if there should be any, or we can take it to Midland ; and when we reach either of these two points, we will hand you over to the tender mercies of the railway companies. That is the position, and so it is to our interest to have the largest and most complete accommodation at Midland, which has an advantage of fifteen hours of lake travel over Buffalo. Let me recall to the House another fact which they have perhaps overlooked. The ordinary observer glancing at a map imagines that from the point in Lake Huron where the freighter bound for Buffalo

branches off, there is an unbroken line of fast sailing, but that is not so. After the vessel once passes Sarnia, from there to Detroit, the passage is a very slow one compared with that on the Great Lakes. The reason is that large parts of the river are practically dyked, and also that the channel is very narrow, and therefore to avoid collisions the vessels have to be checked for a large part of the way down that river. I believe, therefore, I am well within the mark when I state that the run from Port Arthur to Midland has fifteen hours of an advantage over the run to Buffalo. More than that, when the grain reaches Buffalo, where is it going to? To Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, or some other of the many ports of the eastern states, and the benefit of that accrues to the American railway companies. If, on the other hand, the 150,000,000 bushels of grain that is now going to Buffalo, or the bulk of it, is transferred to Midland, and carried from there by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal, what an advantage it is to Montreal. Let me go further than that, and say that if you make Midland a national port, you are going to do this.

You are going to bring a great advantage to the city of Quebec. For this reason: The Mackenzie & Mann system of railway runs within eighteen miles of Midland—that is, their line from Toronto through to Sudbury. They contemplate building a line from Hawkesbury westward of their main line into Toronto. That road, is not under construction now, will be gone on with next season. Then there is the Mackenzie & Mann Railway, known as the Great Northern, running into Quebec. Therefore, with the completion of lines already undertaken, and with the building of the eighteen miles to Midland, this system will carry grain from Midland to Quebec. This traffic could go on at a time when Buffalo is closed up. This would be an advantage not merely to the people of Midland, but to the people of Montreal, the people of Quebec, and many thousands of others throughout the Dominion. I believe I am within the mark when I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway system has on its pay rolls 30,000 men. Think what that must mean to the cities and towns in Canada in which these men are employed. And think how the payroll of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway would be increased if we had not only the grain trade of our own Northwest, already amounting to 100,000,000 bushels but also the immense trade of Duluth and other western cities, all going through our lines and ports instead of being carried to Buffalo. But, I am told, You are too sanguine when you say you are going to capture the trade of Buffalo, because a large part of that trade is not export trade, but is scattered throughout the eastern part of the United States. Not at all. Last year we sent from Midland to Portland over 10,500,000 bushels of grain. Besides this, millions of bushels of grain were carried from Midland and is distributed among points in the northern and eastern states. Why does not this grain to American points go through Buffalo? It is because the Grand Trunk Railway can carry it cheaper by way of Midland. The Portland trade, it will be understood, is an export trade. But millions of bushels are carried down and distributed for feeding or distillery purposes to the eastern and northeastern states. This brings me to the consideration of another advantage to be had under the scheme that I propose. The Grand Trunk Railway have a complete system of transportation throughout the eastern and northeastern states. Now, it has been demonstrated—it was proved by Mr. Booth—that he was able to carry large quantities of merchandise from Boston and the eastern states by way of Depot Harbour to Chicago, Milwaukee and other similar points. Any person visiting Depot Harbour would be surprised to see the thousands of packages of goods piled upon its docks coming from Boston and other eastern points, to be carried by vessel to Chicago and other places in the west. Now, what is the one drawback against the carrying of grain through Midland and to eastern points? The one drawback is that there is no return freight. But if you had a system of railway by which you could draw fifty cars behind one locomotive, instead of twenty as at present, each car with a capacity of 1,000 to 1,500 bushels, the freights from the west to the east could be cheapened. And, not only that, but much cheaper freight rates could be given from the east to the west. All classes of goods from the great manufacturing centres in the northern and eastern states could be carried by way of Midland for distribution to points west of the great lakes. Or these grain cars, returning westward, could be loaded at Montreal and other points in eastern Canada with goods designed for distribution in our own Northwest. This would be a benefit not only to Montreal and Quebec, but to every point in Ontario, and especially to the great city of Toronto. Today the Grand Trunk Railway have direct communication from Midland to Toronto. The Canadian Pacific Railway have a line within a few miles of Midland and running to Toronto, work upon which is now in progress. And, as I have stated, the Mackenzie & Mann system passes within eighteen miles of Midland, and a spur line could be easily built. If the grain trade were centred at this most advantageous point of Midland, there would be so many vessels coming into that port that rates would be offered that would be beyond competition, whether by the Canadian Pacific Railway around the head of Lake Superior or by any American system via St. Paul, Winnipeg

and beyond. The city of Toronto would have the advantage of the competition of three great lines of railway from Midland. And as these railways, especially the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have each its network of railways throughout western Ontario, where there are such fine cities and towns as Guelph, Galt, Berlin and many others, all these producing centres could send their manufactured goods to Midland to be carried to the west by vessel. No one who has not carefully considered the matter can realize the advantage of cheapness afforded by a system of water transit. Consider this one fact: The port of Toledo, I think I am right in saying, is only something over a hundred miles from Buffalo. Whatever the distance it is not very great. Grain is brought in cars into Toledo and rather than carry it by car over the intervening distance to Buffalo they load it upon vessels and elevate it out again at the port of Buffalo.

Mr. SCHELL. The distance is 250 miles.

Mr. BENNETT. I thought it was less than that. But it seems a trifling mileage to make it worth while to transfer the grain twice. But the reports of the port at Buffalo show that this is actually done in the regular way of business. This fact must appeal to every man as indicating the advantage afforded by water communication with the Northwest. The handling of general freight can be carried on to very great advantage on these grain vessels. As a rule these vessels are of a very superior class, the bulk of them to-day being iron. While they are unloading the grain out of the hatches with the leg of the elevator, quantities of furniture, agricultural implements in the knock-down state in which they are generally shipped, and package freight of all kinds can be put on the vessel to form a deckload. At the head of Lake Superior there are two lines of railway—and we hope to have the Grand Trunk Pacific constructed within a year at the outside—to carry on the distribution of these goods throughout the great Northwest.

The other night the question of the encouragement of ship building was referred to. On that point I do not propose to say much, but I would merely call attention to the fact that the ship building interests of Canada is to-day seriously handicapped. It was seriously handicapped, as was then pointed out, by the importation of British ships and the bringing over from the United States of old vessels, re-christening them and entering them as Canadian vessels on the payment of tonnage fees. But there can never be any considerable traffic for the Canadian trader as compared with the American, for the reason that the former is limited to the carrying of grain from the west to the east and the taking of freight back. You may ask why he cannot have a share in the carriage of iron ore which is now monopolized by the American built steel ships. He cannot for the reason that under the United States regulation no ore can be carried between two American points by a Canadian vessel. But it may be contended that the Canadian freighter has the carriage of all the ore on the Canadian side. That is quite true, but what have we in Canada? Any one conversant with the iron business will realize that in Ontario, for many years to come, no more iron smelters are likely to be built. A huge concern has been established at the 'Soo' which is the nucleus of a great steel industry. In Ontario a smelter of no inconsiderable proportions has been established at Hamilton and also one at Midland. But the one at Hamilton is the last that will ever be constructed on the shores of Lake Ontario. Why? For the reason that you have to bring your ore from the upper lakes to Hamilton, and it cannot be carried to the same advantage as to Midland because you have to take it through the Welland canal. All the ore intended for the Hamilton smelter has to be carried to Sarnia and from Sarnia by rail across to Hamilton. I am within the mark when I say that it is not likely there will be many more smelters erected in Ontario within the next few years, so that the Canadian vessel has only one bulk trade open to it, and that is the carrying of grain in the fall and the spring of the year and what may lag on through the summer. Further than that, there can be no possible freight for Canadian vessels except some packages from the east, and we should endeavour to build up a maritime trade, especially on our great lakes, as well as on the ocean. How are we to do that? If we can attract, not merely 100,000,000, but 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 bushels of grain to the great trade on the Georgian bay, then we shall furnish an immense traffic to our Canadian vessels. It must be borne in mind that all the grain that might be carried to the port of Midland from either Port Arthur or Fort William must, unless our coasting laws should be changed, be carried in British bottoms. To carry it in other bottoms would be in contravention of our coasting laws. Thus all the grain can be carried to Midland, which will ultimately outrival Buffalo as a port for the eastern shipment of grain. And as all the grain from Duluth, Superior, Chicago and Milwaukee or other American ports to Midland can be carried by Canadian vessels, you will thus secure to Canadian vessels the monopoly of that trade from American ports to Midland. I believe you could centre at Midland all the carrying trade from the Northwest and the United States ports for distribution to the eastern and northern states and export to the old country, and the result would be such a phenomenal building of ships on the upper lakes that

the question of bounty need not be considered at all.

I need not say much concerning the natural capabilities of the port of Midland to handle that trade. I am sorry that more of the ministers have not been there to see its advantages as a natural harbour. Let me for a moment refer to what has in the past been a much-abused system, namely, the Trent Valley canal. When you look into the evidence before the Transportation Commission, you find one point insisted upon plainly, and that is the fact that the Trent Valley canal is bound to become a great competitor with our railways in the carrying of grain. People call this a canal, but it should never have been called a canal because it is really not one. It embraces a succession of lakes, varying in width from one to twenty miles, upon which barges carrying 20,000 bushels could easily float behind powerful tugs carrying several of them in one tow. That is a waterway system which is certain to be a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Railway, of much greater magnitude than is the Erie canal to-day to the American system. The Erie canal took from the American railways last year no less than 20,000,000 bushels of grain, and that canal has only a depth of some seven feet and can only carry 8,000-bushel barges. With the centralization of our three railway systems at Midland which is destined by nature to be the terminus of the Trent Valley canal, all the action the government need take is that recommended by this commission, of which Mr. Ashdown, a very capable gentleman, was chairman, succeeding his predecessor, John Bertram, now deceased, who was certainly a great authority on that point. That commission recommended that Midland should be made a national port and that there should be purchased sufficient property to accomplish that object.

I want to call attention to the situation there to-day. I referred last year to the historical fact commented upon by Governor Simcoe one hundred years ago when, after he had examined the survey of the harbour and seen its advantages and its closeness to Montreal, he prophesied it would be in the future the port of communication from the west to the east for the transhipment of the commodities of the west. What is the property held there to-day by the Grand Trunk Railway? It consists of a water frontage of upwards of a mile long with an enormous depth of water. True some little dredging has to be done where there are some little shoals, but they are a mere bagatelle. But at the end, as it were, the continuation of this water frontage, nature seems to have devised something to make it one of the greatest harbours in the world. A river passes up to the lake, called the Wye, which has a depth of water of thirty feet. On either side of that river, elevators could be constructed. You could have half a mile in length of elevators on either side and on the lake shore another half mile. The Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern could have all the elevator accommodation they require. Better than that. There is a line of the Grand Trunk to-day from Peterborough to Midland, about ninety miles in length. That line is being made ready by the Grand Trunk for double tracking, as foreshadowed by Mr. Hays.

Now, if terms cannot be arrived at between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the government could purchase that line and grant the common user to both lines upon suitable terms. I do not know of any reason why a business arrangement should not be arrived at between the two companies for the common use of this line. But, whether the Grand Trunk Railway rents to the Canadian Pacific or not, the difficulty could be solved by the public purchase of the line and its common use by the two systems as I have suggested. Then, let the government purchase the water front at Midland. This done, the government would be certainly approached by American capitalists to whom opportunities could be afforded on fair terms for carrying out on a larger scale the work of elevator building and other improvements which is going on to-day. That work is being carried on now without bounty, or bonus, or special privilege of any kind. American capitalists are there to-day erecting elevators in preference to erecting them in Buffalo. I am not here to state what expenditure on the part of the government would be necessary, for I have no idea of the value which the Grand Trunk Railway place upon that property. But I make bold to formulate the opinion that, had the government of Canada spent at Midland what it has spent at Port Colborne, even had it spent a much less sum than the $3,000,000 expended there, the trade centred at Midland to-day, instead of being fifteen or twenty million bushels, would have approached the hundred million mark. But it is not too late. Let us have the improvements at Port Colborne that have been undertaken, and also the advantage at Welland. But, let there be no delay in carrying on the more important works at Midland, not because of the advantage to be conferred upon Midland, but because of the advantages that would accrue to Quebec and Montreal, as well as to Toronto, and all Western Ontario. Let the Grand Trunk Railway hurry on their work of double-tracking their railway to Midland; let the Canadian Pacific Railway construct their line through from Peterborough, upon which project they have embarked, and let Mackenzie & Mann build their spur of eighteen miles into the town of Midland. Let that huge waterfront, which God and na-

ture must have placed there for a good purpose, be used to advantage in carrying on this great transport trade. American capitalists will undoubtedly come in to construct elevators and develop a harbour upon what is, I believe, the finest situation on the Great Lakes for such works with the safest harbour on the lakes. We can then have a system of transportation which will beat out the Buffalo route by fifteen hours. Let the matter be discussed in this House fairly on its merits, and then, I believe, there will be no demur by hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to the government taking up this question and vigorously carrying out the works which are necessary to make this system practical. A full and fair discussion will lead to but one conclusion—that the proper system of transportation, not only for the grain of the Canadian Northwest, but for the grain of the northwestern states, is by way of the port at Midland and also that this port is the natural assembling place for the great traffic to be carried by the lakes to the west. I trust the government will make a presentment on this question this session. The country is in a prosperous state. We have huge accumulations of revenue. We are frittering away hundreds of thousands of dollars upon little harbours here and there that are of no national importance. But here is a port which, while important in itself, is important also in the interest of our other great ports, not merely Quebec and Montreal, but Halifax and St. John as well. The government has elevators, if I mistake not, at Halifax and St. John. Let millions of bushels of grain be accumulated at Midland in the fall, and, during the rest of the season it can be carried by rail to the maritime ports for storage in the elevators there and shipment in outgoing vessels. The country is watching for some definite action in this matter on the part of the government. Having regard to the report which the Transportation Commission has made and having regard to the advantages of the harbour at Midland, which I have but too feebly set forth, I trust that action will be taken which will enable us to establish a great port that will outrival the port of Buffalo and will secure for our transportation lines the grain trade not merely of our own Northwest, but of the American west as well.

Mr. R. R. HALL (West Peterborough). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the address which has just been delivered by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I was particularly struck with the fact that he seemed to be thoroughly alive to the importance of Midland as a great lake port in a through transportation system. I can frankly say that, knowing that section, I largely agree with him,—I believe that Midland is a very important point in our transportation system, and I know that it was so declared by the Transportation Commission. It seems, however, a most remarkable thing, that a gentleman coming from so important a place as Midland should not have realized the place that it could fill in the transportation system of this country until a very recent date. I find that, while he was a member of this House in 1894, the only appropriations that were made for dredging and improving that harbour and making it a suitable place for this trade amounted to, $4,983.96. In 1895 the government of that day spent on this harbour only $4,997.50. I find also that in 1896, the last year of the Conservative regime the amount expended in Midland harbour to June 30, was the magnificent sum of $2,252.65. It is a most remarkable thing, that it has remained for this government to find out for themselves the importance of Midland harbour, to take hold of the improvement of it in a businesslike way, and make it a centre for the grain trade.

We find that for the year ending June 30, 1904, the government spent $23,759. I also find that for the financial year ending June 30, 1905, the government spent $38,099.37. We further find that this year the government have placed in the estimates the sum of $40,000 in order to improve the harbour there. These estimates were brought down before the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke on the matter, and drew attention, as he has done so eloquently, to the claims of Midland this afternoon. It has, therefore, remained for a Liberal government to appreciate the importance of Midland as a point on the through transportation system. I have not the faintest doubt from the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) this afternoon, that during these early days before some one else had pointed out the importance of that harbour, he had knocked it as he tried to knock every other port on the great lakes system; he has tried to knock and to minimize the importance of Port Colborne; he has tried to knock and minimize the importance of Depot Harbour as a point on our through transportation system. He has also tried to knock Owen Sound as not being a point of any importance whatever on the through transportation system, although every railway man in this country, every man interested in the transportation question of this country, such as Sir William Van Horne, recognizes the fact that the spout is too small, that the outlets from the lakes to the sea-board are not sufficient to take care of the grain that comes down from these ports. It seems strange to me therefore that in the face of the fact that he had moved a resolution:

> That the report of the commissioners should forthwith be taken up, considered and acted upon by parliament.

He should at the same time entirely ignore this part of the findings of the commission which he referred to, and which will be found on page 22. The commissioners say :

Your commission are of the opinion that the Canadian routes herebefore mentioned, viz.:

1. Via Midland, including the Grand Trunk Railway (double tracked as Mr. Hays purposes), the Trent Valley waterway, and in all probability the Canadian Pacific Railway ;

2. Via Depot Harbour, including the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railways ;

3. The all-water route, via either the proposed French and Ottawa rivers canal system, or the enlarged Welland canal;

Should be taken and considered as the main Canadian routes by which the products of the west will reach ocean navigation.

Now, if I read that correctly, it seems to me the commission recommend all these routes as ones suitable and available for bringing the products of the west to the sea and at the same time affording opportunities for bringing manufactured articles of different kinds from the east to the west. I also agree with the hon. member as to the importance of the port of Midland, for a variety of reasons. In the first place it is a point which has excellent railway accommodation. The Canadian Pacific Railway are building their line from Midland to Peterborough. The Grand Trunk I believe have in contemplation the double-tracking of their line. It is also a point on the Georgian bay where the outlet of the Trent canal will connect with the through transportation system.

I took occasion last session to draw particularly to the attention of the government and of the country the importance of the Trent waterway as a link in the through transportation system. I shall not to-day do anything further than draw particularly the attention of the House to the fact that this commission, after having investigated the matter most thoroughly, have also approved of that canal, and emphasized the importance of having the Trent Valley waterway completed at both ends, so as to allow a proper connection between the Georgian bay and Lake Ontario.

On page 19 of their report, the Transportation Commission say :

The port of Midland should also serve as the port for the Trent Valley waterway, on which the government of Canada has already expended between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000, thus having made its construction a settled policy, and your commission would recommend that this waterway be pressed to an early completion and that it be by way of the Severn and the Georgian bay end, and the Trent on the Bay of Quinte, so that its terminals will be in protected waters whereby greater safety will be given to the somewhat smaller boats and barges which will have to be used on this route.

This canal at present consists of 160 miles of waterway from Healey's Falls to Lake Simcoe. To complete it, all that is required is to canalize twenty-three miles of river on the south end and fourteen miles of river on the north end.

Important advantages would be derived locally from the completion of this canal and to these I shall refer. It would furnish cheaper coal, cheaper fuel, cheaper produce of all kinds, to a very large section, because the shore line that would be adjacent to the waters of that waterway system would amount to over 1,000 miles. In the next place it would encourage manufacturing on the Trent Valley basin and it would improve and encourage the milling interest, that is, the grinding of grain in transit, as it comes through from the west to the sea-board. There is on the line of this waterway, upwards of 100,000 horsepower which can be defined as so many tons of white coal. This 100,000 horsepower on a very conservative basis is worth $4,000,000 per annum in the shape of coal. Moreover, the opening up of this section would afford cheaper freight rates on farm products and would lead to an increase in the price the farmers get for the grain which they have to sell. From a national standpoint, it would also afford one of the most important outlets for the products of the west during a large part of the season of navigation, and it would serve an important purpose as a regulator of freight rates in that chain of communication where the rail is used in conjunction with the waterways system. That is to say, we have the waterway from Fort William to Midland, we have the railway from Midland on to Montreal. The Trent waterway system will be a competitor with the railways from Midland down to Montreal. It would be in that measure a regulator of rates, if the competition of the southern or other transportation routes did not afford the necessary competition. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) make some favourable reference to the Trent canal, but it seems to me that here again he and his associates have fallen far short of appreciating the importance even of the Trent waterway as a proper chain in the transportation system. What do we find ? From 1896 to 1906, inclusive, this Liberal government expended $4,131,639 on capital account on the construction of this canal, whereas in the previous ten years, from 1886 to 1895, inclusive, the previous administration spent only $674,710. It therefore seems to me that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has not been as much alive to the opportunities, even from a local standpoint, as he might have been to the interest of his section of the country as being on the line of a through transportation system.

It is not at all therefore to be wondered at that considerable fault is to be found by him with every other port on Georgian bay. He finds fault also with the Georgian bay canal. He says it is ahead of the times. There is no object whatever, I suppose, according to the hon. gentleman, in anything being done in connection with the Georgian bay system for many years to come. I suppose

the same view, judging from the criticism he made, would also apply to Port Colborne, where he questions the expenditure of money that has been made in the deepening of the channel. He forgets that the boats that ply on the upper lakes may have a draught of twenty feet, whereas those below that point, have a lighter draught than 14 feet. I also find that he even knocks the Canada Atlantic Railway and Depot Harbour. It is not a first-class road; it will never compete ! I suppose he would advocate the abandonment of this route. I merely draw the attention of the House to these facts to show the people what a staunch advocate they have for those different ports and routes in the hon. member for East Simcoe. I might point out the fact that the hon. gentleman has chosen a ten year period whereby a reasonable comparison can be made between what has been done by the Liberal administration in regard to the transportation system and what has been done by the late Conservative administration. I contend that there has been a great deal accomplished during the last ten years by the Liberal administration in the development of our transportation system. I desire first to draw the attention of the House to the amount of money that has been spent on our canals. From 1896 to 1905, inclusive, the amount expended by this government on our canal system was $24,600,000. The amount spent during the previous ten years under the Conservative administration was $16,450,000. So that, there has been upwards of $8,000,000 more spent in the last ten years by this government than was spent in the last ten years of the administration of the Conservative government. The money spent has been used to great advantage and has contributed in a large measure to the important development that has taken place. Of that sum I find that on the improvement of the north channel of the St. Lawrence there has been spent $1,539,000; on the Soulanges canal $4,600,000 ; and on the enlargement and improvement of the Welland canal, $3,000,000. Before 1896, if I recollect aright, there was only a nine foot waterway on the mitre sill between Fort William and Montreal. To-day we find that there is a fourteen foot waterway and that vessels of much larger draught those that are able to carry a much larger cargo and which can be operated more cheaply, can be successfully employed upon this waterway. Therefore, I submit this is one of the means by which cheaper frieght rates can be secured and that cheaper freight rates have been secured in that way greatly to the advantage and stimulus of our trade both foreign and domestic. Then again, as further evidence of the fact that during the last ten years this government have been thoroughly alive to the necessities of the transportation system, I might draw the attention of the House to the amount of money that has been expended on the improvement of harbours and rivers, upon dredging and in making repairs of different kinds, and I might add that the money spent in dredging and improving the harbour of Midland has made it the important place that the hon. member for East Simcoe says it is.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will correct the statement which he makes and which must make him appear ridiculous to people who read what he says. None of this amount was spent where all the grain has been elevated at Midland. The money to which the hon. gentleman refers has been spent down at an elevator where no grain has been handled except one or two loads. I tell the hon. gentleman that in charity because some one may read what he says afterwards.

Mr. HALL. I suppose that harbour has to be improved in order to get suitable access to these elevators. I have not visited Midland, although I will make it a special point now that it has been so well advertised to visit that port and see just exactly what an important place it is, because I know that the money that has been expended by this government to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars must have brought Midland forward and made it the very important place that the hon. gentleman says it is. Now, I find that the money that has been expended on harbour and river improvements and upon dredging and repairs has contributed a great deal to the success and prosperity of this country, and the fact of its expenditure shows that this government has been thoroughly alive to the transportation system in all its phases. I find that during this last year in Ontario for the improvement of harbours and rivers and repairs there was expended $1,237,280. That was the expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1905, and for the same period I find that there was expended throughout Canada for the same purpose $3,400,000. It is therefore perfectly apparent that the expenditure of this money has been in the direction of carrying out the very ideas that are suggested by the Transportation Commission in their report. I also find for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, the amount expended on harbour improvements under the Conservative administration was $658,006. There seems to have been an abnormally small amount spent during the last year of the Conservative administration upon the improvement of our harbours and rivers, upon dredging and in making repairs. It is only fair to mention that during 1894-5 the expenditure by the Conservative administration was $2,033,219. The very fact that this government have expended nearly twice the amount each year that was expended by the previous administration shows that this government have been thoroughly alive to this phase of the transportation system because

without the improvement of these harbours and without suitable and complete access to them it would have been impossible to have operated our canals and waterways effectively. I might also point out that an important feature of our transportation system is the operation of our railways. In 1896, when this government came into power, there were 16,210 miles of railway completed in Canada. In 1906, according to the last returns, there were 21,353 miles completed; that is to say that there has been an increase during the last ten years of 5,083 miles of railway. Since 1905 our railways have been extending at the rate of about a thousand miles a year. We can see that the railways that have been constructed in this country must have contributed to an enormous extent to the successful development and working up of our foreign and domestic trade. I might also point out the fact that this government have given every possible encouragement to the building of railways. They have not hampered them in any way in obtaining capital but they have actually assisted them in every possible way in the carrying out of their great enterprises. We find that for the ten years previous to 1896, or the last ten years of the Conservative administration, the government granted aid to railways to the extent of $11,654,000. During the ten years of Liberal administration down to 1906, there have been $16,780,000 spent in aid to railways. Therefore, the amount that this government have expended during these last ten years in aid to railways in excess of what was expended by the Conservative administration is over $5,200,000.

This government has been alive to the importance of developing our railways and our canals. As part of our transportation system the proper equipment of our lighthouse and coast service is important, and I find that during the nine years previous to 1896 the Conservative government expended $4,437,000 on this service, while for the nine years from 1896 to 1904 the Liberal government expended $6,974,000 or over two and a half million dollars more than their predecessors expended in a like period. Another important matter in connection with our transportation system is the aid given by government to steamship lines. I find that for mail subsidies and steamship subventions there was expended by the Liberal government in the ten years previous to 1906, $6,789,000, while for the ten years previous to 1905 the Conservative administration expended only $3,526,000, or about half the expenditure of the Liberals on this service. No one can deny that in all these things which go to build up a country, the present Liberal administration has expended more money and has adopted a more generous policy than did their Conservative predecessors. No better illustration can be given of the enterprise and courage of Liberal statesmanship than the building of the Temiskaming railway by the Hon. G. W. Ross, into what was described by his opponents as a timberless area of barren rocks. Mr. Whitney and his supporters in the Ontario legislature fought against that railway tooth and nail, they described in eloquent terms the barrenness of that country into which it was being built, and they declared that it was a waste of public money to build it. But no sooner was the Temiskaming railway built than development followed; hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the wealth of our country and the eyes of the whole world have been turned on the Cobalt district as one of the greatest of mining centres. And so with the development of the Northwest. We know that land that is twenty miles from a railway is practically valueless for cultivation, and so railways must be built to enable the settlers to market their grain, and so the Liberal government has pursued a policy which aids in the development of railways in the great west. The trade and navigation returns disclose the enormous growth and development of our country, and demonstrate the wisdom of the policy of the Liberal government. In 1896 our total foreign trade was only $231,000,000 while last year it was $500,000,000, and it continues to grow by leaps and bounds. The duties collected in 1896 amounted to $20,000,000 while in 1905 they amounted to $42,000,000. In 1896 the agricultural products exported to England were valued at $9,500,000, while to-day the agriculturists of Canada are exporting upwards of $20,000,000. In 1896 agricultural products to the value of only $14,000,000 were exported to all parts of the world, while in 1905 this same class of export amounted $30,000,000. In 1896 the exports of animals and their products to Great Britain, the United States and other countries amounted to $36,500,000 while in 1905 these exports were valued at $63,000,000. In 1896 the exports of manufactures to Great Britain, the United States, and other countries amounted to $9,300,000 but in 1905 these same exports were valued at $21,000,000. In 1896 the exports of minerals to Great Britain, the United States, and other countries amounted to $8,000,000 and in 1905 they amounted to $31,900,000. I mention these figures just to show the success which has attended the transportation policy as well as the general policy of this government. It does not take them ten or fifteen years, as was the case in the old days of the Conservatives, to awaken to the realization of the necessity of doing a particular work on the St. Lawrence, or on the great lakes, or elsewhere in Canada. They take a hold of such questions as business men and as a result we have ever an ever-increasing trade in this

country. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), in his resolution asks that the report of the Transportation Commission be considered and acted upon by this government at once. Why, the hon. gentleman has been asleep ; the government has been acting on the lines of this report both before it was made and since it has been made ; they are acting upon it this very session. In the main estimates now before the House it will be found there is to be expended next year on harbour improvements in the province of Quebec, $747,450 ; in Ontario, $700,850 ; in Manitoba, $32,500 ; in Saskatchewan and Alberta, $5,000 ; in British Columbia, $125,500 ; in the Yukon, $7,500 ; in New Brunswick, $335,000; in Nova Scotia, $240,376; in Prince Edward Island, $108,250, making a total of $2,414,410. That expenditure on the improvement of harbours and for dredging will further improve our transportation facilities. We find further that these main estimates now before us provide for an expenditure of $1,883,000 on our canals; for an expenditure of $703,300 for ocean and river improvements; an expediture of $1,619,342 for mail subsidies and steamship subventions, and an expenditure of $1,103,000 for improvements to rivers and harbours, and principally improvements in the St. Lawrence. Then, on the improvement of lighthouses, signal service, icebreakers, aids to navigation, Marconi stations, &c., an expenditure of $2,573,570 is provided for.

It is, therefore, apparent that this government is thoroughly alive to the necessity of carrying out such recommendations of that commission as appeared to them to be of the most pressing urgency. We cannot carry out all of these things at once, it requires time. The improvement of our transportation system is well under way, and that without any thanks to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Canadian Northwest is going ahead by leaps and bounds, and the railway companies are taxed to their utmost capacity to take care of the freight that comes from that country. It is to be deplored that men who are attracted to this country, and who go to the Northwest and toil day and night to raise crops, find at the close of the season that they cannot get cars to ship their grain to market. In order that the progress and development of that country may be maintained, it is important that we should push to completion every railway that will assist in perfecting the transportation system of the country. I have been struck by reading a recent speech of Mr. J. J. Hill, the president of the Great Northern Railway, which appeared in last night's Ottawa 'Journal,' and from which I will read an extract to to show the railway conditions existing today in the United States. Mr. Hill in the course of his address said :

The business of the United States is to-day so congested that from every portion of the country arises clamour for relief. The railroads everywhere are taxed beyond their power.

The people of the United States, therefore, are face to face with the greatest business problem that has ever threatened the nation. During recent years the volume of business has increased, and is increasing with extraordinary rapidity ; while the necessary additional trackage and terminals have not been equal to the demands upon them. The resulting situation is one of freight blockade of enormous proportions, especially at all terminal points.

The judgment of many conservative railroad men in the country is that an immediate addition of not less than five per cent per annum to the railroad trackage of the country for, say five years, should be made to relieve the situation and put an end to unreasonable delays in the transaction of business.

Suppose that only 25 per cent additional tracks with necessary terminals and equipment, making 33 per cent, is to be built during the next five years ; or say, in round numbers 75,000 miles of track as the requirements for the country to meet immediate needs. No practical man would furnish the facilities required, including additional equipment and terminal facilities for less than $75,000 a mile. The question of terminals alone is almost prohibitive. Terminals now in use where acquired when property was cheap and can be enlarged only by heavy outlays.

In many cities it is not even a question of cost, since the area necessary to handle railroad business properly is not to be had at any price. The new work, then, would amount to $5,500,000,000 in round numbers, or yearly an average of $1,100,000,000. That is the sum which should be spent before the commerce of the country can be moved properly.

The problem and necessity are enormous. It is the real railroad problem of the United States ; and it is one which people have been singularly slow to perceive and reluctant to realize.

Two remedies must be found. The prohibitory expenses now attached to enlargement of terminals at many points and the absolute lack of available space at any price, may be met by a decentralization of traffic. There must be more points for export, more interior markets. Terminal troubles admit of more general diffusion of business permitting transfers to take place and forwarding to be done where land can be secured in adequate quantities and at more reasonable prices. To this the traffic systems of the country must be adjusted. The heavy transfers must be made away from the larger cities.

I have drawn the attention of the House to this somewhat lengthy quotation for the purpose of showing the conditions that exist in the United States in reference to the transportation problem. The remarks of Mr. Hill apply with equal, any greater, force to Canada, and more particularly to the Northwest. Therefore I say that one of the most far-sighted and courageous things that has been done towards assisting in the development of this country has been the action of the right hon. the premier

in undertaking the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Everybody now recognizes that the building of that great railway is going to contribute enormously to the growth and development of this country. It is only after the results are realized that some people awaken to the necessity of it, and admire the courage and the foresight of the premier in undertaking that gigantic work. I find in the estimates an amount to be expended towards the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. That also shows that the government are thoroughly abreast of the times and appreciate the importance of our transportation system in every part of Canada. When we compare the record of this government during the past ten years with the record of the go-easy administration that preceded it, we can readily come to the conclusion that we have a progressive government, which is energetically promoting the development of the country whether in minerals, agricultural products, our forests or our fisheries. No matter to what line of enterprise this country may look, we can see an ever-expanding market and an ever-increasing trade. I therefore submit that in carrying out the recommendations of the Transportation Commission this government are taking the part of far-sighted and courageous business men.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is he in favour of the government purchasing the water frontage at Midland and making it a national harbour, as advised by the Transportation Commission, or is he opposed to it?

Mr. HALL. I would like to look into the question first. I do not like to buy or to recommend the purchase of anything until I know the actual facts and the price at which it can be obtained.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to a rather amusing and interesting discussion by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall). He seems to have but one aim in view in connection with this question, that is to make some cheap political capital for himself and his party by decrying the effort made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to develop the great transportation routes of our country in accordance with the judgment of the commission which was appointed to inquire and report to the government what was the best available route. The hon. member for East Simcoe did what any member of this House might very properly do. The government a few years ago appointed an important commission—for what purpose? Seeing the rapid development of the Northwest country and the immense amount of trade that must be carried both east and west in the future, and the urgent necessity of improving the transportation routes of our own country, it was desired to ascertain how this could be done so as to prevent the diversion of our trade to Buffalo and through the Erie canal or other routes to American ports. The government, with that aim, appointed men whom they believed to be equal to the necessities of the situation to make inquiry and to report for the information of parliament what were the best available routes and what should be done to put them into proper condition to handle the trade, and also what Canada generally could do to secure the trade that was, at that time, fast drifting away. The commission took a reasonable time to make inquiries and they submitted the report which I now have under my hand. Amongst the harbours which they mentioned as valuable for Canada's needs and which in their judgment should be improved, two were especially mentioned. The report says :

> The principal ports on Georgian bay for export trade are Depot Harbour and Midland.

Now, the hon. member for East Simcoe directed his attention particularly to the Port of Midland, for the reason, I presume, that he is more familiar with the geographical position of that port and its special advantages than other hon. gentlemen, who do not live in as close proximity to it as he does.

The commission, further says this :

> As an alternative (to the French river route) and one that we feel much inclined to act upon, the establishment of a new route from Midland or some point in that vicinity to Montreal. We think we can get a line there with '04 grades not exceeding 355 miles in length. With a line like that we could handle traffic as cheaply as they handle it through canals. If we were going into Midland with such gradients as that, I should say that we would be able to handle 40,000 bushels of wheat in a train. When we get into sixty car trains, the wear and tear is considerable; 40,000 to 50,000 bushels I consider quite practicable. The New York Central do handle sixty and seventy car trains.

The commission say that the road from Midland, if a little improved, could do the same thing. Therefore they regard Midland as a very important port. They also called attention to the following evidence of Mr. C. M. Hays, whose standing as a railway expert is well known :

> The grain comes directly down by our Midland railway and comes into the Grand Trunk Railway at Belleville, thence to Montreal. Our plans are for the reduction of our grades from Midland to what is our present standard '04 per cent (at present 1 per cent is the maximum) and to double track the line to our main line at Port Hope.

He speaks also as to the grades from Depot Harbour ; but I need not touch upon that as the hon. member from East Simcoe directed his attention particularly to the

Port of Midland. The commission goes on to say :

Your commission further recommends that a competent board of engineers be appointed to lay out the harbours of both Depot Harbour and Midland on a broad, comprehensive plan, such as may reasonably be expected to be sufficient for the wants of the trade of the future. ample accommodation being provided for the present trade in such a manner that it can be readily added to as necessity arises and along the lines of and in accord with such plans.

Now, is the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) doing anything wrong in drawing attention to these recommendations and to the opportunities which Midland offers to Canada to establish a successful through transportation route? As a representative of the people, and a resident of Midland, the hon. member for East Simcoe, with pardonable pride, directs attention to these recommendations of the commission, and, in view of the fact that the government are not carrying out the recommendations of their own commissioners in laying out Midland and Depot Harbour, in the comprehensive way referred to so as to provide for the through traffic, he endeavours to spur them on to earnest effort to make the best use of the advantages which our situation affords us. In doing this he is not speaking to the detriment of other harbours, as the hon. member of West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) suggests. Nor is it any answer to the hon. member for East Simcoe to say that the late government did not spend more than certain sums upon the harbour of Midland. The hon. member for West Peterborough tries to make a point by showing that, under the former government, and while the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was a member for the House, the expenditures on the harbour of Midland were not large. Well, why should there have been large expenses at that time ? The trade has greatly grown within recent years. The report of this Transportation Commission shows that in the year 1900, the crop of the Northwest Territories amounted to 8,000,000 and that of Manitoba, 25,000,000, a total of 33,000,000. And yet the hon. member for West Peterborough finds fault with the hon. member for East Simcoe because fifteen years before that time when there was much less grain to handle, the former government did not begin a very heavy expenditure at the Port of Midland. In 1904, the yield in the Northwest Territories was 35,000,000 bushels and in Manitoba, 87,000,000 bushels, a total of 122,000,000 showing very rapid expansion. The commission go on to show that because of this increase in the grain production in the Northwest it is so important that transportation facilities should be provided. There was a time when such great transportation facilities were not needed, and there is no reason why the hon. member for West Peterborough should condemn the hon. member for East Simcoe because that hon. gentleman's party when in power, fifteen years before this greatest development, did not make as large an expenditure as is now being made in the harbour of Midland. I say the hon. member for East Simcoe did what he had a perfect right to do in calling attention to the advantages of Midland.

But what did he do more than that ? He associated with that what the commissioners recommended. He spoke in favour of the Trent Valley canal. He said exactly what the commissioners report, namely, that undoubtedly that canal should end at Midland. That is what the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) condemns him for. He condemns him for having the temerity to refer to the matter at all. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) recommended the making of that canal at the earliest possible date. Instead of decrying it, he assisted the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) in this matter of developing that most important waterway which passes through the constituency of Peterborough and in which the hon. member for that constituency should be more than any other particularly interested. Therefore it comes with very bad grace from him to criticise and condemn the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for advocating the development of that route, in which the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) ought to be interested above all others. To take the line of tactics which the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) did is very small politics. That hon. gentleman referred again to what the hon. Mr. Ross did with the Temiscaming Railway. But surely that railway has no relevancy to this matter whatever. This is a different thing entirely to which my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was very properly drawing the attention of the House. I was rather amused with another circumstance. While this discussion was going on the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) was absent at the time. Yet that is the minister who, above all other members of the cabinet, should be interested in this question. There were facts and figures presented by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) which were very valuable. They were concisely and clearly presented and well worthy of consideration. Yet the minister who is particularly charged with the building of these canals and harbours was not in the House at all.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The Minister of Railways had to meet a deputation which waited on him and it was that which caused him to be absent a short time.

Mr. SPROULE. I should imagine that if the minister knew this question was coming up, he would have made it convenient to be present. But if the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) is to be the

apologist for the minister and the minister cannot apologize for himself, I have no objection, and I accept his apology.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Thank you very much.

Mr. SPROULE. But it certainly did not seem very respectful to the House, considering the great question at stake, that the minister of the Crown particularly interested should not be here. We have at present practically no Minister of Public Works. We have only one who is temporarily directing that department, and it evidently did not suit him either to be present on this occasion. That certainly is not what we have a right to expect from ministers of the Crown.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will allow me, I was called out unexpectedly by a large delegation from the central part of Ontario to consider their presentation of another phase of this very transportation question. I was absent about fifteen minutes and hurried back. I intended no discourtesy to my hon. friend and shall no doubt be able to find out the tenor of his remarks. In fact I quite understand the line of his argument, and if it was my misfortune not to hear it all, I intend making up for that in some other way.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says he was suddenly called out while the discussion was going on. Would he not think it at least a courtesy that should be given to any member of the House, when discussing an important subject, that the minister particularly interested should be present and hear him through and not go out to meet a deputation, with whom he had made no previous arrangement for an interview ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me another interruption ? This motion is one which has to do with the administration of the Public Works Department. The report is made to the Minister of Public Works and not to the Department of Railways and Canals. So that it is the duty of the Minister of Public Works to deal with that particular question. Assuredly I am endeavouring to study the canal question, and the fact that I was absent for a few minutes was due to the fact that a delegation of the mayor and members of the Board of Trade of Smiths Falls asked to meet me in connection with a phase of the canal question as well as of the railway question. They were anxious to get home and wanted to see me this afternoon, and I could not very well deny them.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear that there was no previous engagement to meet the deputation. It is equally clear that this report refers to railways and canals as well as public works because the improvement of the Trent Valley canal is under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know so much about the question that it seems to me that the few minutes I was absent cannot matter very much.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister knows all about it, that may be an excuse. I think that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is entitled to the thanks of this House for the diligence and the persistency with which he endeavours to get the government to carry out the recommendations of its own commissioners, as embodied in that report which is regarded by all those who have studied it as a most valuable one. And when the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) endeavoured to induce the government to carry it out and gave very valuable data to strengthen the report of the commission, he was entitled to thanks rather than the abuse he received from the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall).

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). I desire to occupy the time of the House but a very short time on this transportation question, which has been very properly brought up by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) as it would be by any other member of the House. I do not think that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sproule) need have gone so far out of his way in trying to demonstrate that some one has unduly criticised the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for having brought up this motion. No one has any idea or intention of the kind, but it was very naively suggested by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) that while the mover of the resolution was very energetic at present, when this government is doing very much in connection with the transportation question, he was very supine when his own friends were in power and did nothing. Why this anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, as contrasted with their former indifference, we know not. This government has certainly been expending very large sums in developing our harbours, wataerways and transportation facilities. Each year it is voting large sums for these purposes. Hon. gentlemen opposite criticise the government for unduly increasing our expenditure, but at the same time they are urging the government to further expenditure in the direction of improving our waterways and transportation facilities. In that latter respect they are quite right, and I hope the government will continue to appropriate large sums for that purpose. No doubt the transportation by rail would very largely serve the wants of the public in the future but it is equally undoubted that transportation by water is a cheaper system than any railway transportation which can be devised.

The government may make Midland harbour and Depot Harbour as satisfactory as they can be made, but notwithstanding that the transportation of the products of the Northwest by water to the sea-board will be a cheaper means of transportation than any system of railway transportation. There is quite a considerable agitation in the country, and the report of the Waterways Commission suggests the construction of the Georgian bay canal, and suggests the expenditure of large sums of money either in building new canals, or enlarging the present canals. I for one am prepared to say that in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the people of this country, it will be judicious, it will be in the best interests of the public, to devise some intelligent means whereby we can utilize to its fullest capacity the canal system which we have at present, before we start into the enormous expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in building new canals or enlarging the present ones. Let us see what we have here. We have a system of canals from Lake Erie to Montreal, the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals. Those canals are capable of accommodating vessels drawing 14 feet of water and as has been very rightly said by the mover of the resolution, with a carrying capacity of 75,000 bushels of wheat each. A vessel of 70,000 bushels capacity can make between Port Colborne and Montreal at least thirty round trips during the season of navigation, beginning on the 15th of April and closing between the first and 15th of December. That would make 2,100,000 bushels of wheat that one boat could carry from Port Colborne to Montreal or Quebec during a season. Everyone knows full well that the capacity of our canals, the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, is sufficient to accommodate one hundred fold more traffic than is being transported through them now.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has my hon. friend ever had any figures to show at what rate per bushel vessels could carry grain from Port Colborne to Montreal, at a profit ?

Mr. GERMAN. From 1½ cent to 2 cents a bushel. At 2 cents a bushel they can make a magnificent profit. It can be done at 1½ cent, and one full sized canal boat can carry from 1,200,000 to 1,500,000 bushels to Montreal from Port Colborne during the season. Our canals have not been used to the hundredth part of their capacity. We can take a fleet of 50 full sized canal boats, carrying products from Port Colborne to Montreal and Quebec. That fleet would carry 1,000,000 bushels of wheat ; then why the necessity of building more canals ? Every bushel of wheat that will be produced in the Northwest for the next fifty years can be transported from the west to the sea-board by the present system of transportation, if that system is properly worked and satisfactorily and sufficiently looked after. I have nothing to say against the railway system, the railway companies will carry all the grain they can possibly get to carry and will carry it as cheaply as they can, consistently with doing a revenue producing business. The one problem that this government must take up in regard to our transportation system is the construction of elevators. Our canal system without elevators is practically useless. The government has started into the building of an elevator at Port Colborne, and I really cannot congratulate them on its mode of procedure in the construction of that elevator. It was, I understand, stated by the Minister of Railways and Canals in this House a few weeks ago that the elevator at Port Colborne would be constructed in time to handle the crop of 1907. If he did say that, then I must beg leave to differ from him most emphatically. I myself do not believe and no one in the locality knowing the circumstances believes that the elevator can or will be constructed in time to handle the crop of 1907 ; they have no more thought of that than they have that the minister can lift himself out of his chair by his boot tops. There is not one pound of material on the ground. The elevator has to be built on piers out in the harbour, and there is not a pound of material that can be put on the ground between now and the opening of navigation excepting some small particles of it which might be hauled across the ice. The material cannot be put on the ground before the opening of navigation in the spring because you cannot reach the site by either team or rail. Navigation opens on the Welland canal on the 15th of April, Then who is there who is bold enough to say that Mr. Peter Lyall, of Montreal, the contractor, a very excellent man I understand, will be capable of placing the material on the ground, constructing an 800,000 bushel elevator, putting the machinery in place, ready to handle the crop of 1907 ? It would have to be completed by October in order to do any business of any value. It is an absolute impossibility and I am saying this because I desire to urge on the minister and the government the necessity of as great speed as can be used in regard to this matter because the elevator system at Port Colborne is a prime necessity if the Welland and St. Lawrence canal system is to be of any use. There should not be only one elevator of 800,000 bushels capacity but there should be elevator storage capacity to the extent of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bushels, the more the better. What makes Buffalo the point of transhipment excepting its elevator facilities ? They have storage facilities in Buffalo for twenty or thirty million bushels of grain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. 40,000,000.

Mr. GERMAN. 40,000,000 bushels of grain possibly. That is what makes Buffalo the point of transhipment. Large upper

lake boats carrying 200,000 to 300,000 bushels of grain can go to Buffalo and be sure of always unloading their cargo at once. If one of those boats should come to Port Colborne, and it could not unload, it could not afford to stay there, there is too much money invested and if they could not unload at Port Colborne, they would go to Buffalo and unload and never come back to Port Colborne. You must have storage facilities at Port Colborne, to store at any rate from 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 bushels and there should be storage capacity for 10,000,000 bushels. Those storehouses can be filled with grain in the fall. A fleet of these boats will bring down on their last trip in the fall of the year 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bushels of wheat and they must have some place to put it. They will act as storehouses themselves; they will keep the wheat stored in the vessels themselves during the winter but there must be greater storage facilities if our canal system is to be any good.

You could get a fleet of boats to run between Port Colborne and Montreal the year round if you had storage facilities there so that they could begin to work in the spring. The crop of the great Northwest cannot be moved in the fall. What is happening now? The Canadian Pacific Railway, with all the energies which they usually display and with all the energy which they can exert in the matter, are quite unable to bring this year's crop from the Northwest to Fort William. I was talking with a Winnipeg man only a few days ago on the train and he said that everything is congested up there. The grain is in the granaries, the farmers cannot dispose of it, they cannot pay their bills, the retail merchants consequently cannot pay their bills and all that creates disturbances in business. The Canadian Pacific Railway cannot move the crop in the fall for transshipment by water. They must continue to move it in winter. They bring it to Fort William in the winter time, place it in the elevators there, of which there should be more, and immediately in the spring ships begin to bring this grain down to Port Colborne, or Midland or Depot Harbour. They have storehouses there, they can unload quickly and return for another load. As far as our canal system is concerned you can have a fleet of boats plying between Port Colborne and Montreal which will tranship every bushel of grain that the Northwest can produce if you have storage elevators at Port Colborne and Montreal. I say that rather than spend millions of money in the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal or in the enlargement of the present canals let the government build storage elevators at Port Colborne and Montreal, at Quebec, if you like, at Midland if you desire and at Depot Harbour if you choose.

Mr. BENNETT. Private capital will build them at Midland and it does.

Mr. GERMAN. I will come to that shortly. I would expect there that it would. Let the government build elevators at these places and then we will have the transportation question solved. Private capital will build elevators at Port Colborne. My hon. friend, in moving this resolution, suggested that no private capital would go to Port Colborne to build elevators. He is quite wrong. Private capital desired to go to Port Colborne. The company was incorporated by Act of this parliament for the very purpose of building elevators at Port Colborne. The Wolvin syndicate desired to build elevators at Port Colborne but the government decided possibly in its wisdom—for myself I think not—I think they might have better allowed private capital to go into that speculation—to build the elevators themselves. I think it would have been wise to have allowed private capital to have built these elevators but the government thought differently. They have undertaken to build these elevators and now that they have put their hand to the plough they must not relinquish the duty which it is incumbent upon them to carry out. They have undertaken the building of these elevators, they must continue it if they intend to make that line a success and it cannot be made a success except by the construction of these elevators. So soon as that is done the transportation question is solved in this country. We have ample facilities at the present time with our railways now and the railways to be built and with our canal system without the expenditure of another dollar by the government except in the way of improvements which have to be made continually. Let us utilize these facilities to the best advantage and when we have exceeded the capacity of our present system of transportation it will be time enough to talk about building new canals and enlarging existing canals.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). Mr. Speaker, in rising to claim the indulgence of the House at this moment it is not my intention to follow the hon. members who have taken their seats by discussing questions of local importance, the nature of which is better known to themselves than to me, nor is it my intention either, Mr. Speaker, to rise in defence of the general policy of the government on the question of transportation. The policy of the government on this question requires no apology on my part because it received the greatest defence in the sanction of the people two years ago when the government was sustained after placing before the country the great scheme of the Transcontinental Railway. Meanwhile I wish to be allowed to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by this debate to present to the House

and the country a few remarks tending more particularly to bring to their attention some of the facilities of the east and the requirements of the maritime provinces in particular. In this extensive country of ours, industrial arteries have to be opened, and commercial channels have to be developed, improved and perfected by the concerted efforts of intelligence and patriotism. We have at our command all the necessary gifts and resources to make a great nation powerful in wealth and industry. In the space of 4,000 miles between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and from the southern boundary of our territory to the southern district of Keetwatin and Hudson bay one can find at any point a sufficient quantity of natural resources for the maintenance of a dense population in comfort and happiness. Although these products may be of different kinds and although they may require different modes of exploitation for the happiness of the population, still, Mr. Speaker, they have all been so well arranged and distributed by the hand of Providence that they form a chain of wealth uniting the Atlantic with the Pacific coasts. I may say that the extensive limits of our country have been, perhaps, to some extent, a drawback to our prosperity. Our people not being able to come easily into contact with each other remaining to a certain extent strangers to each other, unconscious at times of the existence even at a very short distance of the necessary facilities which they possessed. The people of the east have been rather unaware of the immense resources of the west and perhaps at times have assumed a lukewarm attitude in regard to their development, and I am prepared to say to-day that to a great extent the people of the west are not sufficiently acquainted with the immense facilities of the east and that a great many of them seem to be either unaware of or oblivious to the facilities possessed by the maritime provinces. We have yet to improve our domestic relations which can only reach the stage of national brotherhood by greater intercourse in commerce and in extending to one another the special facilities which are at hand. Much has been done, no doubt, and much still remains to be done to bring the great products of the west by the cheapest possible routes to the best markets of the world and also to bring the wheat producers and the grain dealers to the counters of the foreign speculators and purchasers by the speediest possible route that Canada can offer. This question of transportation, as it has often been said, will rule the destinies of Canada. It will rule more particularly the destinies of the maritime provinces. Our progress and prosperity will follow our commercial expansion, and our commercial expansion can only become of national benefit according as it follows the streams of our country from the western producing districts to the Pacific coast for the markets of the orient, already looking for our breadstuff; or from the western producing districts through Canadian streams, to the Atlantic coasts for the markets of Great Britain and Europe. We should be thankful that both on the Atlantic and the Pacific we have the finest harbours in the world. Our destiny lies in our own hands, and if enterprise and energy are shown by our people, the grain producers of the inland prairies have nothing to fear from any competition which may arise elsewhere in the world. Our country has a vast area, and all patriotic Canadians must look forward with anxiety and with hope to the time when our people shall be welded together in amity and brotherly feeling, when the people of the west will appreciate the riches and resources of the east, and when our people in the east may learn and appreciate the fertility of the west. It is the duty of every true Canadian to do within his own sphere that which will tend to the advancement and progress of our country, and if we are but true to ourselves we need have no fear but that Canada will develop as rapidly as the United States has developed. The right hon. the Prime Minister has very truly said that the 20th century is Canada's, but the 20th century will only be Canada's if a brotherly feeling exists among our widely separated people, and if we are embued with those patriotic ideas which actuate the Americans, who are for the United States always; for the United States in the far west as well as the east. The people of the maritime provinces and of eastern Canada have a two-fold mission in the development of our country. It has been our duty to purchase the territory in the west, to develop that territory, to aid in the construction of railways through it, and to provide the money for these purposes. That was our mission in the past, but to-day it is our mission to be on guard against competition from the south which might possibly deprive us of the benefits which are due us for the sacrifices we have made on behalf of the west. Speaking of competition from the south I for one would view with great satisfaction a movement for the construction of a railroad from some point in Manitoba or Saskatchewan to the Hudson bay. Trade goes on regardless of the flag, making its way through easy and open channels, and while we have often appealed to patriotism in this House, I believe that our grandest patriotism at the present moment should find vent in opening up channels for the commerce of our country. I believe that our efforts in that direction will be more appreciated by the generations to come than almost any other thing that we can now think of. The best patriotism is that we should take advantage of the conditions at our disposal and bend our energies to the

development of the resources of our country. Providence has placed on the Atlantic coast great harbours which await the development of the trade of the west. The commodious harbours of the maritime provinces have not been placed there by Providence merely to accommodate the traffic which the surrounding territory could afford. They have been designed from the beginning of creation to await the development of the west, and to accommodate the shipping which will transport to the markets of Europe, the products of the fertile soil of that country. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) can also boast that his splendid county of Gaspé possesses excellent harbours, but I would remind him that Mr. Hays, when speaking before the Committee on Railways and Canals, on the construction of the new Transcontinental Railway, declared that in a few years we would require a dozen ports along the Atlantic to accommodate the traffic that the railway would bring there, and who knows but that in the county of Gaspé there may be one of these ports. But I wish to say to Mr. Hays and the world at large that the maritime provinces possess that dozen of ports, and half a dozen over. I might point out also to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, which he has managed with such great ability, there are many excellent and commodious harbours capable of accommodating a portion of the trade which I believe in time will come to them.

Many of the harbours on the Atlantic coast have not been placed there merely to accommodate the traffic of the maritime provinces, but they are awaiting the development of the west. I may say also, in contradiction to the statement so often made that the route of the Intercolonial Railway was badly chosen, that I hope to convince this House that the fathers of confederation, in selecting the north shore route, had in view the opening of harbours and facilities which had till then remained dormant. These harbours have their resources and their utility as well as the harbours of Halifax, St. John and Sydney, and the day will come when the Minister of Railways and Canals will realize a surplus from the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway which will prove that that portion of the route along the north shore of New Brunswick and through the Metapedia valley was wisely selected, and that the Cartwrights, the Peter Mitchells and the Tuppers who were in favour of that route were right in their conception of the future. Fault has been found that up to a year or two ago the Intercolonial has not been in a position to show a surplus of earnings or to balance the expenditure with the receipts. It was foreseen at the time of confederation that no matter what line might be chosen, whether the Baie des Chaleurs or the interior line, for some years to come the traffic would not be sufficient to meet the expenditure on such a road, and that it would be in the far future that the value of that road would be appreciated by the public. Still, the Intercolonial Railway has its role to play in the development of the country, and in providing facilities for trade between the east and the west, more particularly perhaps in the near future that part of the west of which we have heard so much to-day. In addition to the two great ports of St. John and Halifax, of which we hear almost every day, we have other ports which I may say have no rivals in the world. The people of St. John are certainly right in boasting of the facilities of their port. During the past year the shipments from the port of St. John show a marked increase, which will certainly appeal to the intelligence of every member of this House as well as to the country at large. The St. John 'Sun' of May 15, 1906, reproduces a statement made last year by the Canadian Pacific Railway showing the grain shipments from the port of St. John during the year to have been 4,500,000 bushels greater than those of the year previous, the amount being 5,749,865 bushels against 1,213,170 bushels, an increase which I believe has continued in the same proportion ever since. Besides, I understand that the Intercolonial as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway is now shipping by the St. John elevator. We have proven the ability of St. John, Halifax and other ports in the maritime provinces to ship immense quantities of grain from the west. While we hear so much of the ports of St. John and Halifax, I claim that we have in the maritime provinces many other ports of equal value. I am sure my hon. friend from Guysborough will be pleased if I mention the great port of Country Harbour. I might mention also Gaspé in New Brunswick and Charlottetown, in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. And Herring Cove.

Mr. TURGEON. Yes, and Herring Cove in New Brunswick. I might mention also, perhaps, the port of Petit Rocher, which has been built by this government, who were perhaps unconscious of the great benefit they were giving in that work to the country at large, a port created, one may say, by the hand of this government. When a few years ago application was made for the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher, I was asked by my neighbours what I intended to do there. I said I intended to develop the business of the neighbourhood and to afford facilities for navigation on the Baie des Chaleurs, and I intended to establish brotherly relations between the people of Quebec on one side of the river and the people of New Brunswick on the other side. I might say, what is in the knowledge of the Deputy Speaker of this

House, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), as well as of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), that already a company has been formed for the establishment of a ferry between the shores of Quebec on one side of the bay and the port of Petit Rocher on the other side. I might say also that while I was working for the development of that port for the local benefit, I had also aspirations that it might some day be a shipping port for the Intercolonial Railway, because it is open not only during the summer, but to the 1st of January every year. I think therefore that the time may soon come when the transportation of grain by the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal down will be made to greater advantage by way of Petit Rocher rather than by going around to St. John, thus saving a haul of over 215 miles. I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, with his practical intelligence, will see the force of my remarks. I may say to my colleagues from the north shore of New Brunswick that I think before very long the Minister of Railways and Canals will see the necessity and the advantage of giving an extension of railway less than half a mile to connect with the wharf at Petit Rocher and tranship the grains of the west by Petit Rocher harbour. There are other places along the Bay of Chaleurs which could be utilized by the Intercolonial Railway for summer shipment and late season shipment. I am sure that my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. Jas. Reid) would have no objection to having the traffic of the west shipped from Dalhousie. I am sure that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. W. S. Loggie) would have no objection either to the construction of a grain elevator at Newcastle and the shipping of grain across the ocean by a shorter line than the line to St. John and Halifax. I am sure that the facts I have brought to the attention of the House will be taken seriously into consideration.

One of the chief reasons why I rose in my place to-day was to call attention to the necessity for a rapid mail and passenger service between Canada and the United Kingdom. That is a question which has interested the public mind at all times—perhaps just as much at the time of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway as it does now. If we look at the reports of the chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway of that day—one of the greatest engineers the world has ever produced and who is still, in his old age, in the possession of all the vigour of the mental faculties of his youth—if we look at the report of Sir Sanford Fleming, we will see that he predicted that the Intercolonial Railway was destined to become the medium of the greatest facilities of communication, not only between Liverpool and Canada, but between Europe and America, and I believe that the public mind is to-day as much occupied with this question as it ever was. No doubt suggestions are made on all sides, but to my mind there is one question which perhaps the Canadian people—I do not wish to cast any blame upon any individual or government—have been too indifferent, and that is the rapid service for mails and passengers between America and Europe. And another question on which they have been likewise too indifferent is the entrance of Newfoundland into the confederation. It may be that the people of the maritime provinces are too apprehensive to-day, to a certain extent, regarding the future of those provinces. For my part I have great faith in the possibilities of the maritime provinces as well as in the known facilities of the great west; and I believe that before long our maritime people will recognize their possibilities and that the maritime provinces will be in no way inferior to the great producers of the west. We have at our command resources similar to those they enjoy, but which have not been sufficiently developed. We have the wealth of the sea as well as the resources of the land. We have the wealth of our forests, the riches of our soil and under-soil; and in my opinion the future of the maritime provinces is only now beginning and in the course of a few years the wealth of those provinces and their capabilities and possibilities will be known to such an extent that our children will not have to go west, as has been too much the case since confederation, owing to particular circumstances, but the young men from the west will be glad to come to the east to seek their fortunes. In the meantime we have been too long dormant regarding some of the resources at our command and some of the possibilities which we could have developed to the advantage of the maritime provinces and the general good of the whole country. It has always been a mystery to me why the great colony of Newfoundland is not yet a part of our confederation. At this very moment perhaps it would not be opportune to raise that question, but should the opportunity occur we ought to guard against committing the grave error we did in the past when Newfoundland offered to join this Dominion. I regret that when in 1895, Newfoundland was ready to enter confederation and when all other points of difference had been settled, we should have, for the sake of a paltry half million dollars, put off the entrance of that colony into our Dominion for years to come.

What is half a million dollars to this Canada of ours to-day? And what would not Canada be for Newfoundland, and what would not Newfoundland be for Canada? The maritime provinces, as I have said, have their greatness in the future. The time has not come for them to be known as they are. But I hope the time will soon come when the facilities for intercontinental communication which we possess, together with our vast resources—resources

not only of the land, but of the sea—will be known to the world at large. Those resources would be greatly added to by the addition to the Dominion of such a great territory as that possessed by Newfoundland. Should she offer to come into confederation and give up her lands and minerals to-day, it would pay this country to give not merely $150,000 a year, which Newfoundland offered to accept at the time of the confederation of the original provinces, but to pay double, treble, or quadruple that amount. And again, should Newfoundland wish to come in and keep control of her wild lands and minerals as the other old provinces did, then we should be ready to offer in return the most generous measures, and openly, and manly, admit and declare our deep appreciation of the usefulness of her fishing and maritime resources and strategic interests to Canada, interests which can be more usefully developed with the co-operation of Canada than by the colony alone. But, in the meantime, it is not necessary, I admit, to speak of the entrance into confederation of Newfoundland. Nor is it what I aim at to-day. I think the time has come, however, when we should show more anxiety to enter into commercial relations with Newfoundland. And, if there is one thing more than another likely to bring a small country into union with a larger one it is the establishment of commercial relations between the two. There was a Canadian who went to the United States and took a prominent place in the commercial life of that great country. At the height of his career an agitation arose for the annexation of Canada to the United States. And what was the advice of this gentleman? The advice given by Erastus Wiman to the people of the United States was that if they wished to secure the annexation to their country of Canada their first step should be to improve the commercial relations between the two countries. We ought to be more diligent in establishing closer trade relations between Canada and Newfoundland, and, if closer organic relations should follow it would be to the benefit of this Dominion as well as to the benefit of the island colony.

The question of the fast Atlantic service is agitating the minds of the leaders of some of our greatest transportation corporations. Some urge the improvement of the service between Halifax and Liverpool or other ports of Great Britain. Others set forth the claims of St. John as the Canadian port for a line to Great Britain. While every one of these schemes necessarily commands a certain amount of attention, and while I believe that those who favour them are actuated by considerations of patriotism as well of commercial advantage, I contend that if we want to have the trans-Atlantic service that will be of the greatest benefit to Canada we must have a route that will command the attention of the world. We must not have for our object merely the reduction of the time in crossing the ocean by a few hours or the securing to the passengers of some additional comfort. I claim that, in order to use wisely the advantages which are placed at our command by the hand of Providence, we must take into consideration the due relation that exists between the maritime provinces and Newfoundland. This is the only scheme that is worthy the attention of Canada as a whole. Even if you cut down by a few hours the time occupied in crossing the ocean, whether you start from Halifax or any other of our ports, you only spur the American navigation companies to greater efforts, and, by making these efforts, by improving the construction of their vessels, they can also cut a few hours off the time of the trans-Atlantic trip. They can also improve their vessels with a view to the comfort of travellers. But if you make the connection between Canada and Newfoundland, you shorten the time, not merely by the few hours in which your competitors can meet you, but thirty-six hours, and so out-distance them completely, commanding the attention not merely of the people of Canada, but of the people of the United States, and not merely of the people of Great Britain, but of the people of all continental Europe as well. All the world will know that you have saved time—and time is money for the people of our own west as well as for the people of the United States.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 17, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. BERGERON. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no notice of this given.

Mr. GERVAIS. With the permission of the House I am ready to give the explanation asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection is taken that there is no notice, it will have to stand as a notice of motion.

SUPREME COURT ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. GERVAIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 70) to amend the Supreme Court Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. The object of the Bill is to amend the law relating to appeals to the Supreme Court from the courts of the province of Quebec. There is an anomaly now existing in the revised statutes of Canada in relation to appeals to the Supreme Court from the province of Quebec and the Bill if passed will remove that anomaly. Section 37, chapter 139 of the revised statutes of Canada defines the right of appeal from the court of Kings Bench, Quebec, which is the highest court in that province, and that section reads :

> In the province of Quebec, if the matter in controversy involved the question of or relates to any fee of office, duty, rent, revenue, sum of money payable to His Majesty, or to any title of lands or tenements, annual rents and other matters or things where rights in future mgiht be bound ; or amounts to or exceeds the sum or value of two thousand dollars.

When the right of appeal is dependent upon the matter in controversy there is not much trouble with regard to that ; whether the appeal is from the judgment of the Superior Court, in review, which is an inferior court to the court of King's Bench in the province of Quebec or from the latter court itself. On the other hand, the difficulty comes in, when the right of appeal is dependent upon the amount involved, whether the appeal to the Supreme Court is from the court of King's Bench or from the Superior Court sitting in review. In 1891 an amendment to the Supreme Court Act was passed by parliament, and this enactment is now embodied in section 40 of the Supreme Court Act, which, with the permission of the House, I will quote:

> , In the province of Quebec an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from any judgment of the Superior Court in review where that court confirms the judgment of the court of first instance, and its judgment is not appealable to the Court of King's Bench, but is appealable to His Majesty in Council.

That section looks very simple at first sight, but when we study it a little we find that one of the conditions of appeal to the Privy Council of England is that when the appeal is dependent upon the amount involved such amount must be five hundred pounds sterling. In virtue of an old ordinance issued by Governor Murray on the 17th of September, 1763, for the establishment of civil courts to replace the military councils, the amount which was permitted to be made the subject of an appeal to the Privy Council from the court of appeal of the province of Quebec was £500 sterling, which, according to a statute passed in 1849, 12 Vict., chap. 38, section 91, was equal to the sum of $2,433.33. What is the result of all this ? If I appeal to the Supreme Court from a judgment of the Superior Court sitting in review in the province of Quebec, the amount involved must be $2,433.33 ; while if I bring an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from the Court of King's Bench, the amount may not exceed $2,000. As every lawyer knows, the higher the court of appeal is the greater the amount involved must be ; that is the rule accepted by all jurists and legal writers ; but in this case we find that a higher amount must be involved in an appeal from a lower court than in an appeal from a higher court. The object of the Bill is to do away with such an anomaly.

I may say that I am introducing this Bill at the special request of many legal gentlemen of Montreal. As a matter of fact, since 1891, a considerable number of appeals to the Supreme Court from the Superior Court of the province of Quebec sitting in review have been dismissed for want of jurisdiction on account of the insufficiency of the amount involved, when, nevertheless such amount exceeded $2,000. It may be said that lawyers ought to know what should be the amount in any case ; but I answer that it is not the intention of this parliament to maintain anomalies of this kind which sometimes puzzle legal men to the great prejudice of litigants. I think it will be in accordance with the general principles of procedure to pass the Bill and make the amount to be involved uniform ; that is to say, $2,000, whether the appeal is from the Court of Review or from the Court of King's Bench of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

CANADA-UNITED STATES BOUNDARY SURVEYS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Has the Geological Survey Department made any surveys along the boundary line between Canada and the United States during the past two years ? If so, what is the nature and extent of said surveys, how many men were employed, what are their names and salaries ?

2. How much money was voted for this purpose, and how much used ?

3. How many men from the Geological Survey Department were engaged during the past eighteen months on or near the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and what are their names and salaries in each case ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes, a geological examination of the Niagara river and falls, with investigations incident to the volume of water passing over the falls, together with its change and variations of volume. No other special geological examinations were made along the international boundaries during this period, although in a few cases geological work has incidentally touched the international boundary, as in the case of Mr. Camsell in the Similkameen valley of British Columbia, and

Mr. LeRoy along the Pacific coast. J. W. Spencer, in charge, wages, $3,083.33. Men employed by Dr. Spencer :—

	Wages.
Robert Harvie, assistant	$ 90 00
Claude E. Eldridge, assistant	223 75
James Humphries, boatman	15 00
Alex. Ledger, boatman	30 00
J. Scott, shoreman	38 00
Henry Butler, shoreman	15 00
Jas. McCabe, shoreman	10 00
C. C. Butler, driller	125 00
Jacob Snider, driller	55 00
E. L. Swenzie, draughting	5 00
J. D. Cleary, draughting	31 00
E. D. Liscom, typewriter	242 00
Labourers, taking soundings	31 25
Chas. Camsell, salary	1,350 00
J. A. Allan, assistant	180 00
E. F. Robinson, packer	226 00
J. F. Campbell, packer	351 00
O. E. LeRoy, in charge, salary	1,500 00
H. F. LeRoy, assistant	92 00
M. Hickleton, boat engineer	96 00
R. Mathinson, deck and boat hand	42 00

In this connection I may state that on the 14th instant, Mr. Low received from Dr. Spencer, a report which is as yet incomplete, but the remainder is expected from Dr. Spencer in a few days, when it will be immediately placed in the hands of the King's Printer.

2. No special vote for this purpose.

Total expenditure :—

J. W. Spencer, salary and expenses	$6,170 60
Chas. Camsell, salary and expenses	2,384 08
O. E. LeRoy, salary and expenses	2,102 72
Total	$10,657 40

3. Six.

Names.	Salaries.
W. W. Leach, British Columbia	$1,800
John Macoun, Saskatchewan and Alberta	2,550
Robt. Chalmers, Saskatchewan and Alberta	2,000
W. H. Collins, Ontario	1,200
J. W. Wilson, Quebec	1,500
R. A. A. Johnson, New Brunswick	1,700

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—TAXATION.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is the right of way or other property of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway exempt from taaxtion in the province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta ?

2. If not, is the government aware that the company has claimed to be exempt, and refused to pay taxes to the municipalities through which it passes ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The government have never understood that the property of the Grand Trunk Railway was exempt from taxation in any of the provinces named, and the government have no information with respect to any claim made by or on behalf of the railway company for exemption.

THE DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ending June 30, 1906, by the Department of Inland Revenue?

2. How much of this was due to the additional duty imposed by the legislation of 1897?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. $5,970,573.74.

2. $1,832,235.85.

CHEESE ARBITRATIONS.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT asked:

Does the Department of Agriculture purpose to re-establish for the opening of the coming season, the position, at Montreal, of official arbitrator between the sellers and buyers of cheese, as certain farmers request?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Further information must be obtained before a decision is reached.

ST. CHARLES POST OFFICE.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT asked :

1. Has the Post Office Department verified the fact that, on the occasion of the almost general fire which devastated St. Charles, on the Richelieu river in October last the person in charge of the post office of that locality had rescued the postal matter which represented a considerable value and had in order to do so neglected to save his own movable and other personal property ?

2. If not, does the department intend to verify these facts ?

3. If so, does it purpose indemnifying him ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The department is aware of the fact that the St. Charles post office was destroyed by fire in October last, and that the postmistress succeeded in saving the post office property which was thereby endangered; also that the postmistress claims that her personal loss through the fire was in the neighbourhood of $6,000, with insurance amounting to $3,000.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The department has no funds at its command which would enable it to compensate the postmistress for a loss of this character.

BOUNTY ON BINDER TWINE.

Mr. COCKSHUTT asked:

1. What quantity of binder twine has received the drawback of three-eighths of a cent per pound from its inception to 1906 ?

2. How many factories have obtained such bonus ?

3. How much did each factory receive each year ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no drawback on binder twine manufactured in this country, but there is a bounty equivalent to the export duty on manilla from the Philippine islands. The Act provides that the bounty shall not exceed three-eighths of a cent.

1. Bounty at a rate of a trifle less than three-eighths of a cent per pound has been paid on 15,943,753 pounds of manilla fibre used in the manufacture of 34,599,764 pounds of binder twine.

2. Eleven.

	Bounty Paid.		
	1903-4.	1904-5.	1905-6.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Canadian Cordage Mfg. Co., Peterborough	3,873 26	1,448 84	3,017 62
Brantford Cordage Co., Ltd., Brantford	4,870 59	1,557 19	2,613 32
M. J. Wilson Cordage Co., Chatham, Ont.	754 82	71 71	.....
Independent Cordage Co., Toronto	1,287 81	470 99	134 18
Colonial Cordage Co., Toronto	.....	.....	164 40
Consumers Cordage Co., Montreal and Dartmouth	8,276 93	4,935 73	6,427 47
Brandon Binder Twine Co., Ltd., Brandon	1,760 32	.....	.....
Walkerton Binder Twine Co., Ltd., Walkerton	1,927 66	.....	.....
Kingston Penitentiary Binder Twine Factory, Kingston	2,700 65	1,116 45	1,238 00
Ayton Cordage Co., Ayton, Ont.	.....	186 81	.....
Farmers' Binder Twine Co., Ltd., Brantford	.....	4,001 55	1,484 41

DREDGING AT PICTOU, N.S.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. How many days did the dredge 'W. S. Fielding' work at Pictou, Nova Scotia, in 1906?
2. When did the dredge commence to work, and what was the last day she worked?
3. What was the nature of the work performed?
4. Who had the contract for tug service in connection with said dredge at Pictou?
5. What were the terms of the contract for said tug service?
6. How many tugs were employed?
7. How much was paid for tug service at Pictou up to December 31, 1906?
8. What was the total expenditure at Pictou for dredge and tug service in 1906?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). The information not yet received.

THE KINGSTON, JAMAICA, EARTHQUAKE.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I wish to draw the attention of the government to the disaster which has taken place at Kingston, Jamaica.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under rule 37 the hon. gentleman has to give notice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This subject is engaging our attention at this moment, and we may have something to communicate to the House later on.

THE REVISED STATUTES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Has there been any distribution of the revised statutes other than the copy which has been laid on the table and the copy which was to have been supplied for the Supreme Court?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). A copy was laid on the table and one also sent to the library, as requested by the leader of the opposition. There has been no other distribution that I am aware of.

Mr. FOSTER. When is the distribution to take place?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I assume it will take place as soon as the statutes come into force and the volumes are completed with binding and an index. The copies laid on the table and sent to the library are without index and schedules and are simply the work as it left the revisers. In other words, they are the advance sheets.

REPRESENTATION OF SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 51) for the representation in the House of Commons for the provinces of Sakatchewan and Alberta. He said: This Bill does not require any more explanation than what I gave in introducing it. It was introduced in blank with the intention that the definitions of the constituencies which are to be represented in this House shall be left to a special committee to be appointed by the House. If the second reading carries, I intend to move that it be referred to a special committee of five members consisting of Messrs. Turiff, McCraney, McIntyre (Strathcona) Lake and

McCarthy (Calgary). Had the leader of the opposition been in his seat, I would have shown him this draft of the motion I propose making, but I suppose it is satisfactory.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the said Bill be referred to a special committee to be composed of Messrs. Turriff, McCraney, McIntyre (Strathcona), Lake and McCarthy (Calgary).

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF CANNED FOOD PRODUCTS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 33) to provide for the further supervision and inspection of canned food products, meats and fish.—Mr. Fisher.

Sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 allowed to stand.

On section 10,

Any person slaughtering animals and selling, or offering for sale or transportation, for export a carcase, or any portion or product thereof, which he knows to be unhealthy or unfit for food is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment.

2. Every one who is convicted of this offence after a previous conviction for the same crime shall be liable to two years' imprisonment.

Mr. STOCKTON. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) whether in his opinion, it would not be well to provide for a fine as well as for imprisonment?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I consider the offence referred to in this section a very serious one indeed, and one that ought to be dealt with in a most drastic manner. It is not an offence that can be committed by negligence or by ignorance; the act must be done designedly and with the intention of passing off on the public an unfit article of food. Our experience has rather been that fines, in the case of large concerns especially, are very ineffective in reforming abuses. Still, I would view with a great deal of respect the opinion of lawyers on this point. If hon. members who are of the legal fraternity consider this too heavy a penalty, I should be prepared to consider very seriously the idea of changing it. I respect my hon. friend's (Mr. Stockton's) judgment in a matter of this kind. I only wish to explain my reason for believing that a very heavy penalty should be imposed. But, if the House think that the penalty here proposed is too heavy, that would greatly influence my opinion.

Mr. STOCKTON. If a very severe penalty be imposed, with no alternative, it is possible that every means will be taken to avoid conviction. I quite agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that where a person commits this offence knowingly, and the fact is clearly brought home, probably the punishment here proposed is not too severe.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister tell us what is the law at present with regard to a matter of this kind? Is there not a clause in the Criminal Code providing for the punishment of a person who wilfully disposes of meat of a diseased animal?

Mr. FISHER. I think any law of that kind would form part of the provincial laws in relation to public health. I have not in mind the penalties provided in those laws. However, I will look them up before this section is carried, and be able to give my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) the information.

Mr. PORTER. As I read the clause, it is confined to the person who actually slaughters the animal. Should it not be broad enough to cover the employer or person who causes the animal to be slaughtered? I would suggest that the section should be so worded as to cover the employer and make him responsible. In that case it should be provided that the offender should 'wilfully' as well as 'knowingly' commit the act.

Mr. FISHER. My intention was to cover the employer as well as the employee. And I think the clause is so drafted as to have that effect. But that also is a matter for the lawyers to decide. This Bill was drawn by the law clerk of the House, so far as the details are concerned. I shall have to leave it to the lawyers whether it is worth while to insert the word 'wilfully' or not. The clause says, 'which he knows to be unhealthy' which seems to me to cover the point. I do not see the necessity for saying 'wilfully' also.

Mr. PORTER. What occurs to me is the difficulty of proving or fixing the knowledge upon the person. The person employed, who actually slaughters the animal, has no interest—outside the general interest of his employer—but the earning of his wages. He slaughters what comes before him. And to make him responsible where the principal should be responsible seems to me to be erroneous. In answer to what the minister (Mr. Fisher) has said, it appears to me that the principal would not be responsible under the wording of the Bill for the act of his agent. It being a criminal act and covered by the criminal law, as is intended in this case, it would be necessary to insert in the clause a provision exactly covering the position of the employer. For that reason, I suggest that the word 'wilfully' should be inserted as well as 'knowingly.' Then, if the employer wilfully allows it to be done, or does not take the proper means to ascertain the condition of the carcase at the time, he would be responsible.

Mr. STOCKTON. I would remind the minister that the section of the Criminal Code relating to impure food is section 194, and is as follows:

Eery one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who knowingly and wilfully exposes for sale, or has in his possession with intent to sell for human food, articles which he knows to be unfit for human food.

Then every one who is convicted of this offence after a previous conviction for the same crime, is liable to two years' imprisonment. So the minister will notice that the phraseology mentioned by my hon. friend is in the Criminal Code.

Mr. FISHER. I will have the matter looked up by the law officers. I have understood that the word 'wilful' in such sections very largely nullifies the effectiveness of the section, because it is frequently impossible to prove will on the part of the person doing the thing. I would not like that to be the case. The intention was to make it clear that the principal should be the responsible party rather than the employee who did the work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the minister whether he has taken into consideration the debate on this section 10 with reference to the local trade, and if he proposes to make any amendments with reference thereto ?

Mr. FISHER. That is a question involving the whole principle of the Bill. I have considered very carefully the suggestion that was made that this Bill should apply to the home trade, or the local trade. In the first place, I was asked by the leader of the opposition, when introducing the resolution, whether I had received an opinion from the Department of Justice. I had a verbal opinion at that time, I have now a written one, which I will lay before the House. But before dealing with that side of the subject, I would like to say a word with regard to what I may call the policy of adapting this Bill to the local or provincial trade. In the first place, it seems to me that the provincial authorities having power, as the Minister of Justice says they have, to deal with these matters within their province, largely if not entirely relieves this parliament of the necessity of passing an Act for such local trade. In the second place, it seems to me that to carry out the provisions of this Act, which I do not consider by any means are too minute or too drastic---in fact, I think they must be as minute and drastic as the Bill provides to accomplish the object aimed at---to carry out those provisions for a purely local trade such as butcheries and slaughter-houses in small country places within a province, or meat shops situated in towns or villages where the trade is altogether local, would practically make the Bill unworkable. The Bill as it is drafted is not going to be an easy one to administer. If we undertook to apply the provisions of this Act to the local trade in all parts of this Dominion, it would mean one of two things: either that we would have to expend an enormous sum of money and have an army of inspectors, the management and supervision of whom would be almost impossible, or on the other hand, it would mean that we should have to seriously modify all the provisions of the Act. I think if we did that we would fail to secure the confidence of foreign markets for our Canadian export trade, which is the chief object aimed at. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that it would be extremely inadvisable to undertake to apply the provisions of this Act to the local trade. If we apply them as the Bill now is drafted to interprovincial and export trade, it is as far as we can go. I will now read the opinion of the Minister of Justice, which was in reply to a letter of mine reporting the question of the leader of the opposition, and referring to conversations we have had before.

Re Meat and Canned Foods Act.

In reply to your letter of the 8th instant, in which you state that in the discussion on the resoluion with respect to this measure, you were asked by Mr. Borden whether there was any question of the constitutional right to deal with butcheries and meat shops and their trade entirely within one province, and that he asked you if you had the opinion of the Minister of Justice on this point, and in which you ask me to give such an opinion, I beg to state that in my opinion your Bill is properly limited to food intended for export either out of Canada or from one province to another. It is very doubtful in my opinion whether it could go farther and deal with strictly domestic trade within a province, without trenching on the exclusive legislative authority of the legislatures. I am not prepared to say that under any circumstances such legislation would be unconstitutional. There might arise possibly a condition of affairs which would make it proper for parliament to enact general regulations applying to the whole of Canada or to more than one province with respect to such establishments as you mention, but there is not, so far as I know, any existing condition which would do so.

I remain yours faithfully,
A. B. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then do I understand that this would follow ? For instance, the Davies Company have fifty odd stores, and although they do not export a very large amount at present, they send out goods to these fifty odd stores, meats of all kinds that are being killed and that will not be inspected. With reference to the small amounts going out for export, they will be thoroughly investigated, and the sound animals free from disease will be killed and exported, but those with any taint of disease may be distributed throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr. FISHER. No, my hon. friend is entirely wrong in that supposition, and no words I have uttered justify any such interpretation of this Bill. I say again that in any establishment where any trade is

carried on, either for export abroad or to another province, everything that enters into that establishment shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, whether it is afterwards sold within the province or without the province, and that every part of that establishment without any exception shall be subject to the provisions of this Act. Under these circumstances there can be no possible danger that articles which have been condemned so far as the export or interprovincial trade may be concerned, can be foisted on to the local trade.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It seems to me from the wording of this Act that the inspection is required to be made in the establishment in which the meat is slaughtered. Now, I think that would be almost impossible. Take the county in which I reside, there may be thirty or forty establishments in which meat is slaughtered and exported, say, to Newfoundland. If that meat is slaughtered in cold weather, or if it is inspected before it leaves the establishment, these men who are in that business might as well give it up altogether. Taking the whole Act and reading it altogether I think the meaning is that the inspection must be made in the establishment. I would gather that from section 11, from the inspection of the sanitary condition of the establishment, section 12, section 13, and section 14. I think that is a mistake. I think it should permit the slaughtering of animals and that the inspection should be made at the point from which the meat is shipped.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) has indicated a state of affairs with which perhaps I am not quite familiar. I would point to section 5 which may perhaps meet the difficulty that the hon. gentleman has alluded to.

> Unless the minister otherwise directs, animals owned by farmers and slaughtered by them on their premises, and animals slaughtered by retail butchers on their own premises, shall not be subject to inspection under the provisions of this Act.

These words would indicate that under certain circumstances and conditions, when the trade is found to require it, the minister may direct that such local butcheries shall be subject to the provisions of the Act, but the intention is that they shall not be but that they shall be subject to the provincial health laws only. In regard to the export of meat from such butcheries coming under the description which my hon. friend gives, subsection 3 of section 14 would or might apply. Subsection 3 says:

> Notwithstanding anything in this section, the minister may, whenever in his opinion it is necessary or advisable to do so, authorize the export of any such articles without inspection.

At the same time if the trade assumes the proportions or is of such a character as to require inspection, then inspection should be carried out. The difficulties of the inspection would have to be got over whenever it was thought necessary to carry out the inspection. I do not think it would be possible to inspect meat satisfactorily and attach to that meat a certificate in the shape of the tag or stamp of the department saying that it is sound and healthy unless the animals had been inspected and the processes had been inspected all through the course of preparation.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The distinction that the minister makes is simply with reference to animals slaughtered by farmers These are retail dealers, but there are many men in Canada who buy animals, slaughter them upon their own premises and export them, for instance, to Newfoundland and other countries. These animals are all slaughtered and sent by the carcase while they are frozen. If it would be necessary to obtain an inspection of these animals great loss might be caused because a thaw might come and the carcases would deteriorate in value. The minister refers me to subsection 3 of section 14:

> Notwithstanding anything in this section, the minister may, whenever in his opinion it is necessary or advisable to do so, authorize the export of any such articles without inspection.

Do you think it would be possible, Mr. Chairman, to send to Ottawa for the authority of the minister in such an emergency as that to which I have referred? These meats are shipped fresh. There would be as much red tape about it as there is about the war office in London, and before the authority would come from Ottawa for the shipment of this meat great loss would ensue. I think the minister should look more carefully into the conditions in the different parts of Canada and see that no injustice is done to the people who are now engaged in this business.

Mr. FISHER. I perhaps do not quite understand the situation from the description of the hon. gentleman. There is a clause which provides for the making of regulations under which the Act shall be enforced, and in these regulations provision would be made as far as possible, consistent with the spirit of the Act, not to interfere any more than is necessary with the trade. Perhaps I do not quite understand the situation yet that my hon. friend describes. Do I understand him to say that there are large establishments or butcher shops in Prince Edward Island where the slaughtering of animals is carried on for export, from where this meat is sent in sides or carcases probably to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and that these establishments are very numerous? I have not looked up the statistics of the trade at all, but I would inquire of the hon. gentleman and others who know the situation better than I do how numerous such establishments are. Subject to correction by these hon. gentlemen the impres-

sion I would have is that in a wholesale way there could not be a very great number. There might be a number of retail ones such as would come under section 5 or which can be provided for under subsection 3 of section 14 by regulations under which this Act must be enforced and administered. But, as I say, I am speaking subject to correction by hon. gentlemen who know the situation of Prince Edward Island better than I do.

Mr. PORTER. May I direct the attention of the hon. minister to another feature of the Bill which has been brought to my notice by some of the canners operating in the riding which I have the honour to represent? It is this: By the terms of the Bill, as far as I have been able to observe, no provision is made for an appeal from the decision of the inspector. The power of the inspector is absolute and it has been pointed out to me—and it is possible, although I admit at present not probable—that some of the inspectors might be actuated by a spirit of malice against a particular factory or some other improper consideration might be present and a whole batch of vegetables might be condemned. That means, if that is so, and there is no appeal from that decision, that a very heavy loss would be entailed upon the manufacturer. It apears to those who have written me in regard to the matter—and it appeals to myself as being quite reasonable—that some provision should be made whereby, if, in the opinion of the packer or producer, the judgment of the inspector is not as it should be given, under the circumstances existing, some appeal from that decision should be allowed in order that the rights of the packer might be fully protected under circumstances such as I suggest.

Mr. FISHER. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) that I have just sent for the statutes to see whether there is any such provision as that in the General Inspection Act. I would say in the first place that there would always be an appeal to the department from the judgment of the inspector alone. The department certainly could not be accused of any bias or unfairness or anything such as my hon. friend has intimated that the individual inspector might be accused of.

Mr. PORTER. That appeal to the minister would be only as a matter of grace. It is not provided for.

Mr. FISHER. That, of course, might be provided for in the Act. I appreciate that fact, but I think it has always been understood. I know that in the administration of my own department it has always been thoroughly understood and acted upon that when any dissatisfaction with the judgment of an inspector has been expressed to the chief of the branch or to the minister it has always been carefully investigated and dealt with. I think that is the general practice in the administration of all the departments, and therefore the possibility of an individual inspector being actuated by personal feeling is overcome. Cases might arise where considerable amounts would be involved and where perhaps a decision might be open to a legal trial, but to have that generally accorded would interfere very materially with the effective administration of the Act. I will be glad to look into the suggestion of my hon. friend, and if it is found desirable I shall add a clause to that effect.

Mr. LALOR. Is it the intention of the government to have an inspector at every canning factory in the Dominion of Canada to inspect the goods while they are being put up, or, are the goods to be inspected at the port of export? In my opinion the inspection can only be properly done if we have an inspector at every canning factory in the Dominion, and that being so this Bill will entail enormous cost on the country. I may tell the minister that there are canning factories which put up goods which they have no intention of exporting but which they may afterwards ship on export order. Does the minister see that difficulty? Are these goods for export to have a government inspection stamp upon them, and is the stamp to be upon each can or upon each case.

Mr. FISHER. There are two classes of inspection under the Bill, one the inspection of meat carcases and canned meats, and the other the inspection of vegetables, fruit, and fish. The slaughter of animals and the preparation of meats will be under the actual supervision of an officer of the department, and these meat products will be marked as inspected and passed so that no canned meat package will be allowed to be sold without having that mark upon it. There is no intention that the inspection of vegetables, fruit, and fish, shall be complete, nor will these goods be marked as having been inspected, but the factories are liable at any time to have a visit from the inspector. There are between twenty and twenty-five meat packing establishments in Canada doing an export trade, and it will be necessary to have an inspector in these factories all the time they are working.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture is pressing this Bill with the very best intentions, but I fear he is placing restrictions which are too onerous upon the meat canning industry. If there be, as he says, only thirty packing establishments in Canada, then I can tell him that there are ten or twelve in Prince Edward Island alone so that we would have one-third of the entire number besides about 100 or more fish canneries. However, I think the minister is mistaken in his estimate. These goods exported from Prince Edward Island hold the highest position in

the markets of the world, and so far as they are concerned they do not want a Bill like this. Under section 5 of the Bill the minister has taken upon himself special authority to discriminate between factories, and however much we may respect his judgment this parliament should not place it in a minister's power to say that one establishment should have one privilege and that another establishment shall not have that privilege. I notice that the present government are very fond of introducing Bills which place very great power in the hands of the ministers, and I think parliament should call a halt in this matter. If certain butchers in the retail trade are to have certain privileges, then let all have the same privileges and do not leave it to the minister to say which shall have privilege, and which shall not. If you are to have a man in each factory in Canada to supervise the slaughter of animals you will have a whole army of officials at enormous cost and the chances are that things will not be any better than they are now. In the case of the lobster canning establishments in my province, the buyers from Great Britain and France go to the factories, see how they are conducted, and they buy or do not buy as they please, which is a far better guarantee than any which can be given under the provisions of a Bill like this. There has been no public demand for this Bill, parliament has not been petitioned for it, and I do not think it is worth the cost it will entail.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall submit a proposition to the Minister of Agriculture, and I shall ask him to tell the House and the country how it should be dealt with. When this Bill is passed the minister will appoint an inspector to a certain meat factory—let us say Davies & Company, who are large packers of meat products—the inspector comes to Mr. Davies and wants to inspect animals before they are killed and Mr. Davies says : I am not going to do any export business, I am going to sell the product of my factory exclusively to the trade of Ontario. The inspector of course has to walk out and the Davies firm go on manufacturing their goods as heretofore, selling them to the trade of Ontario.

My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) is a large dealer in, and exporter of cheese and butter. One of his customers in the old country tells him that he wants him to send over a case of bacon. He goes to the firm of Gilmour & Co., of Brockville, who are wholesale dealers, and buys a case of bacon made somewhere in Ontario, and therefore known to be sound and wholesome. During a visit to the United States to purchase cheese, which he sometimes does, to have it shipped to Canada in bond, he buys a case of American bacon, and has it sent to Brockville in bond. He makes the whole shipment to his customer in England—butter, cheese, the case of Ontario bacon and the case of American bacon. How is that shipment going to be dealt with? Is he going to be prevented from shipping the case of Canadian bacon because by section 14 of the Bill you provide that he cannot export from Canada any bacon, even if it is only a case, unless it is branded as having been inspected under the terms of this Act? I want the minister to explain if that is the purpose of his Bill. We have many factories in Ontario making bacon which is not exported at all. Is a man who buys any of this bacon to be prevented from sending it out of the country unless it is inspected? Is that the way the Bill will work out?

Mr. FISHER. If I rightly gather my hon. friend's statement, the case of Canadian bacon will be stopped. The American bacon must have the mark of the American inspection before it leaves the United States to come to Canada in bond, and the rules of the American inspection are practically the same as these, the only difference being that the form of the congressional legislation is somewhat different from ours. I may add that if the congressional legislation were any more drastic than ours, the purchaser in the English market would prefer the American bacon instead of as now preferring the Canadian bacon.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I would like to point out that clause 14 provides not merely for the stamp or mark of the inspection, but a certificate from the inspector, which is a more onerous requirement from the shipper.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend's interpretation of section 14 is correct. The clearance will not be given unless there is a certificate of the inspection accompanying the cargo. That is already the case in reference to the shipment of live animals from the country, and we propose to apply it to dead meats.

Mr. ALCORN. Referring to the remarks of the minister with regard to the marking of the can, I would like some information as to the time when the marking is to be done, which appears to me to be quite material. The meats are put up in cans, and are afterwards labelled, the cans being placed in a storehouse preparatory to the labelling. At what time would the marking of the cans be done? I have heard of such an instance as this. A large quantity of these goods, before the wrappers are put on, are stored in a storehouse, and, by some fault in the cooking or preparation, they sweat. The consequence is that the iron in the tin rusts and probably the whole lot have to be condemned. Is the marking to be done before they go into the storehouse, or is it to be left until they are placed on the market or are just about to be shipped out? I have known of an instance in which a very large quantity of canned goods was stored in the winter time in a storehouse which

was not weather-proof, and owing to some snow getting into the building, they were totally destroyed by the rusting of the tin. If previously marked they could be placed on the market, but would be unfit for use.

Mr. FISHER. The period of the marking, I think, will be largely a question of convenience. But I call my hon. friend's attention to section 8, which provides that the inspector may at any time re-inspect if he has reason to believe that the meats have deteriorated or that his first inspection has not been complete. It seems to me that this covers the point, although, as a matter of practical working, I think the goods would not likely be inspected until they were pretty nearly ready for shipment.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask the minister if it is his intention that the inspectors to be appointed under this Act shall possess any specific qualifications—whether they will be required to qualify by passing an examination, or whether they will be appointed, as is sometimes done, from worn-out politicians or others who may perhaps be politically fit, but otherwise unfit for the position?

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will look at section 17, he will find that 'no person shall be appointed as a veterinary inspector until he has passed such examination as is deemed necessary by the Governor in Council.' The inspectors of meats and animals and all that will have to be veterinary inspectors. As regards fruits and vegetables, there will be more difficulty. I can assure my hon. friend that the inspectors will be appointed on the ground of their qualifications for the work and not for political reasons.

Mr. PORTER. I am glad to have that assurance. I would call attention to another feature in the Bill. It appears by section 5 that a farmer who slaughters his own animal is not required to have the carcase inspected. Take a packing company, such as William Black & Sons, of Belleville, who pack hams and bacons very largely for export, they do not slaughter any animals upon their own premises. They buy their raw products from the farmers who are not obliged to have the carcases inspected. But after these carcases have been accepted and paid for, then the government inspector can go into their factory and demand an inspection and may condemn these carcases. The loss in that case falls on the packer. He has no protection against the farmer because the Act does not require an inspection of the animals slaughtered by the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will read the section carefully, he will see that it contains the words 'unless the minister otherwise directs.' The minister could direct that these animals be inspected on the farm, but if that be not thought advisable, no doubt the gentlemen who control the factory would only buy the carcase subject to its passing inspection by the government inspector in the factory and not pay if it did not.

Mr. PORTER. Is not the Bill contradictory in its terms? The farmer is not obliged to have the carcase inspected. The packer says to him, I will not take it unless it is. In that case the farmer is obliged to have it inspected before he can sell it, yet the Act says he is not.

Mr. FISHER. In 999 cases out of 1,000 the farmer does not slaughter for export or interprovincial trade but for the local market. In a particular case it may be that the carcase will be used for export. In that case it must be inspected, and necessary regulations might be provided to have it examined either when slaughtered or after it came into the factory.

Mr. PORTER. Would it not be well to provide in the Bill that when a carcase is sold to the packer for export, it will have to be inspected?

Mr. FISHER. That is practically provided for.

Mr. PORTER. I would draw attention to the point that the enactment in section 5 may possibly come in conflict—and very likely will—with the by-laws of different municipalities. In nearly every city and town by-laws are passed prohibiting the slaughter of animals within its limits. This Bill might be read as authorizing the slaughter of animals upon the premises of a retail butcher. The retail butcher would carry on his business within the limits of the city or town; and if the provisions of this Bill are wide enough to bear that interpretation, it would certainly come in conflict with the municipal law. That ought to be avoided if possible.

Mr. FISHER. I shall not give an opinion on the legal point, but it seems to me quite out of the question that this Bill should override provincial laws, where these laws are intra vires of the legislature which passed them. Any municipal or provincial Act would have effect especially when, in this Bill, there is no specific authorization of such work required. It might bear the implication which the hon. gentleman gives although I hardly think it will. But certainly there is no specific authorization for the slaughtering by a farmer or anybody else without inspection.

Mr. PORTER. Does the hon. minister say that a municipal by-law—I was not speaking of an Act of the local legislature—would override the provisions of this statute?

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

Mr. PORTER. If the provisions of this Bill would override a muncipal by-law, then would there not be a conflict of authority between the two ?

Mr. FISHER. We have tried to draft the Bill so that it shall not conflict with provincial statutes. At the same time, so far as the interprovincial and export trade are concerned, I believe that this Bill will override any Act of a provincial legislature, and in that I include municipal by-laws passed by virtue of such legislation. At the same time, as it is specifically intended that this Bill shall only apply to interprovincial and export trade, I do not see how it can clash with municipal by-laws or regulations governing purely local trade. If there be any danger of that, I should be very glad to have the opinion of the law officers and have it made clear that there is no such conflict.

Mr. KEMP. With respect to certain people who do both an export business and a domestic business, will all the meat such an establishment turns out be subject to inspection ?

Mr. FISHER. In the case of any establishment engaged in interprovincial or export trade, everything that goes into and comes out of that establishment, whether for export or interprovincial or local trade, will be subject to the provisions of this measure as regards meats.

Mr. HENDERSON. If a slaughter house be engaged in the business purely for local trade, and not for interprovincial or export trade, will it be affected by this Bill ?

Mr. FISHER. No, except to this extent that anything it produces cannot be sent to any other province or be exported.

Mr. KEMP. What effect will that have on the trade, when one establishment will have its meats inspected by the government —and that fact is known to the public— and another concern next door is not subject to inspection ? Has the minister considered what effect that will have upon the reputation of the several firms so engaged?

Mr. FISHER. I think that, if the establishment which is not engaged in export or interprovincial trade comes largely into competition with the establishments engaged in that trade, it will practically be obliged to ask to come under the operation of this Act. But purely local establishments such as the village butchery, and concerns of that kind, I think, will not come into competition with the goods supplied by the other institutions, and will go on, as they do now, under the provincial health law.

Mr. LALOR. Take the case of a concern doing a domestic business that has put up a large quantity of goods and has an opportunity to export—would it be permitted under this law to sell the goods for export?

Mr. FISHER. Not unless the goods had been inspected under this Act.

Mr. LALOR. Will not that be a hardship to the firm that has put up more goods than it can place in the domestic market?

Mr. FISHER. I think the provisions of the Bill are necessary in the interests of the country Such provisions will necessarily tread upon the toes of some people.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask a question that I may know whether I fully understand the matter. Take the case of a concern that was manufacturing both for the export and interprovincial trade and for the local trade—let us say, to make the illustration stronger, that it is manufacturing more for the local than for the outside trade. Do I understand that all the goods put up by such an establishment must be inspected and marked?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether for the local trade or for the export or interprovincial trade?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) said certainly has great pertinence. This Act will have the effect of placing on the local market a goverment-marked food in competition with the product of the man who manufactures only for local and not for export purposes.

Mr. FISHER. There is no doubt of that. I do not think there is any escape from it. As we shall have to take all the necessary steps to inspect the products of establishments that are for export or interprovincial trade, it would be in the interest of these people to have all their goods inspected and marked. All the work has to be done in connection with it, so, practically, the inspection and marking of what is for local consumption would not cost the public anything, and the concern interested would certainly prefer to have all the goods marked. Still, if we were perfectly sure that certain goods were only going to be used for local consumption, we should not be called upon, necessarily, under the provisions of the Act, to mark them.

Mr. STOCKTON. But, for the public good, you would not object ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I would not object ; and, as a matter of practice, I think all the goods could be marked.

Mr. FOSTER. What fee does the manufacturer have to pay for this inspection and marking ?

Mr. FISHER. There are no fees.

Mr. FOSTER. It is absolutely free ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, does not the minister think that, as a matter of fact, he will be called upon to extend this inspection to practically all establishments ? The inspected establishments will have the great advantage of offering to the consumer a government-stamped meat. Other establishments will put themselves in such a position that it will be practically obligatory upon the government to extend this benefit to them. Even those that manufacture only a few packages for interprovincial or foreign trade will put themselves in such a position that all their goods will be marked with the government stamp.

Mr. FISHER. That, I believe will be true of all the larger establishments.

Mr. KEMP. But I understood the minister to say that he does not intend to extend this inspection to those that do a domestic business only ?

Mr. FOSTER. My point is this : Suppose a man in a small way of business in a town of 5,000 inhabitants, who has to face the competition of the inspected goods. It costs this small producer nothing to get his goods also inspected, and he can secure that advantage by merely exporting one carcase a week.

Mr. KEMP. I can imagine a store, say in Montreal or Toronto, with large display windows which it fills with government-stamped goods, and with streamers over the door announcing that all products sold in that store are inspected and stamped by the government. The establishment next door does no export business and so cannot take advantage of this way of doing business. In that case, it will be placed at a great disadvantage. I have in mind two competing concerns in Toronto that would be in that relative position under this Act. One does both domestic and export business, while the other caters to the domestic trade alone. Now, I would ask the minister if he does not think that, in such cases, this Bill would have far-reaching consequences ? If he carries through such a Bill, it seems to me he will have to go further and inspect every shop in every small village throughout the country. I do not see where he is going to draw the line.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that there is a very serious point involved in this matter. We propose to inspect meat that is put up for interprovincial or export trade, but we neglect the inspection of that used within the limits of the province. It seems to me that if this Bill is to be of any great service to the country, its benefits, like charity, should be given at home—we should give our own people the first consideration. If it is important that we should send out meat fit for food and that cannot be contaminated, is it not more important that meat to be sold within the province in which it is put up, should be carefully inspected ? I believe that this Bill is of great importance, if properly carried out ; but, if we are to face the great expense of a number of inspectors all over the Dominion only for the purpose of selling our meat on the foreign market, we are putting the people of the Dominion to expense without giving them the consideration and protection that we ought to give them. Again, as has been suggested here, if the products of one house are to bear the mark of government inspection, and if all other establishments can seek the same advantage without expense to themselves, will not all claim to be inspected ? It does seem to me that here is a question that requires grave consideration. A great many dealers carry on a large business purely for domestic purposes, and it does seem to me that their meat should be of a pure quality, and that those dealers should be placed upon the same footing as others who manufacture for export. You are going to employ a large number of inspectors, and why not utilize them for inspecting local establishments as well as those who are manufacturing for export ?

Mr. FISHER. I may say to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the point he has raised does present a certain amount of difficulty, if it is carried to what I may call the reductio ad absurdum. There will be no doubt some difficulty in drawing a line. A factory purely local in its character, and by that I mean a butchery or slaughter house, might come and demand inspection under this Act by some such expedient as my hon. friend suggests, that of exporting a single carcase once a week or once a month. I rather hesitate in suggesting that the minister should possibly have power to refuse to give such inspection, because my hon. friend will agree that ministers already have enough responsibility without desiring to add to it. But there might be some condition or limit provided under which this inspection for interprovincial and export trade shall not be abused for local purposes. It is rather a new idea. I have thought that people would rather wish to be free from this inspection than to come under it, but possibly some local shops might try to come under it for the purposes mentioned. I will ask the House to allow me to look into that. In the United States regulations lately passed by Act of Congress every person or company who wishes to come under this export inspection has to make application to the department and get permission.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the conditions ?

Mr. FISHER. Simply that they shall throw open their establishments to inspection. There is no fee, nothing to hinder,

and men who never intend to export may ask to come under that inspection.

Mr. FOSTER. And naturally must come under it.

Mr. FISHER. Well, they might. I think perhaps there ought to be some power on the part of the minister to refuse to inspect establishments which are purely local in their character. It seems to me the minister might be given power to judge whether the establishment is or is not really a bona fide interprovincial or export trade establishment. I may say to the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) who asks that local consumers shall be protected, the provincial authorities have now absolute power for such inspection, and they do so to a considerable extent. I do not see why we should undertake to assume powers they are now exercising satisfactorily.

Mr. FOSTER. The spirit of this Act is to affect simply what is meant by export in the widest sense, either interprovincial or otherwise. When you go into an establishment which chooses for its own convenience to carry on the double business of manufacturing for export and for local consumption, which I suppose is the most economical way of doing, you are not obliged to give to that establishment the benefit of inspection for any other than for export purposes. Why then, in the general run, would it not be the better method to make it necessary that when you carry on an export manufacture, and yet carry on under the same roof a manufacture for domestic consumption, you should separate the domestic from the export goods, and that the export goods only should be marked, and the goods for domestic purposes should not be marked? You would then get no advantage in your home competition from the inspection by the Dominion government. A firm might do that, although it would be a little more expensive. But why, as the man gets the advantage free of charge of having his goods labelled for export, should he not go to the extra expense of making what division is necessary to separate entirely his domestic from his export product ? The law is itself the arbiter, because nobody can put on a ship, nobody can carry off on a vessel, nobody can take out for export except that class of goods which are marked. In that way you could avoid what is an absolute disadvantage to the competitor who does not go into the export trade. I think it will be necessary for the competitor to have the same advantage of marked goods as the other, provided he goes into the same market. I do not think you can get out of that at all, and it would practically carry your work to every considerable manufacturer, whether of meat products or of other food products.

Now there is another point brought up this afternoon which strikes me as equally important. Is this not going to be a very wide and vexatious interference with the freedom of trade ? Granted that if the sanitary condition necessary to be attained is paramount, and that you would have to interfere for purposes of absolute protection in that respect, it must be done, but has the minister looked into that? Are there not what you call jobbers in the export trade? Now if you pass this Act you will confine those jobbers in every case to establishments which come under the export trade inspection and marking sytem. Now another man who is manufacturing for local trade takes his article to market, it may be a staple and excellent article, into the city of Montreal or the city of Toronto, and he sells it on the market and the dealers there buy of him. He supplies them. Your jobber comes in and says, I want to make up a lot of goods for the export market; or I want to make up a lot of goods for Nova Scotia or New Brunswick ; what have you on your shelves ? I have so and so, so and so. Well, I will take that.

But here comes this law and says, No, this cannot be. I cannot allow you the benefit of this trade, because your goods are not marked, and they are not marked because they have not passesd through the channel of the man who is under inspection for export trade. In the long run this Act will be a great interference with trade and it will be almost impossible to carry it out—may be not impossible—but certainly attended with great difficulty, because when you come to the train or the vehicle that is exporting and taking it over to another province or the boat that is carrying it you say to the carrier: This is not marked. Where are you taking it? Into another province or by vessel into another country. It must go back. It is fraught with a mighty lot of difficulty unless the minister, by himself or in co-operation with the provincial authorities, gets down to the inspection and marking of all meat products. When you get down to that you do two things. The health of the individual at home is just as important as the health of the consumer of Canada's products abroad, the home market deserves just as much protection as the foreign market and in the end the profits of the maker are infinitely greater in the home market by having a perfectly safe and inspected product to offer to the home consumer than are the profits of the foreign market because the home market is infinitely wider and larger. If I were nurturing a family on fish and meats, if I went into a store to get them, and if there were two qualities one of which was inspected and stamped and the other was not, I would feed my little chaps on that which was properly inspected. I would not like the other to go past their lips at all. And it is so with everybody. The more you have Jungle Books written and the more you have this matter of pure food

agitated—and it is being agitated by clubs, societies and other bodies—the more you will drive people into patronizing the inspected and consequently better and purer article. There is not any reason, as my hon. friend back here has said, why you should poison outright or hurt the digestion of the good citizens of Canada by improper food any more than you should endeavour to prevent the digestive organs of the foreign consumer from being impaired slightly or greatly by the same imperfectly produced food, and when you come to the matter of profit, as the consumption at home is infinitely greater than the consumption abroad, the profit will be therefore greater in proportion to the manufacturer for home consumption and consequently it is of just as much importance that his products should be properly put up and placed before the consumers as it is in reference to the export trade. Now, desirous as the minister will be to extend his inspection and everything like that, has the minister yet considered what will be the financial responsibility that he undertakes in attempting to carry out this legislation? Granted that if it is absolutely necessary the financial consideration must not stand in the way so long as the Minister of Finance sees his way to provide the money, yet, before we pass this Bill, I think the minister ought to pretty closely look into this matter and give us an estimate of the probable expense. As I look through it, it is going to be large and it cannot help but be large. Here is a slaughtering establishment, large, or not very large, which has to be inspected. It will mean one inspector there every hour during the day that animals are being received and slaughtered and meats are being prepared. You must have a permanent man for every establishment unless you can combine two establishments close together and even then it may be risky work and may not be very thorough, so that altogether there are difficulties about this Bill. I suppose they can be overcome, I suppose they must be overcome if it is necessary, may be they have been overcome by the legislatures of other countries which have had experience in that respect, but the more we go into it—and the more we go into it the better before this legislation is passed—the more we see that it is a pretty complex question and that it leads you into a great many lines and avenues towards possible confusion and interference with trade unless you switch the whole thing into one and put it all under the flag of inspection.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate fully the spirit in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken. I gladly accept his—I will not call it criticism——

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is not meant as criticism.

Mr. FISHER. It is not intended in that way, I am sure—but assistance in working out what is, I can honestly say, a difficult problem. My only reason for introducing this Bill was because I believed it was necessary to prevent our exporters from being placed at a great disadvantage in comparison with other countries competing with us in other markets which countries provide these safeguards.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the butcher or meat packer in the United States comes within the scope of the American legislation voluntarily?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but if he does not come under it he cannot export. He makes his application to have his meat inspected, but the law says that no meat shall be exported without being first inspected. The application is simply an intimation to the department that he intends to engage in the export trade.

Mr. KEMP. But the government do not force it on any one?

Mr. FISHER. They do not force it on any one but they forbid any one to export meat which is not inspected so that it comes to the same thing as far as the export and interstate trades are concerned. Now, let me reply to my hon. friend's discussion of the point of the home trade being as important to us as the export and interprovincial trade. I am willing quite to accept that fact. If it were a question of the home trade entirely, I believe that this parliament could leave the whole question to the provincial legislatures. The local powers of the provincial legislatures and the municipalities working under provincial Acts, I think, would be quite sufficient to cover all the necessities of this trade which is not outside of the powers of these respective legislatures. It is obvious, however, that the legislature of Ontario cannot possibly protect itself efficiently or effectively from meats produced in the province of Quebec, Manitoba or elsewhere. When it comes to the export trade we have no machinery for dealing with that except the Dominion parliament. Therefore it is that this Bill is necessary with regard to the export and interprovincial trade. As far as the protection of our home consumers is concerned, I think that is properly within the sphere of the local health authorities and that it is better for this parliament not to interfere. I state that as a broad principle and I am ready to take issue upon that principle. Now comes in the practical difficulty which my hon. friend has pointed out that when we assume that principle and do not deal at all with the local trade, we come into a difficulty at once in discriminating and dividing the export or interprovincial trade from the local or provincial trade. I appreciate these difficulties. As I have already pointed out my hon. friend has raised a question which may lead to some amendment of this Act.

As far as the marking of all goods in a factory which caters to both the home and local trade and the export or interprovincial trade is concerned, I consider that it is absolutely necessary that all the animals going into that factory should be inspected when they go in and they will be under one section of this Act. In the process of manufacture I believe it is necessary they should be inspected, but when it comes to the goods being sent out of the factory it is necessary they should all be marked.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

Mr. FISHER. Principally because they have all been inspected, and it is a legitimate sequence of the continued inspection, and for the convenience of the large establishment which is catering to the foreign trade as well as to the home market.

Mr. FOSTER. I admit it is a sequence of your inspection, but you are only dealing with the export trade, and the moment a packer trys to export anything that was not marked he is held up. There is no sequence compelling you to do that for the sake of protecting the home trade.

Mr. FISHER. The manufacturer of these goods may intend some of them for the home market and change his mind, but if they were all marked in the course of preparation he could do as he liked with them. It is possible we might arrange not to mark any of the goods until they were actually going out of the factory, and it would be then known if they were intended for the export trade or for the local market. We might arrange—I do not express any decided opinion on that now—that the goods put on the local market should not be marked although they had been inspected. My own belief is that as to the competition in the local market with goods not coming from factories which have been inspected, in that case, the result which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) seems to think is unfortunate would be just the same. For instance, every one in Canada knows the Davies Company are large exporters, and when this Bill becomes law all their factories must be inspected. The goods intended by the Davies Company for export would be marked, but under the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) the goods which are intended for local consumption would not be marked. Every one would know that the Davies establishments are inspected and that the unmarked products are equally good as the marked goods. The name of the Davies Company upon these goods would itself be a guarantee. The Davies Company is proud of its name and reputation, and it takes good care to see that any thing that comes out of its factories bears the Davies name. The consumer would know that although the Davies goods were not marked they had been inspected and were equal to any goods marked with the government stamp.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be so in part, but it would be a matter of inference.

Mr. FISHER. It would be a matter of inference, but it would accomplish the same result as if the goods sent out by the Davies Company for local consumption had the government stamp. I grant that it is not the intention of this Bill that the goods of a factory engaged in both home and export trade should be marked when the goods are intended for the home trade alone. My reason is that I consider the safeguarding of the home trade is quite within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, and that it is their duty to see to it, but it is our duty to see that the export trade shall be safeguarded.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Under section 7 all canned goods are to be inspected throughout the whole course of preparation and packing. We have 150 lobster factories in Prince Edward Island, and if the catch every day has to be inspected as well as the whole process of canning, either this Bill will be unworkable or it will cost a vast amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. It would take all the men off the farms.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes, or we would have to increase the population to provide inspectors.

Mr. FISHER. That is not the intention of the Bill.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is what it says.

Mr. FISHER. The intention of the Bill is that only meat packing establishments shall be subject to such inspection.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But the Bill refers to all articles prepared as food in any establishment.

Mr. FISHER. That means that at any time an inspector may enter these establishments and inspect.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It says the product shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation.

Mr. FISHER. They shall be subject to inspection in the sense that an inspector may inspect them when he thinks it necessary. The intention is that lobster canneries, &c., shall be subject to inspection whenever the inspector may visit them, but that in the meat establishment there shall be without any reservation a continuous inspection all through the process.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The Bill would seem to include lobster canning establishments as well as meat packing establishments.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will look at the other sections he will find that there is complete provision for the inspection of animals and carcases and the various products of the meat factories; but there is no such provision in regard to fish, vegetables or fruits. These are to be open to

inspection whenever the inspector can visit the factories, but it is not provided that the inspector shall be present all through the process or that he shall inspect them all. The section provides that no such packages, except packages of meat products, shall be marked by the inspector. They will probably be regulations as to what shall be put on the labels, such as the name of the packer, a correct description of the contents and possibly some other definition. The suggestion has been made that the date of the packing should also be put on the label. Personally I am not prepared to endorse that, although a large section of the community wished it. But those who are engaged in the business of packing, the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) leading the discussion here, hold that that would interfere very much with the course of the trade and would probably be impracticable. Therefore I have said to the House that I would not at present provide that the date should be put upon the label. The marking of the other packages than the meat packages is intended to be of the character I have just indicated. On the meat package there must be a mark put by the inspector which shall be proof that he has inspected the animal, the carcase and the products, so that we may be absolutely sure that the inspection has been thorough. So far as the other goods are concerned, that is not the case. A less complete inspection and the marking by the packer under certain restrictions and rules are all that is required.

Mr. STOCKTON. Can the minister state whether under the American law it is absolutely necessary that the meat should be marked before it can be exported from the United States ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STOCKTON. That would be of course under federal authority ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does that apply to meat for home consumption as well ?

Mr. FISHER. For interstate commerce, not for local commerce. In that respect the scope of this law is the same as that of the American law. I believe that their law is limited for the same reason as ours—that there the states have rights as here the provinces have rights.

Mr. STOCKTON. The difference is this, that whatever this parliament declares to be a crime would come under the legislative authority of this parliament. By subsection 2 of section 10 you have declared that part of it to be a crime, and therefore there can be no question about the legislative authority of this parliament to act in the matter. I speak, however, with all deference as to the opinion of the Minister of Justice in that respect.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the opinion of the Minister of Justice went so far as to say that this parliament had not the right to legislate and to make a crime of any of these acts.

Mr. STOCKTON. No, I do not understand that he did.

Mr. MARSHALL. Did I understand the minister correctly to say that only fruits and vegetables for export would have to be inspected?

Mr. FISHER. I think I went further than that. The Bill is limited to interprovincial and export trade for meats, vegetables and fish. So far as vegetables, fruits and fish are concerned, it does not provide for continuous and complete inspection of all the packages or goods. It renders the places at which these goods are to be put up and the products used, open to inspection. In that respect it is very much like the Fruit Marks Act, which, while defining certain requirements in regard to marking the packages, enables the inspectors to inspect any package. In this case the inspectors would be authorized to inspect any package, and to go into any factory and inspect its sanitary condition and the goods used, but it does not provide that that shall be done in every individual instance all over the country. In the case of meat packing, it does provide that, and that is the difference between the two.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Then it would be preferable, in my opinion, to use the word 'may' instead of the word 'shall,' which is imperative.

Mr. FISHER. That is a question of drafting.

Mr. LALOR. When the Bill says that all meat shall be inspected, does that apply to poultry ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, so far as the scope of the Bill goes.

Mr. LALOR. Then I may inform the minister that nearly all the canneries of Ontario pack poultry for domestic trade as well as the export trade, and that would necessitate an inspector in each canning factory.

Mr. MARSHALL. Would a canner be liable if he shipped fruits or vegetables without notifying the inspector ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think that an inspection which is not made at the time the goods are packed is of no use at all. All packers have some goods which are better than others, and there are certain times when the goods are better than at other times. There is only one way to inspect goods properly, that is, when they are going into the can. I find that there are between sixty and seventy packers of fruits and

vegetables in the west. I do not think it at all necessary to have an inspection of the actual quality of the goods but merely to have the premises thoroughly inspected. The minister mentioned that an inspection might take place just when the goods are being shipped. I do not think that would be satisfactory. It would certainly delay shipment. There is only one way in which a proper inspection of the goods themselves can be had, and that is by having an inspector in every factory. But if you have an inspector in each one of the sixty-five fruit and vegetable factories, that will cost you, for properly qualified men, from $1,500 to $2,000 per year for each factory. In my opinion an inspection of the products themselves is not at all necessary, because the firm or factory which does not send out good goods will soon have to go out of business.

Mr. FISHER. I have no intention or expectation of having an inspector in every vegetable or fruit canning establishment. When my hon. friend from the west spoke about the fish inspection, I pointed out that I did not think that was feasible from what I knew of the conditions in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia regarding fish packing. Nor do I think it would be feasible to have an inspector in every vegetable and fruit canning establishment. That is why in this Bill vegetables and fish are dealt with in a very different way from meat products. It is not the intention to have a man in each factory, but at the same time all the factories and everything in them are liable at any time to be inspected. And when the inspector does come, he should be able to inspect and report upon the character of the goods used. True he can only inspect the goods which are in the factory at the time, but if he is careful to go all through the factory and look into everything, it will be difficult for those in charge to conceal from him the bad goods and only show him the good products. That is not the kind of inspection I want, and I shall be careful not to appoint any man who would be so feeble and ineffective as to allow himself to be hoodwinked in that way. In my hon. friend's factory, no doubt all the goods put up are of good quality, but they will all be liable to inspection at any moment. When the inspector visits a factory, he should inspect all the goods in it, whether packed or not, as well as the premises and surroundings.

Mr. LALOR. The fruit and vegetable factories of Ontario are most rigidly inspected now.

Mr. FISHER. I know.

Mr. LALOR. I do not see how any inspection the hon. minister can bring about will be an improvement on the one we have now. The province of Ontario has not only women inspectors, who inspect the women's quarters, but also men inspectors who inspect all the machinery. And besides these, during the last year the provincial board of health had a medical man who inspected the goods and premises from a sanitary standpoint. With these three different systems of inspection in the province of Ontario, I cannot see what there is left for the minister to do. The canners of Ontario look upon this Bill with a great deal of alarm. They fear very much that it will interfere with their trade. From a business standpoint they realize that the provision requiring that goods for export must be inspected, will be a great handicap.

Mr. FISHER. I have said over and over again that that provision is not in this Bill.

Mr. LALOR. It is within the power of the minister, as I understand.

Mr. FISHER. No, it is not.

Mr. LALOR. I understand that the minister has power at any time to order an inspection. If the goods are not to be inspected when brought in by the farmers, there is no object in an inspection at all. How can you have a satisfactory inspection of canned goods? One can might be perfect, while every other can in the whole box might be poor. I do not think that is the case, but I say it is impossible to inspect goods after they are canned. They should be inspected while they are being canned. Then the competition among the canners of Ontario is sufficient of itself to make them put up the best goods, and there are no better canned goods to be had than those put up in Ontario. If the minister is well advised, he will withdraw from the Bill the clause relating to fruits, vegetables and poultry, because they do not require any other inspection than that which they are already receiving. But if he wants to have the goods inspected as they should be, he will require to have an inspector in every factory. No inspector travelling from factory to factory, visiting a factory now and then, can inspect satisfactorily either for the minister or the consumer.

Mr. BARR. What examination will an inspector have to pass before he is appointed? To-day the people of this Dominion, who are eating canned goods, are eating different kinds of impurity, and goods very very different from what they are described in the label. It has been proved beyond doubt that thousands of calves, not a day old, have been slaughtered and put up in cans as chicken and veal and sold as such. You can purchase such canned goods in Ottawa to-day. In view of that condition of affairs, our people require protection, and it is much more important that they should be protected than the foreign consumers. As far as the cleanliness of the factories is concerned and the machinery, the provincial inspection is sufficient for all requirements, but so far as the food which is put into those cans—meats and vegefables and others—the health

of the people is not protected as it should be. That is the important question. It has been proved beyond doubt that a state of affairs exists which should not be allowed to continue, and I am very much afraid that this Bill does not strike at the root of the evil. Take the Davis Company and other companies which have some of their cans marked for export and others for domestic use. Will it be possible for them, under this Bill, to can the good quality for export and use the refuse for domestic purposes? If so we are protecting the foreigner and leaving our own people at the mercy of the canners. That is the serious question, and to my mind it is not met by this Bill.

Mr. LALOR. I have heard before gentlemen in this House speaking on subjects with which they are not familiar. And I fear that the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr), when he speaks of canned poultry, speaks of something that he has heard about from others, but concerning which he knows very little.

Mr. BARR. I examined it and found out for myself.

Mr. LALOR. Regardless of this statement sometimes made that calves are used to simulate canned chicken and turkey, I believe that there never was a greater mistake than that statement covers. I do not think that such a thing was ever done in Ontario, and that is where the goods are put up. I know concerning thirty factories in Ontario, a company of which the member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) and I are directors, and I know that in these establishments nothing of that sort is done.

Mr. BARR. How can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) prove that statement? I tell him what I found by examination that I have made myself.

Mr. LALOR. The poultry put in these cans are true to name—turkeys, chickens, ducks. Whatever they may be labelled, that is what is in the cans; and there is no composition and no substitution of any kind. I state that with pleasure to the members of this House who may have an impression to the contrary. I myself have heard such statements as made by the hon. member for Dufferin. In fact, there seems to be a somewhat general impression to that effect. But that impression is wrong. If a man buys a can of poultry put up in any cannery in the province of Ontario, I do not care who the canner may be, the goods are true to name—the goods named on the label are the goods in the can. There can be no greater mistake than to say that these cans contain the meat of calves or anything different from what the label states. The statement we have heard reminds me of another statement that I heard on the floor of this House once—that turnips are used to make marmalade. Well, that will be news to every canner. Certainly, I never heard of such a thing except from people who know nothing about the business.

Mr. MARSHALL. The hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) is entirely mistaken when he says that something is used as a substitute for poultry in canning. I am the pioneer canner of poultry in Canada—the Aylmer Canning Company began its business twenty-three years ago and has continued it ever since; and we never put up anything but the poultry, the name of which appears on the can. As the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) says the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) does not know everything, even if he is a doctor. Doctors do not know everything.

Mr. BARR. But I examined it, and I know what it was.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister informed me, in a previous discussion, that these canned goods could not be exported unless they were marked as inspected. Is it his intention to have an inspector at every steamer to see that no goods go aboard that are not properly branded? He tells us now that canned poultry must be inspected and marked. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) says there are fifty or sixty factories in Ontario canning poultry, all of which operate at the same season of the year. Will the minister have an inspector at each of these factories? The minister told us that all the animals must be inspected before they are killed. If that is to be done in the case of poultry canning, it will mean that there must be an inspector for every factory. So far as vegetable canning is concerned, I suppose that an occasional visit of the inspector during the season would be sufficient. But it would not be sufficient in the case of poultry canning—and that season is a long one. I understand the minister to say that this Bill would not interfere with the provincial authorities. Will he explain that point a little further? Suppose that the Davies Company, in Toronto, are packing for export. They get an order from a dealer in Ottawa for a large quantity of their products, and by the same mail they get an order for a dealer in Hull, for a similar quantity. These orders will be put up and sent to the consignees. Will the minister have an inspector at the provincial boundary line on every railway—there is provision for steamships, but I see nothing with regard to the railways—to see that no goods that have not been inspected and marked are allowed to leave the province? Then, if he is not going to interfere with the provincial authorities, I would like to know how he will carry on this work in the case of the great army of drovers who are purchasing hogs and cattle throughout the country and shipping them by rail to Montreal. Suppose that, after this Bill has come into operation, a carload of hogs or a carload of cattle are offered to the packer.

Will the packer say: 'These animals have to be inspected before we can put a price upon them'? And, if so, will these drovers, the next time they go out to buy, will they say to the farmers whose steer or hog they propose to buy: 'This animal must go to Montreal and stand inspection; if it passes we will give you so much, but if it is found defective in any way, you will get nothing'? Is it the intention of the minister to work out the Act in such a way that every butcher, before he buys an animal, must have it inspected, or buy it subject to the inspection at Montreal?

Mr. FISHER. Answering the hon. gentlemen's (Mr. Taylor's) last question first, I would say that the course he indicates is the one that is pursued now at Toronto and other large cattle-producing centres. The local health authorities decide whether an animal can be used or not. The farmer sends in his animals. Some turn out to have lumpy jaw, or other disease and they are rejected. The parties must arrange how the loss, in that case, is to be borne. I do not know how they do it,—no doubt in some cases it is done one way and in some cases in another way. As to the question of goods passing the interprovincial line, taking the illustration that the hon. gentleman has given, if the Davies Company send some goods to Hull and some to Ottawa that have not been inspected, they will break the law in the case of those goods going to Hull, as the goods must go outside the province in which they were canned. The fact that they would be liable to punishment under the law would deter a concern like the Davies Company from doing such a thing. I think, therefore, that we require no inspection on the railways. Another question was as to the chicken packing establishments. I confess that I was not aware that there were so many establishments for the packing of chicken. That may be a matter for consideration. It may be necessary to put chicken in the same catagory as fish.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not only chicken, but ducks, turkeys and so on.

Mr. FISHER. When I speak of 'chicken' I mean to include them all. It may be necessary to put them along with the fish, fruit and vegetables. That is a matter for consideration. Another question put was with regard to the inspection of vessels doing an export business. That matter is effectively done by the customs in clearance. Every vessel will have to get a clearance from the customs house, just as they do now.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. With regard to the packing of fruits and vegetables, there does not seem to be any condition mentioned which constitutes an infraction of the law, it simply provides for an inspection. The section states that the goods shall be marked or labelled in such manner as the minister directs. What does he mean by that? Suppose an inspector were to go to a cannery and there find, in examining 1,000 cans, that there was one can blown or somewhat defective, what would he do about it? He could not tell whether the other 999 cans were wrong until he opened them. What would the canner be guilty of if the inspector found one can or tin, or ten cans, in his establishment that, for some cause, were not in a condition suitable for food? They may have been all right when they were put up, but owing to bad cooking, or the can leaking, the produce has gone wrong. The can may be all right when it is in the warehouse, but after it is put on ship the movement may set up a fermentation. I do not see any conditions saying what the canner may be guilty of or how he may be punished, or what the inspector has to do.

Mr. FISHER. The intention is to frame regulations under which this Act will be administered. With regard to labels on the packages, I have been trying to frame some definition of those labels which could be inserted in the Act itself. I think it better that they should be inserted in the Act than left to regulations. As for the instance my hon. friend gave, I think it tells its own story. The inspector goes in and looks at a lot of sealed goods. He cannot inspect the contents, but he sees one of them that happens to be blown or is in some way defective, and then he looks a little more carefully after the others. The inspection in the fruit and vegetable canneries will have to be very general, it will be an inspection of all the conditions in the canneries as regards cleanliness, sanitary conditions, the character of the products used. When the inspector happens to visit an establishment he can only judge of the general conditions by what he finds on his visit. The object of making these canneries subject to inspection is to give the inspector authority to go in and inspect them. The object of this inspection is different from that provided for under the provincial Acts. I have been told that there is a provincial Act which requires females to be employed as inspectors, for the reason that they are required to investigate the conditions under which women and children in a factory are employed. There is also an inspector under the Ontario and Quebec Acts, and perhaps in other provinces, with regard to the condition of the machinery, so that it shall be of a safe character, and not dangerous to men who are working with it. There is also a third inspector with regard to the health conditions in factories, and to a certain extent that inspector might accomplish some of the objects aimed at by this Bill. For instance, he has to see whether proper lavatories are provided, and whether decent conditions prevail where the employees

work. But any one who understands the object of the provincial inspection will see that it is quite different from the objects which are aimed at by this Bill. While the provincial inspection may be very useful, it does not carry with it the assurance which this Bill provides, that the products of the factory shall be pure and healthful.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am glad to hear the minister say that he intends to have regulations inserted in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. Such of them as can be.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. That was one of the most serious objections I saw in the Bill at first, and I am glad the minister has removed the objection.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad this further discussion has taken place. I think now we have reached the stage where we can take up the Bill clause by clause in a future sitting, especially as there are one or two points that I wish to consider with reference to slight amendments, and I would ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, when I will ask the House to take up the Bill and really pass it clause by clause.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

WAYS AND MEANS—APPOINTMENT OF NEW SENATORS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I shall move that the House go into Committe of Ways and Means, not with the intention of proceeding with the tariff schedules, but that an opportunity may be afforded several gentlemen to bring up matters which can be most conveniently considered in that way.

Mr. OSWALD S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Before the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to call attention to the matter of the New Brunswick Senate appointments, which, although the appointments took place at the meeting of the cabinet on Saturday last, the Prime Minister was not able to communicate to the House until yesterday. I rise, on this the first opportunity since their official announcement, as the representative of a New Brunswick constituency, to enter a protest against these appointments. I trust no member of the House will imagine that I have any intention of making any personal reference to either of the two gentlemen who have been called to the much coveted seats. Mr. Daniel Gillmor, one of the appointees, is, I believe, a very respectable man and what is perhaps of greater significance in connection with appointments to the Senate, he is a man of means. I would not care to say of the Hon. John Costigan that he is otherwise than a very respectable man also, though, having stated that much, I cannot refrain from saying that his political record, marred, as it has been, by perhaps the most striking and lamentable exhibition of political trimming for the mere sake of the loaves and fishes which this country has ever afforded, is not such a record as to inspire either confidence or respect in those who regard our politics as more than a mere game of patronage and office hunting by members of parliament for themselves and their friends. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not that feature of the question which I rise to discuss; I will leave that to be threshed out between the government and their followers in the province of New Brunswick and between the government and some of the numerous applicants for these offices who are residents of that province. What I object to is that the government in the case of both these appointments has seen fit to go outside the province of New Brunswick for its men. Neither the Hon. John Costigan nor Mr. Daniel Gillmor is a resident of the province of New Brunswick, and I submit to the House that the government has openly violated both the letter and the spirit of the British North America Act in that regard.

There can be no question but that one of the essential qualificatioins for appointment to the Senate is that the person appointed must be a resident of the province for which he is appointed. Section 23 of the British North America Act lays down the qualifications necessary for appointment to the Senate of Canada. That section provides:

1. That the appointee shall be of the full age of 30 years.
2. That he shall be a British subject.
3. That he shall be seized of freehold or real estate in the province for which he is appointed to the value of $4,000 over and above all rents, dues, debts, charges, mortgages and encumbrances.
4. His real and personal property shall be together worth $4,000 over and above his debts and liabilities.
5. ———

And this is the particular subsection of the British North America Act which I propose to discuss.

5. He shall be a resident in the province for which he is appointed.

No one can read that section without seeing that it is the clear and plain intention of the British North America Act that no one shall be appointed to the Senate as a representative of any province unless his residence is within that province. The requirement is a very proper one; no one should be appointed to the Senate to represent a province unless his interests are closely associated with the interests of the province for which he is so appointed. The same law, of course, does

not apply to membership in the House of Commons; a British subject can represent any constituency in the Canadian House of Commons, whether he is a resident of that constituency or not, it being a question of election, and it being for the electors of the constituency to say whether they will have as their representative a resident or a non-resident. But, with regard to the representation of the provinces in the Senate, the appointments to the Senate are vested in the Governor in Council, and they must be made in strict conformity with the provisions of the constitution authorizing such appointments. It is, as all legal gentlemen in this House are aware, a well settled rule of law that the legal residence of a person with reference to his eligibility to office is that place which is his fixed and permanent abode, and to which whenever he is absent he has the intention of returning. And furthermore, that a person can have only one legal residence at the same time. These are maxims of law which no lawyer in this House will for one moment dispute. I do not think it will be denied that it requires a fixed permanent abode in the province which the senator represents to constitute a residence within the meaning of the British North America Act.

Tried by that test, I submit, with great deference to any who may choose to differ with me, that neither the Hon. John Costigan nor Mr. Gillmor is a resident of the province of New Brunswick. I think that every member of this House and every citizen of this city is well aware that Mr. Costigan is a resident of the city of Ottawa in the province of Ontario. This is the place where he keeps his principal establishment, and where his home is, and while it is true that he represents the county of Victoria in the province of New Brunswick, he is not a resident of that constituency nor of any other constituency in that province. When he comes to New Brunswick he is looked upon as a mere visitor, and it is very seldom that he is in the province even on a visit. It may be true that once in a while he goes into his constituency to enjoy a few weeks' gunning or fishing; but that, I submit, does not constitute a residence in the province of New Brunswick to make him eligible for appointment to the Senate. I find that the Hon. John Costigan is a taxpayer and a voter in the city of Ottawa, and has been so for a great many years past; and I am informed, though I am not able to state this positively, that he has voted in the elections in the province of Ontario. Certainly, under the election law of the province of New Brunswick Mr. Costigan would not be competent to vote, because our law specifically provides that no one is competent to vote unless he has been a resident of the constituency for a period of twelve months before the date on which he tenders his vote. Therefore I respectfully submit to this House that Mr. Costigan is not a resident of New Brunswick, but is a resident and a citizen of the province of Ontario, and that in this appointment the government have violated the provisions of the British North America Act, and have disregarded the interests of the people of the province of New Brunswick by appointing to a seat in the Senate of Canada as one of the representatives of the province of New Brunswick, a citizen of the province of Ontario. Right here I may call attention to a rather singular fact, which appears to show that the people of Ontario themselves rather regard Mr. Costigan as one of their own citizens. I notice in the press today that he was introduced into the Senate by two Senators representing the province of Ontario, the Hon. Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, and the Hon. Mr. Coffey. It occurred to me as a very singular thing that this introduction was not made or participated in at least, by a senator of the province which he was supposed to represent. I believe the Hon. John V. Ellis, a most respected member of the Senate representing the province of New Brunswick was in the city, and was in the Senate at the time, as well as other senators representing the province of New Brunswick; and yet we have the significant fact that the introduction of Mr. Costigan as a senator of the province of New Brunswick was made by two senators representing the province of Ontario.

With reference to Mr. Gillmor, the same facts practically may be stated. Mr. Gillmor, I believe, is a very worthy gentleman against whose character I do not wish to be understood as saying a single word, but I find that he has been a taxpayer and a proprietor in Westmount, in the city of Montreal, for more than fifteen years past. That is the place where he carries on his principal business, and where his home and permanent abode is. His name appears in the Montreal directory with his place of residence at No. 4149 Dorchester street, Westmount. It is true that Mr. Gillmor does visit the province of New Brunswick occasionally, but that has amounted in the past few years to no more than a visit to the home of his deceased father in the county of Charlotte for a few weeks in the summer season. It is also true that Mr. Gillmor contested the county of Charlotte as the candidate of the government in the last general election; but this fact cannot possibly be relied upon, as I have already pointed out, to establish his residency in that province.

These are the facts in connection with the residency of each of these gentlemen. I have already referred to the maxim of law which is well known to every legal gentleman in this House in regard to the subject of residency, and I now have in my hand volume 30 of the reports of the Supreme Court of Canada, which contains

a very late pronouncement of that court on that subject. It was in a case of an assessment appeal from the city of St. John, and is entitled 'Simeon Jones, appellant and the city of St. John respondent.' The facts of the case are given briefly in the syllabus and are as follows:

Jones carried on business in St. John as a brewer up to 1893 when he sold the brewery to three of his sons and conveyed his house and furniture to his adult children in trust for them all. He then went to New York where he carried on the business of buying and selling stocks and securities having offices for such business and living at a hotel paying for a room in the latter only when occupied. During the next four years he spent about four months in each at St. John visiting his children and taking recreation. He had no business interests there but attended meetings of the directors of the Bank of New Brunswick during his yearly visits. He was never personally taxed in New York and took no part in municipal matters there. Being assessed in 1897 on personal property in St. John he appealed against the assessment unsuccessfully and then applied for a writ of certiorari with a view to having it quashed.

The Supreme Court of Canada held that under these facts Mr. Jones was not a resident of St. John. Now, every member of this House who has followed closely this statement of facts will at once see that it makes out a very much stronger case of residency than do the facts in the cases of Mr. Costigan and Mr. Gillmor. Mr. Jones simply paid for a room in a hotel in New York when he actually occupied it. He was not a taxpayer there, and took no part in the municipal government of that city. In the case of Mr. Gillmor, I have already stated that he has been a proprietor and taxpayer, registered upon the electoral list of Montreal for the past fifteen years. It seems to me therefore that the government have violated the British North America Act in appointing as a representative of New Brunswick in the Senate one gentleman who is a resident and citizen of the province of Quebec and another who is a resident and citizen of the province of Ontario. The representation of the province of New Brunswick in this parliament is not so large that we can afford to pass over our rights either to the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec, and I think the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues in the cabinet, particularly the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson), will find that public opinion in New Brunswick will not condone this gross violation of our rights.

When this government came into power in 1896, we had in the cabinet two ministers from New Brunswick. One of the first acts of the right hon. gentleman was to reduce that cabinet representation to one. Then it is well known to every member of this House that the representation of the province of New Brunswick in the House of Commons has been reduced from sixteen to thirteen members and that much disappointment was occasioned in that province by that reduction. It is well known that such was the feeling aroused, that the government of New Brunswick initiated a special case for determination by the Supreme Court of Canada as to whether that reduction was right and proper, having regard to the provisions of the British North America Act. The claim of the province of New Brunswcik to its full representation was met, to a large extent, by appointing to the provisions of the British North America Act regarding the representation of the maritime provinces in the Senate. It was pointed out that under the terms of that Act, the maritime provinces, although smaller, were given equal representation with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; and only last session, when a motion was made by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) to reform the Senate, the right hon. the First Minister made this statement and gave it as his reason for opposing any proposal to abolish that body:

But one consideration which, in my mind, is absolutely conclusive and paramount is that, under our system of government, it is an absolutely needed safeguard for the smaller provinces against a possible invasion of their rights by the larger provinces.

The provision, to which the right hon. gentleman then referred, was that provision of the British North America Act governing the representation of the smaller provinces in the Senate. I must say that this argument of the First Minister impressed me at the time, and it would be the strongest reason why I, as an individual member, would be opposed to any proposal to abolish the Senate. The House will, therefore, see the great importance of this question to the province of New Brunswick. We are now entitled to ten seats in the Senate, yet on the one day this government has made two appointments to that body nominally for New Brunswick and assigned them to other provinces. They have taken away by these appointments one-fifth of the representation of the province of New Brunswick in the Senate. I say, therefore, that this is a matter of the greatest importance and concern to the people of New Brunswcik; and as one of the members of this House, representing a constituency in that province, I felt I could not allow the matter to pass without at least entering my protest against this invasion of our rights.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I wish to join my colleague from York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) in the protest he has made against these two recent appointments to the Senate. He has put the case very clearly indeed both as to the facts and the law. We are of course aware that the Prime Minister has no call to consult hon. gentlemen on this side regarding any advice he may give to His Excellency as to

whom His Excellency may summon to the Senate. But at the same time, as members of this House, we are interested in these appointments, and if we believe that any of them are made illegally, we are bound to at least enter our formal protest. It would seem almost as if there were no two gentlemen resident in New Brunswick qualified, in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman, to be called to the Senate. But what qualifications do these gentlemen who have been appointed possess? They certainly have not the essential qualification, under the British North America Act, of residents. Mr. Gillmor was a defeated candidate at the last general election, but he is not alone in sharing that qualification. There are other gentlemen in New Brunswick who equally enjoy it, and who have besides the other qualification which, it appears, Mr. Gillmor has not. Whatever may be thought of the case of Mr. Costigan, certainly the facts brought out to-night by my colleague from York (Mr. Crocket) prove beyond doubt that Mr. Gillmor is now and has been a resident of the city of Montreal and Westmount in the province of Quebec for the last fifteen years. No doubt he has visited the province of New Brunswick during the summer season. No doubt he has a summer residence at a seaside in that province. But that, according to the British North America Act, is not sufficient to qualify him as a resident of that province. Now, I have no objection whatever to either of these gentlemen personally. None of us on this side has any personal objection to either, but I for one protest against the appointment, as a representative of New Brunswick in the Senate, of a gentleman who cannot, according to the British North America Act, be a representative of that province in that body. There are other gentlemen representing New Brunswick here present. I would ask any one of them, no matter on which side of the House he may sit, whether he is satisfied with the appointments of senators to represent New Brunswick. I challenge any hon. gentleman from that province to stand in his place and justify the action of the government in making these appointments? I would like to hear the defence he would make of the action of the government in this case. As the matter has been so fully gone into by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) I will not pursue it further. I merely rose in order that my protest might be registered against the appointment of a gentleman to represent New Brunswick in the Senate, who, I believe, is not quailfied according to the British North America Act.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). As I understood the observations from the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) and of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniels), the view taken of the appointment of the two gentlemen who have been mentioned, Hon Mr. Costigan, and Hon. Mr. Gillmor, is no reflection upon the propriety of the advice which has been tendered to His Excellency the Governor General by his responsible advisers; but the attack which has been made upon the appointment of these two gentlemen to the other branch of the legislature, is based upon the question of the legality of these appointments. Nothing has been said against the fitness of either Mr. Costigan or Mr. Gillmor to fill, and worthily fill, the high position to which they have been called: The only ground which has been taken against their appointment is that they are not qualified according to the letter of the constitution——

Mr. CROCKET. And the spirit of the constitution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let us say, the spirit also—I have, no objection to the modification. But if the appointment which has been made is not in accordance either with the spirit or the letter of the constitution, I submit that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have been altogether too mild in their criticisms in confining that criticism to a protest. They have better remedy than that. This question is a question of law. If these gentlemen who have been called to the Senate are not properly qualified, if they do not come within the fair view of the statute, then, in my humble judgment, their appointment is illegal, and, being illegal it is null and void. And there is a tribunal to test the question, and that tribunal is not the House of Commons, but the Senate itself, the House to which these hon. gentlemen have been called. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) to the provision of the British North America Act in this matter. It provides that a person called to the Senate must be qualified in certain respects—he must be of a certain age, he must be a resident of the province for which he is called to sit, he must have property qualification in the province to a certain extent. But in order to be very particular and very clear on this point, let me recite the law itself:

23. The qualification of a senator shall be as follows:—

(1) He shall be of the full age of thirty years.

(2) He shall be either a natural born subject of the Queen or a subject of the Queen naturalized by an Act of the parliament of Great Britain, or of the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the legislature of one of the provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, before the union, or of the parliament of Canada after the union.

(3) He shall be legally or equitably seized as of freehold for his own use and benefit of lands or tenements held in free and common socage, or seized or possessed for his own use and benefits of lands or tenements held in franc-alleu or in roture, within the province for which he is appointed of the value of four thousand dollars, over and above all rents,

dues, debts, charges, mortgages and incumbrances due or payable out of or charged on or affecting the same.

(4) His real and personal property shall be together worth four thousand dollars over and above his debts and liabilities.

(5) He shall be a resident in the province for which he is appointed.

The Act goes to say that the appointment of a senator is for life. But there is another provision,—that the seat of a senator may become vacant. And when may it become vacant ? The moment he ceases to be qualified in the manner provided by law. If he ceases to be a resident of the province, he ceases to be a senator ; if he ceases to be qualified in regard to property to the extent provided by the constitution, he ceases to be a senator. Here are the words of the constitution on this point :

31. The place of a senator shall become vacant——

The words are imperative in any of the following cases.

(1) If for two consecutive sessions of the parliament, he fails to give his attendance in the Senate.

(2) If he takes an oath or makes a declaration or acknowledgment of allegiance, obedience or adherence to a foreign power, or does any act whereby he becomes a subject or citizen, or entitled to the rights or privileges of a subject or citizen of a foreign power.

(3) If he is adjudged bankrupt or insolvent, or applies for the benefit of any law relating to insolvent debtors or becomes a public defaulter.

4. If he is attainted of treason or convicted of felony or of any infamous crime.

5. If he ceases to be qualified in respect of property or of residence.

Now, Sir, if a man who has been called to the Senate ceases to be a senator and his place becomes vacant, by reason of the fact that he ceases to be qualified in regard to residence or property, as a matter of course, he never is a senator if he is not properly qualified. And, who is to be the judge of this ? Is it the House of Commons ? I submit, with all due difference to the opinion of my hon. friend from York—true that hon. gentleman has not expressly stated his opinion to be such as I have set forth, but by bringing this matter to the attention of the House of Commons he, in effect, expresses that opinion—I say, I submit, with all due deference to his opinion, that it is not the House of Commons that is to pass judgment upon this point, but the House to which the gentleman has been called, the Senate.

Mr. CROCKET. If the Prime Minister would allow me a word there, I would like to say, that I was fully aware that the trying out of the qualifications of a senator lay with the Senate itself. But I brought this matter up to discuss it with reference to the responsibility of the government for appointments, which in my opinion, they should not have made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) wants to hold the government responsible before the question has been tried. He simply asserts that this appointee is not a resident of the province for which he has been called to sit, and holds the government blameable for that before the Chamber to which the gentleman has been called has had an opportunity to decide that question. The question is one which can be brought up in the Senate any day. Any member of the Senate can call attention to the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) concedes the point that it is not for this House to try the question. It may be that my hon. friend has the opinion that Mr. Costigan is not a resident of the province of New Brunswick, but a resident of the city of Ottawa. But that is his opinion only.

Mr. CROCKET. It is the general opinion in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has been authorized to speak for the province of New Brunswick on that point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The declaring of a senatorial seat vacant is not without precedent. It has happened more than once. Even within the last three or four years the seat of a senator was declared vacant. It had been declared that the senator had forfeited his seat, not because he had ceased to be qualified by residence, not because he had ceased to be qualified as a property owner, but he had become disqualified under another of those heads which I mentioned a moment ago, because he had ceased to sit in the Senate for two consecutive sessions. Under such circumstance the case was tried before the Senate. The statement was made that a certain gentleman had lost his seat as a senator, the case was tried before the Senate, and was adjudicated. In a similar manner the Senate has laid down certain rules and regulations for trying its own members on the question of property qualification ; those rules are observed to-day, and upon them a senator can be tried. Therefore my hon. friend will agree with me that this is not the place to determine such questions. Of course we are responsible for the advice which we have given to His Excellency, and we must take the consequences. To-day it is alleged by my hon. friend that we have made a mistake, that we have violated the constitution, that we have advised His Excellency to call to the Senate two gentlemen who are not qualified according to the letter of the constitution, that is to say, are not residents of their province. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, we are res-

ponsible; and if it be proved that we have advised His Excellency to appoint two gentlemen who have not the proper qualifications, then we are liable to the censure of this House. But I say to my hon. friend that this House has no right to call our responsibility in question until the matter has been tried and determined by the body which alone can try and determine it, and that body is the Senate itself.

My hon. friend stated that Mr. Costigan was a resident of the city of Ottawa, and he has brought evidence which undoubtedly shows that quite lately, perhaps last year, Mr. Costigan was a resident of the city of Ottawa. The history of Mr. Costigan is well known, he has been a public man for more than forty years. He came from the province of New Brunswick, of which he was a resident until he was called to the executive government of this country and became a minister of the Crown. He then became a resident of the city of Ottawa, he became a property owner here, and voted here, had his domicile here. But I may say to my hon. friend that I had somewhat anticipated his objection. When the name of Mr. Costigan was suggested to me I made inquiries, and if the case is tried before the Senate it will be shown that Mr. Costigan is no longer a resident of this city, that he has disposed of every inch of property he had in this city, and has become a property owner in and a resident of the town of Edmundston in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the Prime Minister able to say when he became a resident of Edmundston ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I am not able to say that, but it has been represented to me that it is a fact all the same. I believed it to be a fact and acted upon that belief. If I have been wrong, if it be true that the advice which I, as head of the government, gave to His Excellency, was based upon an erroneous impression, and that Mr. Costigan is still a property owner and resident of the city of Ottawa, that matter can be tried elsewhere. But until this is done, I have only to repeat that the accusation of my hon. friend is altogether premature, that he has no right at this moment, notwithstanding what he may say, to bring his charge. I challenge completely his assertion that Mr. Costigan is not a resident and property owner in the province of New Brunswick.

The same with Mr. Gillmor. Mr. Gillmor has a house in the city of Montreal where he spends a good deal of the year. I understand on authority which cannot be disputed, in which I have full confidence, that Mr. Gillmor is also a property owner in the town of St. George, that he has a residence there, for a large portion of the year, for as large a portion of the year as he has in the city of Montreal that in fact he has his domicile in the province of New Brunswick. I give these facts for what they are worth, I give them as they have been represented to me, as being beyond controversy. So it is not possible for my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) or any other hon. gentleman who takes the position he does to maintain that Mr. Gillmor is not a property owner in the town of St. George, that not only is he not a property owner, but that he is not a resident of the town of St. George. Under such circumstances I claim that the government has committed no violation of the constitution, has done no wrong, and that in point of fact, when we represented to His Excellency the Governor General that Mr. Costigan was a resident of the town of Edmundston, and that Mr. Gillmor was a resident of the town of St. George, we acted upon facts that were beyond controversy. However, every thing is liable to be challenged, in this world there is nothing absolute, it may be that we were wrong, it may be that the facts which were represented to us were not facts. If that is the case the remedy of my hon. friend is not in this House but in the Senate itself. If the Senate comes to the conclusion that Mr. Costigan was not properly qualified as to residence, and that Mr. Gillmor was not properly qualined as to residence, then it will be open to my hon. friend to come to this House and ask it to censure us, but not before.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). I shall occupy but a few minutes in discussing this matter. I wish to say at the beginning that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has indulged in considerable special pleading in attempting to answer the argument of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket). Now a federal constitution above all others is one that depends upon checks and balances of the different localities from which representatives come here to legislate. When we entered into confederation, for the purpose of preserving those checks and balances, twelve men each as senators were assigned to the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia together and twenty-four to each of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; with the proviso that when the province of Prince Edward Island came into the union then New Brunswick and Nova Scotia should have but ten each. Therefore it is important that the smaller provinces of the Dominion should be jealous of maintaining their rights, and of preserving the balance that was established under the terms of the constitution. Let me say that the spirit and intent of our constitution, in my opinion, has been violated by the appointment to the Senate the other day of Mr. Costigan and Mr. Gillmor. They do not reside in the province of New Brunswick in the true legal sense of the term. They are not residents of the province of New Brunswick.

But my hon. friend says that if there is error there is a tribunal to correct that error. It was the duty of my right hon. friend and his government then to advise His Excellency the Governor General that there should be no question as to any error. It was his duty to see to it that the men who were appointed should be beyond all question eligible and qualified for the positions to which they were appointed. Take, for instance, the province of Quebec. A different principle obtains there with respect to the appointment of senators. They must come from particular districts, differing somewhat in that respect from the other provinces of confederation. What would the people of Quebec say if my right hon. friend appointed six or eight men from the city of Quebec or the city of Montreal, confessedly not from the districts for which they were appointed, and then say to those who objected to the appointments : Oh, there is a tribunal, and if these gentlemen are not qualified you can go there and rectify the error. That is what my right hon. friend says in reference to the appointment of Messrs. Costigan and Gillmor. If there is a mistake you have your remedy. There is a legal tribunal. You can go before that legal tribunal and have it rectified. What is the legal tribunal ? The Senate of Canada ! I tell my right hon. friend that if we could go to a court of law his appointments would not stand very long. Under the decisions of the courts, under the principles which govern cases of this kind, if we were permitted to go to one of the Supreme Courts of this country to determine that question there would not be much difficulty in seeing what the result would be or what would be the judgment of the court with respect to the appointments which have been made by my right hon. friend and his government to the Senate. But, we can go to the Senate, a political body. Let me say to my right hon. friend that I am in favour of the bi-cameral system, and if it came before this House to-day on a resolution to abolish the Senate, I would vote to retain the Senate. Let me also say to my right hon. friend, to the members of his government and to the members of this House, that if you put men in there for political purposes, men who are not qualified, you are giving a tremendous argument to the people of this country in favour of abolishing the bi-cameral system. I appeal to the gentlemen of this House if there were not other men in New Brunswick who, beyond all question, would be competent and qualified for that position? I appeal to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. LeBlanc), to the former member for St. John (Colonel Tucker), and I could appeal to half a dozen other gentlemen who are confessedly residents of the province of New Brunswick, and I ask, would they not fill these seats in the Senate and fill them as eligible appointees quite as well as the gentlemen who have been appointed by this government? I am not saying a single word against these gentlemen; I am not uttering a single word against either Mr. Costigan or Mr. Gillmor. Mr. Gillmor has a summer house for his family in the county of Charlotte. Does that make him a resident in the correct sense or qualify him to represent the province of New Brunswick in the Senate of Canada? Because a gentleman fishes upon the head waters of the river St. John or chases moose and cariboo in the wilds of the northern part of the province while being a resident and a taxpayer of Ottawa, does that qualify him to be a senator representing the province of New Brunswick? I did not think that my right hon. friend for a moment would argue that, and yet he did argue that. My right hon. friend says that this is not the place to mention this question. Is it not an executive act? Is it not an act for which the government is responsible? Is it not an act to which we, as the representatives of that province, should call the attention of the people of New Brunswick? Therefore, I say that constitutionally and by every rule of parliamentary usage, it is our right—nay more, it is our duty—in parliament assembled, in the face of parliament, to let our people in the province of New Brunswick know how these appointments have been made and how ineligible are the men who have been appointed by the government in filling these vacancies. Now, I am not going to discuss this at greater length. When did Mr. Costigan become a resident of Edmundston in the province of New Brunswick? When? You could not find a single individaul in New Brunswick who could tell you when. It is true that my friend Mr. Gillmor, for whom I have the very highest personal regard, does appear once in a while in the province of New Brunswick, when there is an election being held or when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals flings his cohorts into the city of St. John for the purpose of holding a political convention. Then Mr. Gillmor appears there.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he come from St. George?

Mr. STOCKTON. He does not come from St. George; he comes from the city of Montreal and he returns to the city of Montreal. According to the logic of my right hon. friend, he is a resident of the province of New Brunswick, because he happens to hold some property in the county of Charlotte. Well, what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, in a question of this kind, is, in a fair, square manner, to interpret our constitution, not to fritter it away by fine spun theories with respect to residence. If a man, to all intents and purposes, is not a resident, let us say so and let him not be appointed to the Senate of Canada to represent the province of New Brunswick. For nearly two years we have only had eight men in the Senate to represent the interests of New Brunswick. Have we any more to-day? No, but there

are two more men representing the provinces of Ontario and Quebec in the Senate than there were before these appointments, a fact which is adverse to the interests of New Brunswick and the little provinces by the sea, and we are the ones who should jealously resent such appointments as have been made by the government to the Senate. I, therefore, without entering further into the question, desire to place on record my protest against appointments of that kind. I feel that New Brunswick has been wronged in consequence of these appointments, because we have been denuded of the right of that representation on the floors of the Senate to which we are entitled under the terms of the constitution, and which has been taken away from us by my right hon. friend and his government. Feeling that they have the right to answer for that on the floor of this House, or at all events to listen to our criticism of them, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) has brought the question up. I am astonished that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals allowed the interests of New Brunswick to be sacrificed as they have been sacrificed in this particular case.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, parliamentary rules and usages require of us that we should assume at least that my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) is not simulating. But, it does seem to me that my hon. friend has certainly travelled a considerable distance from his real feelings. The argument of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) is, that the Hon. Mr. Costigan was at one time a resident of Ottawa, that he was a voter in that city, and that his appointment is irregular because he is still a resident of Ottawa. I might as well say that my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) and my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) have no right to sit on that side of the House and associate with their political friends of the present day because forsooth at one time these gentlemen were familiar figures in the Liberal conventions held in New Brunswick.

Mr. CROCKET. That was before you became the leader in New Brunswick.

Mr. EMMERSON. The men who support me in New Brunswick have my respect and esteem, and it is perhaps something to be grateful for that I have not supporting me to-day men for whom I could not entertain that feeling. Be that as it may, I know as a matter of fact that the Hon. Mr. Costigan has been for a considerable period merely a boarder in the city of Ottawa; he disposed of his property here about two years ago and he established his domicile at Edmundston in the parish of St. Francis, in the county of Madawaska, in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. How long ago ?

Mr. STOCKTON.

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot say exactly, but I know it was at least a year ago, and since then he has been a resident of New Brunswick and he owns property within that province on which he has qualified. Mr. Gillmor is a resident voter in the parish of St. George, in the county of Charlotte, in the province of New Brunswick, and he has for years been recognized as such. I state that on the authority of Mr. Gillmor himself. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) says Mr. Gillmor has simply a summer house there, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Gillmor resides in the old homestead in the town of St. George, N.B.; the house occupied by his respected father——

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Gillmor lives in that house at any time except in the summer?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I have been in that old homestead during other than in the summer months and Mr. Gillmor was residing there with his family, and that house is occupied as his residence the year round. There are those in the house who look after it for him and he has what is known as a summer residence on the shore. Mr. Gillmor claims that he never lost his domicile that he has always continued to be a resident of the county of Charlotte and that that is his home to-day as it always has been.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Blair says he never lost his habitation either.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope we shall deal with the question before us in a dignified manner, and I have no desire to bring into the discussion the name of any other than of those who are directly interested. Mr. Costigan is quite as much a resident of the province of New Brunswick as my hon. friend from St. John county (Mr. Stockton) is; he spends most of his time there except when parliament is in session; he has no home in Ottawa now; he disposed of his property here some time ago and is domiciled in the town of Edmunston in the county of Madawaska. The very fact that my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Stockton) has dragged into the discussion the names of certain gentlemen in the province of New Brunswick, shows that his desire in this matter is not so disingenious as he would lead us to believe. I cannot see how his reference to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Leblanc) or to an ex-member of this House, who now lives in St. John, can have anything to do with the matter.

Mr. STOCKTON. I merely mention that to show that the government had many men in the province of New Brunswick about whose eligibility there could be no question, so there was no necessity to run this risk.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) is of course smooth and pleasant

as he always is—when he is not that he is profound—and I can quite understand why he introduced the names of these gentlemen. Well, there are many eligible men in New Brunswick, the woods are full of them, and if we could gather them all into the Senate of Canada they would make a very representative body. However, the Hon. Mr. Costigan and the Hon. Mr. Gillmor are both residents of New Brunswick; they are old time New Brunswickers; they were born in New Brunswick; they have lived there all their lives except when the service of their country or their business called them elsewhere. Mr. Gillmor has more property in the county of Charlotte than probably any five members in this House have in any part of New Brunswick. He is a member of the firm of Gillmor & O'Brien, a firm which has been carrying on business for years in the town of St. George, and he participates in the management of this business which requires him to be there a certain portion of his time. Mr. Gillmor has returned from the city of St. John to the county of Charlotte, he is there now and has been there for a week.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and he will be there for a great deal longer than some of my hon. friends opposite will be here. So far as I am interested in the matter of these appointments, I want to say that I take my full share of responsibility, and I take credit for them. With respect to the Hon. Mr. Costigan, he held a unique position in this country. There is no man in public life in Canada or who has ever been in public life in Canada, who has had the continued esteem and support of his constituents as has the Hon. Mr. Costigan. Elected at the very first election in 1867 as the representative of the county of Victoria in the parliament of Canada, he has sat in this House continuously from that time to the present, and he has not in any sense been compelled to go out of the House now. Probably he could have continued to represent the county of Victoria here to the end of his natural life. I say his position is a unique one. More than that, I say that it is probably without a parallel, not merely in the history of Canada, but in the history of the empire, and I certainly as one am not ashamed of the appointment of the Hon. John Costigan to the Senate of Canada. Hon. members opposite may for a purpose question his qualification as to residence, but in no other respect can they say a word as to his qualifications. He has been a patriot; he has been true to Canada; he has been a lifetime in politics, and to-day he is a poor man; and I am sure that there is not a man on either side of the House who will say that the appointment of that gentleman to the Senate of Canada is not an excellent one. His experience as a legislator, as an administrator in the government of the country, and as a man of the people eminently fits him for the position. As to Mr. Gillmor, very great credit is due to that gentleman. He is a worthy son of a worthy sire. The name of the Hon. A. H. Gillmor will go down in the history of New Brunswick, and that of his son is respected far and wide. Daniel Gillmor, it is true, has been away from his old home a good deal of the time, doing what? Building up one of the finest businesses in the country. The firm of which he is a prominent member has a continental reputation, and Mr. Gillmor's name is widely know as that of a business man of probity and honour, and he is always known as a citizen of New Brunswick. Never has Daniel Gillmor travelled anywhere without signing his name on the hotel register as Dan. Gillmor, from the town of St. George, in New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it always Dan.?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, always Dan. My hon. friend is generally designated by another name, but everybody designates Mr. Gillmor as Dan. Gillmor.

Mr. FOSTER. My name is not Dan., that is all.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not, but you have another soubriquet. Mr. Gillmor has no reason to be ashamed of his name. In these appointments the government certainly has not committed an error. While they could have made many other excellent selections, the selections which they have made I think are par excellence. Although they might have been equalled, certainly there could not have been any better selections made from the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend from York and my hon. friend from St. John may speak of the cohorts coming from the counties to the Liberal convention—and they used to be among the cohorts—but there has never been in the province of New Brunswick a Liberal convention attended by such great numbers or animated by such enthusiasm—not even in the palmy days when the cohorts could come and listen to the eloquence of my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John. Therefore, I think I can fairly say that I am in a better position to speak for the province of New Brunswick than my hon. friend from York, who claims to speak for it, and I say that the appointment of Messrs. Gillmor and Costigan will be supported strongly and enthusiastically by the people of New Brunswick, and I claim some credit for those appointments.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that the case for the appointments, and even the case for the appointees, would not have been any worse at least if it had been left where the Prime Minister left it. I am not sure that the impetuous and somewhat unique way in which my hon. friend who has just

taken his seat (Mr. Emmerson) has dashed into this legal controversy, has done very much to strengthen the advocacy of this particular case. He spoke of these gentlemen being worthy sons of worthy sires. Well, I suppose there are other gentlemen in the province of New Brunswick who are equally worthy sons of worthy sires, and both their sires and themselves have always lived and been residents in the province of New Brunswick. I did not quite know before that it was an essential qualification for an appointment by the present government to a senatorship that a man should have represented his county for a lifetime——

Mr. EMMERSON. That would disqualify you sure.

Mr. FOSTER—and have enjoyed the uninterrupted confidence of the electorate. It seems to me that the history of appointments in the Senate by the right hon. leader of the government would rather incline us to believe that a different kind of qualification was necessary for an appointment to that chamber, namely, that the gentleman who received it had failed to command the confidence of his constituency or his province. One of the latest appointments to the Senate from the province of Ontario is that of a gentleman who has not been able to command the confidence of his province. I am saying nothing personal against my old friend, Mr. Ross, but it was not because he kept the undivided support and confidence of the province of Ontario, of which he was the premier for several years, that he has been appointed to the Senate. The same is true of Mr. Gillmor, who failed to carry his constituency. Then, my hon. friend said that Mr. Gillmor owned property in the province of New Brunswick. That is altogether aside from the case. How many men are there, thousands of men, who own property in two, three or four provinces? The fact that a gentleman owns property in a province does not make him a resident of that province. Something else is required, and the question is whether that something else is present in the case of these two appointments to the Senate. But the most naive assertion of my hon. friend was this. Driven from other points, seeing their insufficiency, he at last landed with both feet upon solid ground, and he declared that Mr. 'Dan.' Gillmor, who was appointed a senator for the province of New Brunswick, had been for the last week in the county of Charlotte and in the province of New Brunswick. Well, that settles the question of residence—if not to the satisfaction of all, evidently to the satisfaction of my hon. friend.

In discussing briefly these appointments, let it be understood at the outset that I have nothing to say personally with reference to these two gentlemen. One has been an old colleague and friend of my own for many years. The other is a worthy man, the son, as my hon. friend said, of a worthy sire in New Brunswick. Personally we are not discussing these gentlemen at all, except perhaps in the sense in which my hon. friend, who preceded me thought it was necessary to make some personal observations. There is a good deal in what he said when he described the appointment of Mr. Costigan as unique. It does not often happen that a gentleman who has been opposed to a political party—and opposed to it conscientiously and seriously—for the greater part of his lifetime; a gentleman who, up to the very last moment his own party remained in power and office, was a colleague in the ministry and the recipient of the emoluments of office, but who almost the next day turned around and worshipped the star in the ascendent and became the apologist and partisan of the gentlemen he had opposed for the greater part of his life—it does not often happen that such a gentleman should receive by a roundabout way, from what I think may not improperly be called a fictitious residence, an appointment to the Senate over the heads of other gentlemen who for their lifetime—equally strenuous, equally honest, equally serviceable—have always been friends and strong friends of the party in power, but who have been relegated to the back seats to make way for a gentleman of the stripe and qualifications I have named. Would the right hon. gentleman have us suppose that this was a mark of his political generosity? I do not think he would. He did not make that proposition during the course of his address, and I do not think he would want us to view his action in that light. Was there any other reason why Mr. Costigan was appointed as a representative of New Brunswick in the Senate? For many years he had a residence in that province, in the county of Victoria and the town of Grand Falls. Until this moment I never knew he had a residence in Edmundston, which is some forty-two miles above Grand Falls, and where certainly he never lived and his family never lived. That was news to me, but at the same time I am not going to deny, if the Prime Minister says he has a residence there and lived there, that he does not own property and have a house in that locality. But this fact is given me which I believe to be true, namely, that at this very moment Mr. Costigan is assessed in the city of Ottawa as a tenant. The house he occupies is owned by his son-in-law. Of course it is not necessary for a man to own property in order to be a resident. I think a man may be a resident and not be a property holder. But to all intents and purposes, the right hon. gentleman the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) knows, every man on the cabinet benches knows, that for years Mr. Costigan has not been a resident in New Brunswick but a resident and a voter in the province

of Ontario and the city of Ottawa. Now there is no use juggling with facts or putting sham arguments before the country. The country will take them at their worth, and everybody here in the city of Ottawa, who knows Mr. Costigan and who has any knowledge of his affairs, knows that he has for ten or fifteen years been and is to-day a resident of this city. In that he may show his good taste and appreciation of this city. Certainly no fault can be found with him if he choses to have his residence in the capital rather than somewhere else.

With reference to Mr. Gillmor, we have the very same fact. If you are going to make it a sufficient qualification for a man to represent any province in the Senate, that he owns a summer residence or any other place in that province, you are coming to a conclusion which cannot be justified. Hundreds of thousands of men own property in more than one province, but that does not constitute them necessarily residents of any one province in which they may own property but where they do not reside. And it cannot be argued, with any show of reason, that a summer house or other house in any one province makes a man a resident of that province. I would ask my right hon. friend a question. Does he consider, after the inquiries he has made, that Mr. Gillmor would be sufficiently a resident of the city of Montreal and the town of Westmount to entitle him to be named as a senator for the province of Quebec ? Does he doubt that Montreal has been for the last twelve or fifteen years the chief place of residence of Mr. Gillmor, and that his visits to New Brunswick have been chiefly visits to his respected father, and that, if he owns property there, it is not his place of residence but that his chief place of residence is in the city of Montreal? Does my right hon. friend deny that, as far as property qualification is concerned, the residence of Mr. Gillmor in Montreal would qualify him for a seat in the Senate as representing the province of Quebec? Can a man have two domiciles—two residences ?

An hon. MEMBER. Certainly, half a dozen.

Mr. FOSTER. You then have to choose between the two, and there is only one choice to make and that is the place which is the permanent domicile of the gentleman in question. In the case of Mr. Gillmor that certainly is the province of Quebec and not the province of New Brunswick.

The hon. gentlemen who have spoken here have spoken largely from a New Brunswick standpoint. But this is not a question which should be viewed simply from that standpoint. It is just as much a question for members from the other provinces as for those from the province of New Brunswick. The spirit of our constitution, as was admirably shown by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton), is that the balance wielded by the representatives of the different provinces, smaller and greater, in the House of Commons and the Senate, should be regulated by the appointment to the Senate in larger numbers proportionately from the smaller provinces, thus counterbalancing to some extent the discrepancy in the Commons, and therefore that appointments to the Senate from any province should be made of gentlemen who are permanent residents of that province and thus more naturally conservators of its interests. It was never contemplated by the fathers of confederation that a casual summer residence should be the residence stipulated in the British North America Act. What was contemplated was the permanent domicile in which they grew up and which identified their interests with the common every day interests of the province in which they live. The permanent residents of one province may have interests in the other. They may have in these other provinces large business interests, involving vast amounts of money and property, but their interests in those provinces are none the less casual as compared with their interests in the province in which they permanently reside; and the residence which is contemplated by our constitution is the permanent residence, and that is the qualification required, under the property clause, to entitle any man to be called to the Senate as a representative of any particular province.

Now, I ask hon. gentlemen from any of the other provinces to look upon this case in the province of New Brunswick as their own. Let me appeal, for instance, to hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, in which province senators are appointed to represent different districts. It is conceivable that many excellent gentlemen will have business both in the Montreal district and in the Quebec district, and may have a house in each. But our friends from any district in the province of Quebec would be very jealous that the man selected for territorial reasons to represent that particular district should be one whose permanent domicile and whose chief and natural interest was in the district he was to represent. Otherwise they would not be content, as it would be a violation of the spirit of the law under which the representation for these districts was given under the British North America Act. So, it is with the province of New Brunswick. The smaller provinces may be expected to guard with especial jealousy this point of representation and to look with the greatest disfavour upon any juggling with that representation. Take the province of Prince Edward Island with its few senators and its small and decreasing representation in this House. There may be gentlemen living in New Brunswick and having large interests in Prince Edward Island and living there for a portion of the year, respected

and welcome citizens, but still having their permanent domicile in the province of New Brunswick. Rightly enough would the province of Prince Edward Island resent the passing over of men from their own province to choose such a resident of New Brunswick as their representative in the Senate.

In my opinion, this country will be set thinking more than ever about the Senate by these recent appointments. There was the fact that the government kept these places vacant, used these appointments as pawns upon the political chessboard, treated them simply as the appanage of the party power, and, in defiance of the spirit of the constitution, kept the province of New Brunswick for two years out of its proper and requisite representation in the Senate. On a previous occasion, I declared that the government had no right in the world to do this. These senatorships do not belong to Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. These senatorships do not belong to Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government. These senatorships are the property of the people of the province of New Brunswick. And the right hon. gentleman who dispenses the patronage of the government is simply the trustee of the constitutional rights of the people of New Brunswick, and has no right in the world to leave a province partly unrepresented for two or three years in an important part of our constitutional system merely to suit his own partisan purposes—no right whatever. And the country does not like that sort of thing. The people did not take kindly to the disqualification of North Renfrew, for a year or more in the legislature of Ontario, which was the result of the position taken by the former premier of that province, Hon. G. W. Ross. Nothing contributed more to the creation of active public sentiment against Mr. Ross and his government than this high-handed disqualification of an important constituency for mere party and petty reasons. And this case is of exactly the same stripe. If it was reprehensible in Hon. Mr. Ross to cheat a portion of the people of Ontario out of their representation for a year or two, it is equally reprehensible for the Dominion government under the leadership of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to cheat the people out of—or keep from them, whichever he wishes me to say—a representative, keeping the appointment as a pawn upon the board to be played whenever that play was to his party's advantage. Is it true that Mr. Gillmor went down to New Brunswick at the solicitation of my right hon. friend and his friends, to enter a parliamentary contest there? Is it not true that he was persuaded to leave his domicile in Montreal, and go down to New Brunswick in order to oust my hon. friend the member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) who then represented the constituency? Is it true that Mr. Gillmor was urged to do this, that he did do it, and that he did it with plenty of the resources of civilization at his back? And it is said that he did not stir in the matter, until he had the promise that he would be given a senatorship should he fail to carry that constituency. Was there any promise made some years ago, to Hon. Mr. Costigan, with reference to a senatorship? And after all, is this straining of the constitution but another evidence of the old practice of the government of using public positions to purchase men to run its elections, and to reward them should they prove unsuccessful in those elections? Now, I have already said that people in this country are not too well satisfied with the condition of the Senate as it is to-day. The feeling against the Senate as it is to-day is being helped on by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is not too much to say that thoughtful people will add this last phase—no, not last, but this latest phase—of Senate appointments to the other reasons which they hold against the continuance of the Senate as carried on under the government of my right hon. friend. It is bad enough, heaven knows, to use the Senate vacancies as pawns in the game of mere partisanship, even when appointments are confined to those who are properly qualified to receive them. But it is far worse when you juggle with the spirit and letter of the constitution and give these appointments to men who, under a fair interpretation of the law are not qualified to receive them, to the detriment of men equally good who are undoubtedly qualified for appointment. Now, if my right hon. friend still wants to do what a few years ago he and many of his friends said they wanted to do—end the Senate, rather than amend it—he is going about that work in a very good way. Let him go on keeping senatorships vacant for one two or three years until he reconciles the differences within his party ranks, and, when the time comes when he must act, let him continue to juggle with the spirit and letter of the constitution, and, by means of that juggling rob a province of what is its constitutional due. That act has aroused a feeling in this country against the Senate chamber which it may be most difficult for him to allay. I protest against this, not that I have a word to say against the two gentlemen who are appointed, and I want that made clear; but I protest against it because of the reasons that I have given, that I consider it to be a violation of the spirit and of the letter of the constitution; that my right hon. friend has cheated, or kept, the province of New Brunswick out of its proper constitutional representation for a period of three years, and when at last he has filled it, he has filled it by straining out almost the whole strength and tension of the wording of the British North America Act. It is not necessary for me to debate this question longer. I have felt it necessary to make a vigorous protest, not only on behalf of the province

of New Brunswick which is aggrieved in this case, but on behalf of the other provinces which may be aggrieved in another case; and more particularly because I believe in a second chamber, and I am sorry to see things done which are raising a public sentiment which may, if things go on in this way demand a very drastic and perhaps in the end not the most useful change to be made.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). The hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) raised an objection to the appointment of the two gentlemen who have been appointed to the Senate for the province of New Brunswick. He says that these two men are good men in whom he can find no fault. So much then for the appointments that have been made. But he says that these appointments did not belong to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that they did not belong to the government, but that they belonged to the people of the province of New Brunswick. Now if these appointments did not belong to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, nor to the present government, surely it is equally true that they did not belong and do not belong either to the Conservative party, to the opposition in this House, or to the member for North Toronto. He says that these appointments belong to the people of New Brunswick. I should like to know by what authority the people of New Brunswick are represented in this House to-night by the hon. member for North Toronto. Surely, Sir, if there is one man in Canada whom the people of New Brunswick have distinctly and repeatedly said that they did not want to represent them as their attorney here, it is the hon. gentleman who sits for North Toronto to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me, I just wish to set him right on this point alone. He says if there is one man who has been repeatedly rejected by his old province, I am that man. I ran six elections in that province, and I was defeated only once.

Mr. MILLER. Well, the one defeat the hon. gentleman did suffer was so significant to him that he never ran the chance of another. Now I will say to the hon. member for North Toronto that he ought to be a little generous, a little kind, a little liberal, aye, and a little bit careful, for it may come to pass that some government, in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, may have some thought of appointing him to a seat in the Senate, and then it may be urged that he was but a bird of passage and if, to use his own words, it became necessary for him to prove a permanent domicile, I think he would have a very difficult task to perform.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I would not have said a word in this debate had it been confined to the hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies in the province of New Brunswick. As I listened to hon. gentlemen opposite I understood them to say that they objected to the appointment of the Hon. Mr. Gillmor and the Hon. Mr. Costigan on the ground that the representation of the province of New Brunswick was being limited. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I have absolutely nothing to say against his speech, urged that New Brunswick should have a chance to have additional representatives in the Senate. Now does it not seem strange that the hon. member for North Toronto, representing a constituency in the province of Ontario, should deny the favour which hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in New Brunswick said had been granted to the province of Ontario, that of added representation in the Senate? I think, Mr. Speaker, the real reason of the onslaught on the part of the opposition to-night upon the government, was revealed in the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto. The hon. gentleman did not complain because two gentlemen were appointed to the Senate, they would not have complained of the appointment of Mr. Gillmor alone, but they complained of the appointment of the Hon. John Costigan, and the real ground of their complaint was that during the last ten years he has been supporting a Liberal administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my satisfaction at the appointment of the Hon. John Costigan. If there is a man in this country who has commanded the respect of the people of Canada, and, if I may be allowed to say so, the respect of the people of the nationality to which he belonged, whether as a minister of a Conservative administration or as a supporter of the Liberal government, that gentleman is the Hon. John Costigan, and the people of Canada feel grateful to the government for appointing him to the Senate of Canada.

CANADIAN FISHERIES—LICENSES TO AMERICAN FISHERMEN.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker. I desire to discuss some matters relating to our Canadian fisheries, especially on the Atlantic coast,—so long a vexed and unsettled question; but I have more particularly in mind as the pertinent issue for discussion, the matter of the granting of licenses to American fishermen under a statute of the parliament of Canada, the resultant of a modus vivendi originating from the Treaty of Washington, of 1888.

I am quite conscious of the fact that I am raising a question that is old and difficult of solution, a question that has on more than one occasion perturbed the statesmen of England, the United States, and Canada, but one nevertheless that in the material interests of Canada, should not be thrust aside through the fear that it is incapable of solution: neither should it be placed in suspense because the enforcement of what

Canadians consider their unquestionable rights might disturb the present happy relations existing between the two great Anglo-Saxon nations.

I intend placing before the House, the history of this vexed question, and while I shall be as brief as is consistent with a fair and comprehensive presentment of the case, I crave the indulgence of hon. gentlemen if it should appear that I consume unnecessarily the time of the House.

What are the rights and privileges of the American fishermen in our jurisdictional waters, is, in the historical sense, an old question, and I purpose giving to the House in a general way its history, made up as it is of treaty, and statute.

This question had its birth at the close of the revolutionary struggle in the United States, when, by the treaty of 1783, England recognized the independence of the United States, and which treaty in its third article dealt with the fisheries.

Article 3 of the treaty of 1783, is as follows :

It is agreed that the people of the United States shall continue to enjoy unmolested the right to take fish of every kind on the Grand Bank, and all the other banks of Newfoundland ; also in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and at all other places in the sea where the inhabitants of both countries used at any time heretofore to fish. And also that the inhabitants of the United States shall have liberty to take fish of every kind on such part of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen shall use (but not to dry or cure the same on that island) and also on the coasts, bays and creeks of all other of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions in America ; and that the American fishermen shall have liberty to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, habours, and creeks of Nova Scotia, Magdalen Islands, and Labrador, so long as the same shall remain unsettled.

By this article, the United States was permitted a common enjoyment with all other subjects of the realm, just as if no revolution had taken place, and both countries were united happily under one government. It was a remarkable concession, and, as an eminent American senator remarked, it is only explainable upon the ground that Britain was anxious for peace, and the unsettled and barren coast adjoining the northeastern waters were regarded of little value.

Then came the war of 1812 which terminated that common enjoyment, and the easement which American fishermen had enjoyed in our waters.

The treaty of Ghent, which terminated this war, is silent as to the fisheries. The British contended that the war of 1812 terminated the fishery clauses of the treaty of 1783. The Americans refused to assent to this and the issue remained unsettled until 1818, when a new treaty was negotiated and a new arrangement was made respecting the rights of American fishermen in British territorial waters.

Article 1 of this treaty is as follows :

Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States for the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, habours and creeks of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the United States shall have for ever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the southern coasts of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands ; on the western and northern coast of Newfoundland from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and also on the coasts, bays, harbours and creeks from Mount Jolly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belle Isle, and thence northwardly indefinitely along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson Bay Company.

And the United States hereby renounce forever any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above mentioned limits; provided, however, that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays and harbours for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish hereby reserved to them.

It will be observed that the former part of this article defines and delimits the waters which were to be held in common enjoyment by the inhabitants of both countries, so far, of course, as the fisheries were concerned.

The latter half of the article is the important part ; it is fundamental in a discussion of the fisheries question. By it, the United States renounced any right to take, dry, or cure fish within three marine miles of our coast, bays, creeks, or harbours not included in the waters defined in the former part of the article. They also renounced the right of American fishermen to enter our bays or harbours except for four purposes: shelter, repairs, wood and water.

The American people claim that this is a harsh and inhuman restriction. If such a restriction applied to ordinary commercial privileges the claims might be well founded. But it must be remembered the treaty makers were solely dealing with the rights of American fisherman, they were dealing with an industry and its prosecution, and not with a question relating to the ordinary commercial rights of the United States in our waters.

Britain had, by the treaty of 1818, granted to the United States vast concessions in our jurisdictional waters, as set forth in the

first part of article 1 of the treaty. For instance, they were given the right to take fish on the shores of the Magdalen islands. This was a most important concession to American fishermen, and is so regarded by them to-day. At certain months each year they frequent the coast around the Magdalen islands and within our territorial waters secure bait fish and other fish on equal terms with our own fishermen, and at an important part of the fishing season. Now, this is an instance where American fishermen have all the rights of our fishermen right in our own waters, and one can little wonder that our fishermen expect and ask a strict enforcement of other sections of the treaty where it is restrictive or prohibitive as against American fishermen.

In the discussion of the treaty of Washington of 1888 in the American Senate, the remarks of Senator Grey in respect to the enforcement of the restrictive features of clause 1 of the treaty of 1818 are so eminently fair, that I shall venture to read them. He said:

> For all practical purposes the terms of this article——

—referring to article 1 of the treaty of 1818.

> —are the foundation of any discussion as to the fishery rights of the people of the United States in those waters, and all suggestions of our former tenancy in common and our rights under the treaty of 1783 were barren of results, and besides the question with which we are now concerned. By the terms of this deliberate and solemn convention we undertook to define, and did define and limit the territorial waters in which our common right of fishery was preserved and conceded, and we, by no less explicit terms, renounced the right of fishery 'within 3 marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above-mentioned limits.' However it may suit the purposes of the Senator from Maine, who I am sorry not to see in his seat this morning to denounce the negotiations of that treaty now, it was believed at the time of its negotiation to have achieved for the fishermen of the United States important and valuable advantages.
>
> A glance at the map will show into what intimate participation of the fishery rights of Canadian waters we were admitted, and it is a small wonder that a rigid construction of the terms of exclusion was soon insisted upon by the Canadian fishermen, and that difficulties which taxed the best diplomacy of both countries soon arose. They could not be avoided. The conditions of the case were peculiar and unprecedented. Let us be just and even generous to the other side in stating the situation, as a great, powerful and brave people should be and can well afford to be. In being so we need not fear the sneer of any who shall say that we are arguing the Canadian side of the controversy. God help the country and the people if those in whose hands they have placed the trust of power shall refuse to look at both sides and all sides of questions which involve the issues of peace or war and the national honour and welfare.
>
> The inhabitants of those storm swept and fog enveloped coasts led lives environed by many hardships. A rigorous climate and an unproductive soil were sources of a poverty which was only alleviated by the advantage which nature had given them in their proximity to the abundance of the seas. And on their coasts and in their bays and on the grand banks, which lay within easy sail, they were enabled to make the struggle for existence on something like equal terms with their more fortunate neighbours to the south It was natural and human, though selfish that they should wish to retain in their exclusive control as far as possible these advantages which nature and geography had given them, and that they should look with jealousy on the right of participation which was by the convention of 1818 granted to American fishermen in those great landlocked waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence on their coasts and in their bays.

This I submit is a fair answer of the charge that the provisions of the treaty of 1818 are harsh as against the United States. It states the Canadian case fairly because it states that the treaty of 1818 give to United States fishermen important concessions ; and it states that Canadians naturally look for a strict enforcement of the treaty, especially where it was restrictive as against American fishermen.

After the treaty of 1818 imperial and colonial Acts of parliament were passed for the enforcement of the treaty. It is true that a great deal of friction resulted and that the best diplomacy of both countries were taxed to preserve peace between the two countries. A great many American vessels were seized for violations of the treaty and the invasion of our inshore fisheries. The headland question, which I do not to-day propose discussing, developed, and was the source of much trouble and much diplomatic negotiations. All disputes and differences as to the fisheries were put to sleep by the negotiations of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which continued down to 1866, when it expired upon the notice of the United States.

Canada was then thrown back on the treaty of 1818. Then arose all the troubles which took place anterior to the reciprocity treaty of 1854. American fishermen were constantly violating the treaty and invading our territorial waters in the pursuit of the fisheries. I do not intend reviewing the nature of these conflicts, although very interesting, because they are hardly germane to the subject of discussion which I have in mind. Then occurred another period of peace, and cessation of disputes over the fisheries by the negotiations of the treaty of Washington of 1871, which continued to 1885. This treaty of Washington terminated in the middle of the fishing season of 1885, and in order to avoid unnecessary friction, the Canadian government continued to give to American fishermen all the privileges which they enjoyed under the fisheries clauses of the Washington treaty, and without any quid pro quo from the

United States. I merely recite this to show that Canada has always extended to the United States the greatest leniency and forbearance in connection with the fishery disputes, and has always evinced an honest desire to settle once and for all this troublesome issue. In 1885 I think, the President of the United States recommended to congress the appointment of a joint commission by the government of the United States and England, to negotiate a treaty of settlement, but the United States congress rejected the recommendation and Canada was again obliged to fall back upon the treaty of 1818, and seizures of American vessels again suggested the necessity of a delimitation of the waters referred to in the treaty of 1818.

The next step in the history of the fisheries question was a treaty negotiated in 1888 known as the 'Treaty of Washington of 1888,' the British plenipotentiaries being Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, L. S. Sackville West and Sir Charles Tupper; the American representatives being T. F. Bayard, William L. Putnam and James B. Angell. It is to this treaty that I particularly wish to direct attention, chiefly for the reason that, to this treaty was a protocol, voluntarily giving to the United States important concessions pending the interval between the making of the treaty and its ratification or rejection by the United States Senate, and it is because this protocol is still alive and in force as a statute in this country that I am impelled to discuss the matter to-day. Let me in a few words give to the House the text of that treaty, which will be found in chapter 30 of the Canadian statutes for 1888.

The first eight articles related to the delimitation of the waters, bays, creeks and harbours on the coast of Canada and Newfoundland, as to which the United States by the treaty of 1818 renounced for ever any right to take, cure and dry fish. The treaty provided for the appointment of a commission to make the delimitation, and the treaty also fixed the limits of exclusion under article 1 of the treaty of 1818 in certain waters. Article 9 was a declaration to the effect that the free navigation of the Strait of Canso was open to American fishing vessels. Article 10 related to customs and harbour regulations, while article 11 permitted American vessels entering Canadian or Newfoundland ports under stress of weather or other casualty to unload, reload, tranship or sell all fish on board and to replenish out fish, provisions and supplies damaged or lost by disaster. Articles 12, 13 and 14 I shall pass over, as not being important, but I wish to read article 15, which is as follows :—

Whenever the United States shall remove the duty from fish oil, whale oil, seal oil and fish of all kinds (except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of the fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada and of Newfoundland, including Labrador, as well as from the usual and necessary casks, barrels, kegs, cans and other usual and necessary coverings containing the products above mentioned the like products, being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, as well as the usual and necessary coverings of the same, as above described, shall be admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland.

And upon such removal of duties and while the aforesaid articles are allowed to be brought into the United States by British subjects without duty being reimposed theron, the privilege of entering the ports, bays and harbours of the aforesaid coasts of Canada and of Newfoundland shall be accorded to the United States fishing vessels by annual licenses, free of charge, for the following purposes, namely :—

1. The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits.

2. Transhipment of catch, for transport by any means of conveyance.

3. Shipping of crews.

Supplies shall not be obtained by barter, but bait may be so obtained.

The like privileges shall be continued or given to fishing vessels of Canada and of Newfoundland on the Atlantic coasts of the United States.

It will be observed that the concessions to be given to the United States was to be contingent upon the removal of certain duties, but in order to make article 15 operative, so far as the United States was concerned, before the exchange of ratifications, a protocol was attached to the treaty, and this protocol contained the modus vivendi. It is as follows :

The treaty having been signed the British plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland.

In the absence of such ratification the old conditions which have given rise to so much friction and irritation might be revived and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned.

Under these circumstances and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subject of controversy the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years in order to afford a modus vivendi pending the ratification of the treaty.

1. For a period not exceeding two years from the present date, the privilege of entering the bays and harbours of the Atlantic coasts of Canada and of Newfoundland shall be granted to the United States fishing vessels by annual licenses at a fee of $1.50 per ton, for the following purposes :

The purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits.

Transhipment of catch and shipping of crews.

2. If during the continuance of this arrangement the United States should remove

the duties on fish, fish oil, whale and seal oil (and their coverings, packages, &c.), the said licenses shall be issued free of charge.

3. United States fishing vessels entering the bays and harbours of the Atlantic coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland for any of the four purposes mentioned in Article 1 of the Convention of October 20, 1818, and not remaining therein more than twenty-four hours shall not be required to enter or clear at the custom house, providing that they do not communicate with the shore.

4. Forfeiture to be exacted only for the offences of fishing or preparing to fish in territorial waters.

5. This arrangement to take effect as soon as the necessary measures can be completed by the colonial authorities.

To this protocol freely offered by the British commissioners, the American representatives replied in the following memorandum :

The American plenipotentiaries having received the communication of the British plenipotentiaries of this date conveying their plan for the administration to be observed by the government of Canada and Newfoundland in respect of the fisheries during the period which may be requisite for the consideration by the Senate of the treaty this day signed, and the enactment of the legislation by the respective governments therein proposed, desire to express their satisfaction with this manifestation of an intention on the part of the British plenipotentiaries, by the means referred to, to maintain the relations of good neighbourhood between the British possessions in North America and the United States, and they will convey the communication of the British plenipotentiaries to the President of the United States with a recommendation that the same may be by him made known to the Senate for its information, together with the treaty when the latter is submitted to that body for ratification.

The protocol was given statutory effect by the same Act of our parliament which ratified the treaty and will be found in section 12 of the treaty of Washington Act, 1888, and which is not necessary to read.

It will be observed that parliament at this time agreed to give to American fishermen the privileges mentioned in the protocol, for a period of two years, and this was known as the modus vivendi. After the American Senate rejected the treaty, and after the two years elapsed, the Canadian government continued the modus vivendi under statutory authority taken each year from parliament. In the year 1892, an Act was passed giving to the Governor in Council power to issue licenses annually to American fishermen for the same purposes and of the scope as that contemplated under the protocol of the treaty, and the Act of the parliament of Canada in 1888, limiting the period of issuance to two years.

These licenses have been issued every year since, and this is the crux of my remarks, the feature that I object to, and which I submit is a condition that should not prevail and should not be continued.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? That modus vivendi gave this privilege quite freely, did it not ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The vessels were to be licensed. $1.50 a ton was to be paid. I did not intend to refer to that, because the amount of the fee is trifling.

Mr. FOSTER. It was simply to reserve the right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It has that effect. As the modus vivendi originated with this treaty, let me revert briefly to the treaty of Washington of 1888. One might well wonder upon what grounds the American Senate rejected that treaty. You may look for reasons but obtain none. Not one line of that treaty so far as I can see contained an advantage to Canada other than what she had always enjoyed. The whole treaty was pregnant with privileges and rights to American fishermen, none of which belonged to them under the treaty of 1818, nor by international law. I do not believe that even any reputable jurist of the United States, will deny that many of the clauses of the treaty extended the rights granted them in the treaty of 1888. After all, the whole scope of the treaty was intended as a definition of the treaty of 1818 and the delimitation of the waters affected by that treaty, and without diminishing the treaty rights of American fishermen one would imagine the treaty would have met with their hearty approval. The American government were complaining constantly that their vessels were being molested and arrested and condemned without justice. Anything which would have made clear the treaty of 1818 would have minimized the liability of American vessels violating the treaty, and becoming amenable to any Dominion laws intended for the enforcement of the treaty. The headland question was fixed and many other features of the treaty which they regarded as doubtful were made certain.

Now, my only reason for referring to the action of the American Senate is to point out the utter absence of reasonable and frank consideration of that treaty by the Senate of that day. Perhaps it would not be altogether uninteresting to refer to the course of that treaty in the Senate. It was of course given to the Senate by President Cleveland, and in that message he deals very forcibly and luridly with the treaty, and I would like to read a portion of his message to the Senate accompanying the treaty :

The proposed delimitation of the lines of the exclusive fisheries from the common fisheries will give certainty and security as to the area of their legitimate field; the headland theory of imaginary lines is abandoned by Great Britain, and the specification in the treaty of certain named bays especially provided for gives satisfaction to the inhabitants of the shores without subtracting materially from the

value or convenience of the fishery rights of Americans.

The uninterrupted navigation of the Strait of Canso is expressly and for the first time affirmed, and the four purposes for which our fishermen under the treaty of 1812 were allowed to enter the bays and harbours of Canada and Newfoundland within the belt of three marine miles are placed under a fair and liberal construction, and their enjoyment secured without such conditions and restriction as in the past have embarrassed and obstructed them so seriously.

The enforcement of penalties for unlawfully fishing or preparing to fish within the inshore and exclusive waters of Canada and Newfoundland is to be accomplished under safeguards against oppressive or arbitrary action, thus protecting the defendant fishermen from punishment in advance of trial, delays and inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

The history of events in the last two years shows that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and on every occasion of temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbours.

Such inconvenience is provided against in the proposed treaty and this most frequent and just cause of complaint is removed.

The articles permitting our fishermen to obtain provisions and the ordinary supplies of trading vessels on their homeward voyages, and under which they are accorded the further and even more important privilege on on all occasions of purchasing such casual or needful provisions or supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels, are of great importance and value.

The licenses which are to be granted without charge and on application, in order to enable our fishermen to enjoy these privileges, are reasonable and proper checks in the hands of the local authorities to identify the recipient and prevent abuse, and form no impediment to those who intend to use them fairly.

The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal.

These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the treaty of 1818 for which contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State and our minister at London, and by the American negotiators of the present treaty.

The right of our fishermen under the treaty of 1818 did not extend to the procurement of distinctive fishery supplies in Canadian ports and harbours; and one item supposed to be essential, to wit, bait, was plainly denied them by the explicit and definite words of the treaty of 1818, emphasized by the course of the negotiation and express decision which proceeded the conclusion of that treaty.

The treaty now submitted contains no provision affecting tariff duties, and independently of the position assumed upon the part of the United States that no alteration in our tariff or other domestic legislation could be made as the price or consideration of obtaining the rights of our citizens secured by treaty, it was considered more expedient to allow any change in the revenue laws of the United States to be made by the ordinary exercise of legislative will and in promotion of the public interests. Therefore, the addition to the free list of fish, fish-oil, whale and seal-oil, &c., recited in the last article of the treaty, is wholly left to the action of Congress; and in connection therewith the Canadian and Newfoundland right to regulate sales of bait and other fishing supplies within their own jurisdiction is recognized, and the right of our fishermen to freely purchase these things is made contingent, by this treaty, upon the action of Congress in the modification of our tariff laws.

Our social and commercial intercourse with those populations who have been placed upon our borders and made for ever our neighbours is made apparent by a list of United States common carriers, marine and inland, connecting their lines with Canada, which was returned by the Secretary of the Treasupy to the Senate on the 7th day of February, 1888, in answer to a resolution of that body; and this is instructive as to the great volume of mutually profitably interchanges which have come into existence during the last half century.

This intercourse is still but partially developed, and if the amicable enterprise and wholesome rivalry between the two populations be not obstructed, the promise of the future is full of fruits of an unbounded prosperity on both sides of the border.

The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantages and convenience are the only permanent foundation of peace and friendship between states, and that with the adoption of the agreement now placed before the Senate a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established so as to secure perpetual peace and harmony.

In connection with the treaty herewith submitted I deem it also my duty to transmit to the Senate a written offer or agreement, in the nature of a modus vivendi, tendering after the conclusion of the treaty on the part of the British plenipotentiaries, to secure kindly and peaceful relations during the period that may be required for the consideration of the treaty by the respective governments and for the enactment of the necessary legislation to carry its provisions into effect if approved.

This paper, freely and on their own motion, signed by the British conference, not only extends advantages to our fishermen pending the ratification of the treaty, but appears to have been dictated by a friendly and amicable spirit.

This message of the president clearly outlined the purport of the treaty, and the advantages accruing to the United States therefrom.

If hon. gentlemen will bear with me I would like also to read the views of Mr. Bayard as expressed after the treaty was concluded, in an interview with the Washington correspondent of "The Boston Herald,' published in that paper on February the 20th, 1888, secretary Bayard, speaking of the fisheries treaty, said :

It gives us everything I demanded in my correspondence with Great Britain on the fisheries question.

Hereafter the rights secured to us by the treaty of 1818—of shelter, repairs, wood, and water—are to be freely exercised without any such friction as the vexatious customs regulations of Canada have produced.. . . . Nay, more, United States fishing vessels under stress of weather or other casualty may unload, transfer, or sell all fish on board in a Canadian port ; may replenish outfits, provisions, and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; may ship men to supply vacancies arising from death or sickness, and may purchase supplies for a homeward voyage.

Adding that——

If such a treaty as this had been in force during the past three years we would have never had a complaint from our fishermen.

But, say the critics, the treaty does not secure us the right to buy bait and other fishing supplies unless we admit fish, and fish, whale, and seal oil free of duty as a consideration. How else, I would ask, could we get that right ? It was expressly excluded from the treaty of 1816.

What Canada does say is that, if she becomes our partner in the fishing business, supplying us with bait and seines and other fishing supplies, she shall be allowed to share the market with us. But this is all over and beyond the real and substantial advantages secured to us by the treaty.

I do not believe the country will see a peaceful and honourable settlement, promoting good neighbourhood, the object of all treaties, set aside by a little knot of partisans for political ends. I do not believe the country wants to see our northern border lined, first with custom-houses and then with forts, our intercourse with Canada broken up, and our fishermen absolutely excluded from Canadian waters.

Senator Gray, of Delaware speaking in the Senate, when the treaty was under consideration, said :

In place of the condition of rigid exclusion from the inhibited bays and harbours under the treaty of 1818, except for the four purposes of shelter, repairs, wood, and water, and these only available under police regulations which made them well nigh valueless, our fishermen are accorded under this article almost entire and complete freedom of resort to these same bays and harbours at all times and for all purposes. They are relieved even from some of the burdens attaching to trading vessels.

The only things not permitted are the purchase of distinctively fishing outfits and the shipping of crews, and these things are permitted in the cases of loss or casualty.

Now, what is the position of Canada under this treaty ? Is it a fair and just one for her to assume, and one which it is right and just for us to concede ? I declare that it is both, and no fair man, it seems to me, can say otherwise. She has conceded nearly all that we have any right in fairness to ask. We have no right to demand that while we shut her out of our markets, she should give up without reserve every advantage that she possesses by reason of her geographical position and proximity to the great fishing-banks off her coasts, and that we shall make her harbours our basis of fishing operations while we refuse to share with her any advantage that we possess. I repeat she has given us nearly everything we ask and more than we had the right to demand.

These extracts which I have read from the interview with Secretary Bayard and the speech of Senator Gray, together with the Presidential message, contain a fair and unanswerable presentment of the advantages accruing to the United States, and one might well imagine such a treaty meeting with the approval of the Senate, receiving at least deliberate consideration. How was it treated ? As is well known, the American constitution provides that the Senate on consideration of treaties can go into secret executive session. During the whole history of the United States this was, I believe, the first treaty ever considered in open session. My object in referring to this is to show that the treaty was made the football of party politics, largely, I presume, because the Presidential election was forthcoming in the fall of 1888. When the treaty first came to the Senate a motion was made to consider the treaty with open doors and this was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which reported back the motion adversely.

It might not be uninteresting to give to the House the views of some senators, as expressed on the floor of the Senate, indicating the special treatment extended to this treaty, and how and why it was all discussed in open session, and hon. gentlemen will, I am sure, agree with me when I say that the treaty was inhospitably dealt with.

Senator Salisbury, in expressing his opposition to the discussion of the treaty in open executive session, said :

It is known by the published proceedings of the secretive executive session relating to the treaty that the Democratic members of the Senate voted against a motion made by the Senator from Massachusetts to consider the treaty in open executive session, and that the Republican side of this Chamber voted for that motion. This fact has been made the basis for the assertion by the Republican press that the Democratic senators so voted because they believed the treaty indefensible and desired to prevent a public exposure of its real character. Indeed, it has been intimated upon this floor that our opposition to a public discussion of the treaty proceeded from that cause. These statements may have prejudiced some persons against the treaty who know nothing of its merits, and will justify a brief statement of the facts relating to the consideration of the treaty in open execuive session. Soon after this treaty was sent to the Senate, the senator from Virginia (Mr. Riddleberger) offered a resolution providing for the consideration of the treaty with open doors, which was referred to the committee on foreign relations. That committee at the proper time took the resolution into consideration and reported it back adversely. When it came up in this body the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Hoar) made an able speech in opposition to an open discussion of the treaty and depicted in a most solemn manner the danger of discussing treaties with foreign powers in open

executive session. He was followed by the senator from Vermont in an equally able and elaborate argument on the same side, deprecating the injury which would be inflicted on the country by discussing in public treaties negotiated with foreign countries. Mr. Hawley, of Connecticut, ably presented the same view of the matter, and upon a yea-and-nay vote only three senators voted for open discussion. In less than forty-eight hours thereafter (I believe on the very next day) a Republican caucus was held, and it was determined by the caucus that the treaty should be considered with open doors. Then the humiliating sight was presented of every Republican senator, with one exception (Mr. Hale, of Maine), coming into the Senate and voting for an open executive session, reversing their own action upon the Riddleberger resolution. No more humiliating sight was ever witnessed in the American Senate ; senators who had declared that the interest of the country in its foreign relations would be sacrified by repealing or suspending the rule of the body which had existed from the foundation of the government, requiring the consideration of treaties in secret session, at the mandate of a party caucus for a partisan purpose, deliberately bartering their expressed convictions and surrendering their opinions upon a matter of public duty in order to obtain a supposed party advantage. It is supposed that there is a class of voters in this country who are opposed to any treaty or other freindly relations with Great Britain, and the public discussion of the proposed treaty was decreed by a party caucus in order that appeals might be made to their prejudices which would influence their votes in the coming presidential election. This side of the Chamber deprecates most sincerely the prostitution of the high function of the Senate as a part of the treaty making power of the government to partisan purpose, and regrets the evil consequences which may result to the country in the conduct of its foreign relations from the example which has been set in the consideration of this treaty by the Republican members of this body.

Senator Morgan, speaking along the same lines, said :

It was a startling surprise to me, as it must have been to my colleagues on the committee, to find, as we did, on yesterday, by acknowledgments of no uncertain sort on this floor, that a caucus decree had preceded the discussion of the treaty, which forbade the allowance of any amendments by its friends or the friends of any sort of negotiation, by which it could be in any way improved or made more acceptable to the country. The caucus edict has crushed an amendment that was presented in committee by a very distinguished senator of the majority, and has silenced other senators on that side who said that they had amendments to offer.

I am glad to know that no political party ever before attempted thus to impose upon a question of foreign policy the embarrassments of domestic party politics. It rejoices me to find that the party that would attempt to do such a thing makes this broad confession that all its other policies have failed to engage the confidence of the people. In its wild distress it thus addresses itself to the task of doing what it hopes will enable it to regain power by a united appeal to a supposed restless desire of our people for strife and war and to old resentments towards Great Britain, recently intensified amongst our Irish population by the conduct of that government towards their friends in Ireland. The party that made this decree in its caucus, that this treaty should neither be amended nor ratified, feels the sad need of a new issue for its campaign.

Let me also quote from Senator George, who, discussing this phase of the treaty, said :

Mr. President, for the one hundred years of the existence of our constitution this examination and inquiry have been made under circumstances which allowed the freest interchange of views between members of this body, the fullest discussion and the calmest consideration. Our deliberations were confidential, foreign nations having adverse interests were excluded. They were not allowed to know the arguments, the reasons, the motives which controlled our nation.

That the American people, our masters, ought to be allowed to know what their agents, their servants are doing, and the reasons for their action may be admitted in a general sense, but it is also true that it is unsafe, unwise to permit foreign nations with whom we are treating to be admitted into our secret councils and thus learn our views, our motives, the arguments and reasons on which we act. They give us no admission to theirs.

Up to this time the American Senate, without complaint from the American people have denied this privilege to foreign nations, subordinating the lesser rights of the people to be present at those deliberations to their greater right, the right to have their business transacted in a manner most advantageous to them, most consonant to their safety and welfare, the right to exclude foreign nations from intrusion into their councils. This view prevailed in the American Senate as to this very treaty up to and on the 14th day of May last. On that day the Senate, by a vote of 41 to 3.—the negatives being Senators Dawes, Sherman and Teller—refused to admit the British Government and all others to our deliberations. On the 22nd of the same month the British and all the world were invited to be present by the vote of every Republican Senator but one. Mr Hale.

I believe, Sir, it is an open secret that this change in the attitude of the senators on the other sides, resulting in a consequent change in the uniform practice of the Senate, was brought about by the action of a caucus of conference of republican senators from which all the world was excluded. What arguments were urged, what reasons presented, which worked this extraordinary change are unknown to me, unknown to the world. The Republican senators became in some unknown way in secret council, from which the American people were excluded, convinced—solemnly convinced—by arguments and on reasoning which they dared not or would not commit to the American people, that secrecy in affairs, secrecy in making treaties was all wrong, that the universal practice of our fathers on this subject was all wrong. The inconsistency between the methods used and the end attained, the repugnance between the principles of these methods and the principles involved in this end, are so patent that it requires a large share of charity in judging mankind to believe that both are sin-

cere. The result—a declaration that secrecy in deliberations in conducting negotiations with a foreign power is all wrong, the exclusion of that power from our counsels is un-American, is reached in a secret caucus from which the American people themselves are excluded. It is not to be forgotton, however, that this change in regard to secret sessions of the Senate is not by any means the result of a conviction that such secrecy is in general wrong. The change is limited to this very treaty, for since the vote to consider this treaty in open session we have been considering all other executive business in secret. including not only treaties but matters of nominations to public offices which are purely of domestic concern. Thus we take into our confidence, admit to our secret counsels, Great Britain when we consider matters which seriously affect our relations with that empire, and we exclude from our confidence the American people when considering matters affecting them alone.

These quotations from senatorial speeches, along with the strange departure from a time honoured practice and rule, will indicate to the House that the treaty was considered in open session for some strange purpose.

Let me quote to you from the remarks of Senator Frye, who opposed the treaty, which will further indicate that even jingoism used this treaty for vote getting, and that the Senate majority never gave it the consideration its importance deserved or that consideration that was due to Great Britain, one of the signatories to the treaty. Senator Frye said :

Mr. President, the question before the Senate is, shall citizens of the United States, fishermen if you please, but citizens of the United States still, be protected against injustice, wrong and outrage, inflicted by a neighbouring nation emboldened to it only because they rest under the aegis of a mighty power beyond the seas ? That is the question to which the Senate must address itself now. Even these Yankee fishermen have entitled themselves to the respect of the United States Senate, to a lofty niche in the temple of liberty.

Why, Mr. President, they did more to wrest from France these very waters outlined here on the two maps on the wall behind me than all the rest of the whole British Empire together, and in the war for our independence their services can not be overestimated. They fought on every deck of every ship that Paul Jones commanded. Take that picture, drawn by General Knox, of the fishermen of Marblehead—perhaps entitled to contempt in the United States Senate because they are fishermen of Marblehead—see our revolutionary army on the banks of the river on that bitter cold night ; before them a foaming, rushing, mighty steam, huge cakes of ice crashing together ; Washington looking on in dismay, and finally demanding ' Who shall take this army across the river ' ? and the fishermen of Marblehead, the fishermen of Marblehead alone to a man, stepping forward and piloting the army across the perilous pathway to glory, power and independence.

In the war of 1812 the victories which we won on ocean and on lake were due largely to the powers, the skill and the patriotism of the Yankee fishermen. And in that last terrible struggle of this republic for her life there was not a single deck of an American ship unmoistened by their blood.

Do senators think that men who have made a history like this are entitled to be treated with contempt? Do senators think that there is no duty on the part of this great republic to listen to their cry ? When they ask for bread will you give them a stone ; for fish, a serpent ?

If we have another war it will be on the ocean. Who will man our ships ? Eighty-five per cent of the sailors on ships in the foreign trade are foreigners, owing the republic no allegiance, willing to render her no service. These fishermen are 80 per cent American citizens, 65 per cent American birth ; inured to hardship, constantly exposed to the perils of the sea, brave, skilful, patriotic, they would respond to a man to the bugle call of the country. Why should not the republic stand by them when they are in peril, when they are suffering wrong at the hands of a foreign power ?

One car hardly imagine a more irrational, disingenuous and unworthy form of argument as against the treaty. It is startling to find this flood of dangerous declamation coming from a distinguished senator, but nevertheless, this form of opposition to the treaty played an important part in its destruction. In justice to other members of the Senate I must say however that the patriotic cry raised by senator Frye and others, was ably and emphatically resented by others who made splendid appeals for the consideration of the treaty upon its merits. I would like to place on ' Hansard ' a few extracts from the remarks of one or two senators resenting the patriotic cry raised by senator Frye, and which will make plainer the plan of campaign which was waged against the treaty.

Senator Grey said :

I deprecate the fact that party lines seem to have been drawn in this debate ; they should never be recognizable in the determination of a great international question. But, Mr. President, thank God no party in this country has a monoply of patriotism, but if any party has a right to be proud of its traditions and its history as being distinctively and emphatically American, that party is the Democratic party. Holding within its ranks the great body of the plain men who depend upon their daily toil for their daily bread, it has from the beginning fought the battles of the masses against the classes, and passionately resented the influence of English or European traditions upon American institutions and laws.

In its nearly sixty years of unbroken ascendancy it has developed an illustrated American manhood and American courage on the land and on the sea in the only foreign wars in which our country was ever engaged, and under its patriotic leadership the pages of our history have been written in honour and in glory. A brave party, it does not need to protest its courage. It desires peace, but is not afriad of war. Above all, it desires to protect the honour and reputation of our country

by the justness and magnaminity of its dealings with the nations of the earth.

But it has never faltered and will never falter when steadfast courage and grim resolve are necessary to protect the humblest citizen who rightfully claims his country's protection. To this its history and traditions pledge it as no other party was ever pledged. This pledge the country knows that it will redeem when occasion demands.

If to be American is to maintain the highest standard of national honour; to be always willing to be just and ever generous in recognizing the rights of others; to feel that power and wealth and numbers do not justify and warrant bullying or bravado; but make obligatory moderation in our demands as well as constancy and firmness in the maintenance of our rights; if it means that we should never require what we are not willing to yield, when the Democratic party to-day is on the American side of this question, and the Secretary of State and the negotiators of this treaty and those who defend it here are on the American side. And the President is on the American side; and the American people will recognize the courage and self-sacrificing devotion to their highest interests with which this brave, honest, straightforward and sagacious man who they have elevated to his high place has sought to serve them.

If, in obedience to party caucus, which sits with closed doors in this treaty, and keeps veiled in secrecy the real motives which govern their votes, the bare majority of this body rejects this honourable and satisfactory settlement of those long-standing difficulties which have been a reproach to the civilization and diplomacy of the two greatest governments on earth, then we will appeal over their heads to the sober judgment of 60,000,000 people; and over the heads of wealthy fishery combines and trusts, who are willing to employ Canadian labour to swell their dividends, we will appeal to the brave and hardy American fishermen, who through hurricane and fog cling to shroud and life-line or drift in their dories in those stormy northern seas, and whose rights and whose interests have been secured and maintained in this treaty.

Senator Morgan said:

If I were President of the United States, I would withdraw this treaty from your consideration until you got you minds cool enough to consider it on its merits; and I believe the honourable and venerable statesman in front of me would do it, with his full knowledge of diplomacy. I would withdraw it from this Senate and would send it in after this political campaign had ended and after there should be a cessation of those methods of political strife which so excite the people of the United States—frequently as we know almost beyond control. I would carry this into an atmosphere where reason might prevail.

If there were no presidential election pending to-day the discussion of this treaty would be in different terms and in a different spirit. But the object, it seems to me is simply to make political capital out of it. I have despaired really of getting any cool and deliberate and just consideration of the matters of great interest and importance involved in this treaty, because a man can say nothing about it without being accused of being a partisan of the British government. He can make no defence of the administration without being charged with being a Canadian in his sentiments. He can make no explanation of anything that has occurred heretofore in connection with this treaty without being charged with having, under the party whip, changed his relations to the question.

The only apology for quoting so largely from the American Senate debates is to show that at that time, the majority practically treated with contempt the treaty and the protocol to the treaty, which gave United States fisheries the privileges of the modus vivendi so called, and I think I may fairly draw the inference that they did not value or appreciate the modus vivendi, voluntarily tendered by the British commissioners in 1888, nor is there anything to-day known to me which would indicate an appreciation of the modus vivendi by the United States.

Now, let me return to the modus vivendi. The modus vivendi, voluntarily offered in this protocol to the Washington treaty of 1888 was accepted by the United States. It became law by the Canadian statute ratifying the treaty, but only for the period of two years, and with the idea that the United States within that period would either ratify or disallow the treaty and which would decide the fate of the modus vivendi. The year the treaty was negotiated the United States Senate refused to assent to the same. After the two years elapsed the modus vivendi was annually extended by statute until 1892, when a statute was passed giving to the Governor General in Council power to continue from year to year the modus vivendi, which, be it not forgotten, gives to American fishermen the right to purchase bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits, the transhipment of fish and shipping of crews, and under this statute the modus vivendi has been kept alive.

Now it surely was never intended originally that this should be continued indefinitely; the United States never expected such a thing. The modus vivendi was established for a certain purpose, and the purpose was to allow the Americans this liberty pending the exchange of ratifications. The ratifications were never exchanged and never will be. The modus vivendi was a means of contributing to an end, but now the modus vivendi leads to nothing, it is the end itself.

When the statute of 1892 was up for discussion in parliament, the late Hon. David Mills discussed the same, and as he expressed my views on this point better than I can myself, I desire to quote from him. He said:

It seems to me, Sir, that this measure is one which is calculated to weaken the rights of Canada in this matter of the fisheries. If a modus vivendi is established it ought to be established for a particular purpose. When

this was first proposed it was defended on the grounds that negotiations were pending, and that it was necessary to conciliate and to allow the Americans this liberty until the negotiations could be consummated. Now there are no negotiations pending. There is no step taken towards the settlement of the difficulty between us, and yet the liberty of supplies for fishing is to be granted, and a modus vivendi is to be established which is to lead to nothing. The honourable gentleman will see, further, that the modus vivendi that has recently been established between Great Britain and the States is a modus vivendi looking towards pending negotiations, A treaty has been agreed to, a board of arbitration has been established to which disputed rights are referred, and these parties are about to engage in the negotiations with a view to a settlement of the matter in dispute. This modus vivendi is a means contributing to an end in that case, but in this case the modus vivendi leads to nothing ; it is the end itself. It is not created or established with a view to accomplish some other purpose. There are no negotiations pending, no treaty to be consummated, and it is simply a backing down from the position hitherto taken. It is an admission that you have a right which you dare not defend, and which you are proposing to confer upon the Americans for a mere trifle, which on their part concedes nothing to you of the pretensions which you have hitherto put forward. You are exactly in the same position, so far as that is concerned, as if you had conceded to the American government their claims altogether. Your license is a license which they recognize only within the waters which they have not disputed to be yours, and which concedes nothing to you with regard to those waters which they say are a part of the high seas. It seems to me, Sir, that our position is every year becoming weaker and weaker.

I submit that the licenses granted under the statute of 1892 should be discontinued and I will give some reasons for it. 1. Our bait supply for some cause or another is diminishing, and without a supply of bait fishes the fishing industry is impossible, and in order to preserve to Canada this great industry it is essential that our bait supplies be conserved for our own purposes. During the past few years the bait supplies have not been on the average up to the requirements of our own fishermen.

2. We are assisting our greatest competitors in the fishing industry by permitting them to purchase bait supplies, ship crews, and tranship catches in Canada. The right to purchase bait, and ship crews, is a valuable concession to American fishermen. It is a concession which gives a material advantage to our competitors in the initial cost of the catching of fish. The fishing grounds are near us and we have in this an advantage which should be conserved, and should not be abandoned without some consideration from our competitor. It gives American fishermen all the advantages of Canadian fishermen in our fishing waters, without any advantage being given to us by the United States.

In the prosecution of any other industry we would not allow them to use our shores or waters as a base of operations. We could not get it from them and we should not give it to them. Joseph Chamberlain speaking, on this point at the Canadian Club dinner in New York shortly after the treaty was made, said :

> Canada declines, and always has declined, to allow her ports and harbours, which Providence has placed in close proximity to the fisheries of the banks, to be made the base of operations for competitors who rigidly exclude her from their markets, but these facilities are offered freely in return for an equivalent. As long as this equivalent is denied Canada feels justified in declining these facilities.

Senator Gray, upon this point said :

> Now, what is the position of Canada under this treaty ? Is it a fair and just one for her to assume, and one which it is right and just for us to concede ? I declare that it is both, and no fair man, it seems to me, can say otherwise. She has conceded nearly all that we have any right in fairness to ask. We have no right to demand that while we shut her out of our markets, she should give up without reserve every advantage that she possesses by reason of her geographical position and proximity to the great fishing banks off her coasts, and that we shall make her harbours our basis of fishing operations while we refuse to share with her any advantages that we possess. I repeat, she has given us nearly everything we ask and more than we had the right to demand.

The argument, that by the continuance of the modus vivendi, we are aiding our American competitors in the fishing business, is I submit unanswerable, and I think Americans themselves must be surprised at our leniency in continuing to them the privileges annually granted them since 1888.

3. Restricting the United States fishermen to the rights given them by the treaty of 1818 will be to their disadvantage. They have not the supply of bait fishes, which is the primary raw material necessary to carry on the fishing industry. Refusing them the privileges of the modus vivendi will prevent them using our shores as a base of operations, and compel them to use their own, which, being further away from the fishing grounds, will be to their disadvantage, and any disadvantage they may be under in this connection will render them less serious to us as competitors in our home market, and in the United States and foreign markets. We are assisting them in the prosecution of the fishing industry by granting them the licenses under the Act of 1892.

4. They are not entitled to such privileges by treaty or by law. I think I may postulate this. It is not arguable.

5. Because it is a concession granted without consideration nominal or real.

6. Because the United States have never shown any desire or intention to extend to us any favoured treatment in their markets and always construe illiberally their

own customs, laws and regulations as against fish importations from Canada.

7. Because they construe in a lax and favoured manner their customs, laws and regulations as against their own fishermen, much to our detriment as exporters to their markets.

8. Because it is offensive to the national sense to grant to another nation important privileges without considerations and with the view of purchasing national amity at the expense of our own interest. Such is not the practice of nations. It is a weak and unmanly policy and invertebrates a nation. If you cannot claim and enforce that which is clearly our rights by treaty and international law, the sooner we know it the better.

9. Because, when we attempt to negotiate with them in respect to the fisheries, they use the argument that they do not want any privileges from us. I submit we should take them at their word, even if they are not sincere, I wish to quote from a Senate committee report of 1887 on the fisheries :

From the investigations made by the committee during the last summer and fall, and as the result of the great mass of testimony taken by it and herewith returned, the committee believe it to be clear, beyond all dispute, that the right to fish within 3 miles of the Dominion shores is of no practical advantage whatever to American fishermen. The cod and halibut fishing has been for many years almost entirely carried on at long distances from the shores, in the deep waters, on banks, &c.; and it is believed that were there absolute liberty for Americans to fish, without restriction or regulation of any kind, within 3 miles of the Dominion shores, no such fishermen would ever think of going there for the purpose of catching cod or halibut.

As regards the obtaining of bait for this class of fishing, the testimony taken by the committee in its inquiries, clearly demonstrates that there is no necessity whatever for American fishermen to resort to Canadian waters for that purpose. Clam bait is found in immense quantities in our own waters, and there have been instances, so frequent and continuous as to amount to a habit, of the Canadians themselves resorting to American waters or ports for the purpose of obtaining it. The squid bait is found on the very banks where the fishing goes on. So that the instances would be extremely rare when any American fishing vessel would wish to resort to a Dominion port for the purpose of buying bait for this kind of fishing.

It was also proved before the committee that with the rarest exception, it would be absolutely injurious to the pecuniary interests of all concerned for American vessels to resort to Dominion ports or waters, except in need of distress, for the time taken in such departures from the cod and halibut grounds, or from direct sailing to and from them, is so great, that with or without the difference of port expenses, time and money are both lost in such visits.

It is the opinion of Americans that we seek a rigid enforcement of the treaty of 1818 for the purpose of forcing them to give us free access to their markets, or free fish for free fishing. Now, I have quoted already from eminent United States public men to the effect that such an idea is a natural and proper one on our part. I do not hesitate to say so myself. If they ask us for assistance in the prosecution of any one industry, it is natural we should ask for some equivalent from them, in the prosecution of the same industry.

In the deliberations of the United States Senate on the treaty of Washington, Senator Frye spoke as follows :—

But let me tell the Senators that there is something more serious in this delimitation than this mere question of whether or not we shall fish in the excluded waters. You have another article in this treaty which provides that if you put fish, etc., on the free-list we may have commercial rights. Senators know just as well as I do that the whole contest for seventy years has been for our markets. Senators know as well as I do that all the outrages for the last fifty years have been committed for no purpose except to get our markets. Your treaty does give it to them. You simply increase the peril ; you simply have moved out the danger line. Every bay 10 miles wide and 3 miles outside of that, every one of the great bays named is made dangerous grounds. It may be very easy for a fisherman to tell whether he is within the 3-mile shore line or to discover whether or not he is in a bay not more than 6 miles wide ; but let me say to the senators that when a bay is 10 miles wide and the line is 3 miles outside of that, when that bay is like the Bay of Chaleur, 17 miles wide or 21 miles wide, it is an entirely different thing for the fishermen to determine whether or not he has crossed that line and entered the perilous waters. It is almost an impossibility for him to do it. Six months of the fishing season there is a fog prevailing all over the section of the waters, not a dense fog, but a fog that would prevent any fisherman from seeing more than 4 to 5 miles at sea.

Now, you adopt a tariff, leaving the duty on fish at it stands to-day ; let the temptation to obtain our market still continue, the Canadian will repeat the outrage of 1886 and 1887, and you have given them by this treaty an opportunity tenfold greater to outrage and insult our fishermen, to seize and confiscate their vessels than they had before.

Now, there is no doubt Canadians were at one time very anxious to obtain free access to the United States markets. I am not going to say they are not anxious to-day to obtain such a privilege, or that we should refuse such a privilege, but I do say that a great change has taken place in public opinion in this country upon this question. I think I may safely say that Canadian fishermen are of the opinion that if the United States do not want to grant reciprocity in fish and fishing, they are not in favour of this country being servile supplicants for such reciprocity. In Nova Scotia I know there are many able and practical business men engaged in the fishing industry who are of the opinion that reciprocity in fish and fishing with the United States would on the whole be of more advantage to the

United States than to ourselves, and there is a great deal in the idea, but I do not intend enlarging upon it.

Our own market is rapidly increasing and for various causes the United States in the near future will not be so invulnerable a competitor of Canadian fishermen. The greatest advantage to be derived from reciprocity in fish and fishing, would be to remove a longstanding controversy and dispute between the two countries.

In addition to this I must admit, that our admission to the extensive markets of the United States would enure to our benefit upon the general principle that the greater in number the consumers, the better it is for the producer. We doubtless have suffered by the United States tariff upon fish. We also suffered by substitution of American sovereignty for Spanish sovereignty over Porto Rico which was a valuable market for the maritime provinces, but in which we now are faced with a high tariff, whereas American fish enter free. We also suffered by the protectorate secured over Cuba by the United States as a consequence of the Spanish-American war, for to-day American fish have a preference of 25 per cent over the fish of any other country.

However, about the tariff in the United States, Porto Rico and Cuba, I do not complain, for the reason that the United States is well within its rights and powers in this regard, and adverse comment would be foolish. I only refer to this as a justification for my plea that we should not throw, unsolicited, concessions to the United States, when we obtain not only no favours from them, but well designed opposition in respect to the fishing industry.

I do not ask for a strict enforcement of the treaty of 1818, and the recission of the modus vivendi with the hope that it will operate as a lever to open their markets to us. I merely ask it for the purpose of protecting our own fishing interests and those engaged in fishing.

It is true that at some points in the maritime provinces there would be opposition to the discontinuance of the licenses granted to American fishermen. This opposition would only appear at points where the inhabitants sell bait fish to American fishermen. I submit, however, the interests of the whole maritime provinces or of Canada, is paramount to sectional interest, and our policy in this regard must be comprehensive enough to deal with our fisheries as a national asset.

The bait fish sold to Americans, if properly cared for, can be marketed in a profitable form, and the loss to the fishermen at points frequented by American fishermen would in the end be of little or no consequence. Public opinion in the maritime provinces is I think strongly in favour of ending the modus vivendi. I wish to quote from two documents which I think fairly reflect public opinion in the maritime provinces. One is a memorandum prepared by a committee of the Halifax Board of Trade accompanying a resolution of that body asking for the termination of the modus vivendi. It is as follows :—

The modus vivendi in connection with the Canadian-Atlantic fisheries was arranged in 1888, with the intention that it should remain in force during the then pending negotiations for a reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States. And notwithstanding that Canada's proposals at that time were not entertained, and that the United States has since shown no disposition to enter into further negotiations for a new treaty, the modus vivendi has been continued in force. Under it licenses are issued to the American fishing fleet, whereby by the small annual fee of $1.50 per registered ton, fishing vessels are allowed to buy bait and supplies, ship men, transfer fish in bond, &c. In fact use Canadian ports as the basis of their fishing operations. In return Canada receives only some $10,000-$12,000 per year for license fees, and Canadian sell bait and supplies to the extent of possibly about $100,000.

The larger part of the above amount represents the purchase of bait. The abrogation of the modus vivendi would therefore only mean the loss of the profit made on supplies, and on the small quantity of bait now sold the American fleet at points where our own vessels will not go for it.

It must be generally admitted that, but for the privileges allowed American vessels under the modus vivendi, their fishing operations would be very much curtailed. to the great advantage of the Canadian fishermen. The question of bait supply has been, and is, a most serious one. The small catch of fish made by the Canadian fishing fleet in recent years has been mostly due to the lack of bait. In the face of this, it appears most unreasonable that Canada should allow the American vessels to buy bait in our ports in competition with our own vessels. The gain made by the suppliers of bait on our coast is certainly much more than offset by the loss to Canadian fishing vessels and export firms.

The American catch is augmented at the expense of the Canadian fleet, and the export merchant has to compete with the highly protected surplus American product, in the markets of Porto Rico and Cuba.

Our sister colony—Newfoundland—has withdrawn the privileges which American vessels enjoyed in her ports, and if Canada by abrogating the modus vivendi, would work along the same lines, the two countries could practically control the North Atlantic fisheries. This would undoubtedly improve the relations between Newfoundland and Canada, and possibly pave the way for the entry of that country into the Dominion.

The following statement was placed before the Tariff Commission when last in Nova Scotia by a delegation from Digby, Nova Scotia, and is important:

In this connection it is desired to draw attention to a few of the many objectionable features which have developed under the modus vivendi,, which—whatever its theoretical excellencies to the minds of those who

first approved its conditions—has in actual practice proved a veritable vampire preying upon the life of Canada's Atlantic fisheries. It may very properly be said that until vigorous protest is made against the continuance of this agreement, there is no reason why it should not be renewed from time to time, and it is no doubt owing to this lack of concerted action on the part of those interested in the fisheries of the maritime provinces that it is still in existence.

Under its provisions American vessels upon payment of a fee equal to $1.50 per ton obtain a license 'to enter into the bays and harbours of the Atlantic coasts of Canada for the purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines and other supplies, and effect the transhipment of catch and the shipping of crews.'

As all vessel fishing is now carried on outside the three-mile limit this gives to the Americans practically all the advantage which they already possess of the United States markets for the sale of their catch. The license fee, which ranges from $150 to $200 (according to the tonnage of the vessel) is to them a mere nothing. A sum sufficient to more than make it good is saved in the purchase of a single set of dories at the maritime province prices, as against American prices, which are about double those which range here.

So manifest are the advantages of the Americans over the Canadians under the modus vivendi that for some years the people of this province interested in fishing have been investing largely in American vessels (for a foreign built ship cannot be placed under American register) while their skippers for the reason that none but subjects of the United States can command an American vessel, have become United States citizens. They have year after year applied for and taken out the fishing licenses granted by the Canadian Department to American craft; they have shipped largely provincial crews; fitted out in United States ports and carried on the season's operations with Boston, Gloucester or Portland. It is stated upon excellent authority that upwards of 1,000 men from Western Nova Scotia alone are for these reasons engaged in shipping under the American flag.

The ill effects of this condition of things are many. British subjects are being converted into American citizens. American shipyards are kept busy, while many of those in the martitime provinces are silent.

The fishing fleets of the United States are being augumented yearly by Nova Scotia capital while those of the maritime provinces are suffering a corresponding loss in tonnage.

The large sums of money expended in supplying these vessels (particularly while engaged in the fresh fish trade) go chiefly to enrich the dealers in foreign ports.

Many of the best skippers and most active seamen are not only weaned from their allegiance, but our own vessels not infrequently lie idle for lack of crews to man them.

The prosperity of the Gloucester fishing industry exists to-day largely at the sufferance of Canada and to the prejudice of our Atlantic fisheries. The Grand Banks fisheries could not be profitably prosecuted by American fishermen if the license before referred to were withheld and the privilege of obtaining bait, ice, &c., denied them. Many of those of our people who have adopted American citizenship and purchased American vessels would gladly welcome the change; because they believe it would result in a great impetus being given to the Atlantic fisheries of Canada. The yield of our fisheries would be increased. Our fishing fleets be built up. Our fishermen could remain at home, our markets would be broadened.

When, in order to get the best to be obtained under the modus vivendi, Canadian citizens are driven to buy American vessels (instead of having them built at home as they would perfer) when some of our most skilful seamen surrender their rights as British subjects and become subjects of the American republic; when they come to their native shores as aliens, in foreign-built ships, purchase a license of the class issued to American fishing vessels under the modus vivendi, and are able to prosecute the fishing industry at an advantage over the Canadian who has stuck by his nationality, it is submitted, with all deference, that the time for seriously considering the advisability of effecting a change in the prevailing conditions is certainly at hand.

I read this in full because it embodies certain arguments against the modus vivendi which I have not taken into consideration.

The government of Newfoundland have had a much similar experience to our own. They are now enforcing rigidly the treaty of 1818. The American fishermen do not accept this with good grace but employ all possible methods to escape the effect of the enforcement of this treaty, especially in respect to the winter herring fisheries. I am not discussing the modus operandi adopted by the Newfoundland government to enforce the treaty. I have not given the matter sufficient study to discuss it, nor would it be germane to the subject under discussion. In a word however, Newfoundland is enforcing the treaty of 1818. I cannot conceive of any reason why she should not do so. She is clearly within her rights. It may be unpopular and unprofitable to the inhabitants of certain sections of the Island, but even that I am not prepared to concede. The interests of the colony as a whole are paramount to sectional interests. I think Canada should extend her influence and support to Newfoundland in her efforts to prevent violation of the treaty of 1818. We should do so because our interests are the same in the fisheries question, and also because Canada has a great opportunity to become engaged in an extensive and profitable trade in herring with Newfoundland if she is successful in establishing and carrying out her present policy.

The fisheries on the Atlantic coast of Newfoundland and Canada are one, and there should be united action in the future in regard to the protection of our fisheries and the enforcement of treaty obligations which affect our common interests.

I feel, perhaps wrongly, but nevertheless sincerely, that in our commercial relations with the United States generally we have not received from our neighbours that fair and generous consideration which we deserve and which they might well have giv-

en us. This is particularly true of the fisheries question. They have shown, it appears to me, a scant respect for the treaty of 1818, leaving its interpretation to fishermen whose rendition very naturally would be coloured by self-interest. We have found, too often I fear the seal and approval of the nation given to such biased interpretation of treaty, and to the allegations of cruelty and inhumanity of Canadian officers in enforcing what were plainly our rights both legally and morally.

The experience of Canada and Newfoundland with the United States Senate in connection with treaties relating to fisheries actually negotiated and concluded, is not calculated to inspire one with the idea that the United States were ever anxious to settle this long standing controversial issue in the manner they might well have done. Their attitude, to say at least, has not been one calculated to win the eternal forbearance of Canadians, and the granting of perpetual concessions without some fair consideration.

If the matter of the fisheries ever again become the subject of international consideration let us hope that our neighbours will be led to regard the matter as one that cannot longer be considered by the rule, that right belongs to might and wealth, but must be considered with some regard to facts, and all considerations which usually obtain in any controversial issue between men or between nations.

I do not wish to minimize the importance both to Canada and the United States of having all our differences relating to the fisheries settled once and for all. It is a consummation devoutly to be wished. If our fishery disputes, and I mean that in a comprehensive sense, ever again become the subject of diplomatic negotiations, let me express the hope it will receive from the United States that broad, full and serious consideration it deserves. I submit that the government should take this matter into consideration at once and I trust they will see their way clear to notify the United States of our refusal to hereafter grant licenses under the Modus Vivendi Act of 1892.

I am told that similar conditions prevail on the Pacific coast but I do not intend referring to them as they will be dealt with by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan), who has advised me that he intends participating in this discussion.

Mr. WILLIAM SLOAN (Comox-Atlin) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will resume the present discussion.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 18, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE JAMAICA DISASTER.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would ask the consent of the House to make a statement as to a matter which was mentioned yesterday by the right hon. the Prime Minister. A question was asked with regard to the disaster in Jamaica. Owing to the breaking of the cable it has been found very difficult to get any official information, and we are dependent almost entirely on newspaper reports. There seems to be no reason, however, to doubt that the disaster is a very great one—that there has been a large loss of life, a very great destruction of property and consequently very much distress. We think that, without waiting further for official information, it will be the wish of the parliament of Canada to take immediate steps to express in a tangible way the sympathy of the Canadian people with their brethren in the West Indies by the making of a substantial grant. As to what the amount should be we are not prepared at this moment to say more than this, that we will take the usual steps for asking the assent of parliament for a grant of $50,000 as a first step, with the understanding that if further information should show that the disaster is of such a character as to make the need greater, we shall ask parliament to supplement it with another grant of $50,000, making $100,000, if necessary. Information has reached us that a steamer is about to sail from Halifax to Jamaica, and the proprietors of the line, Messrs. Pickford & Black, have generously offered to convey, free of transportation charges, any provisions which the Canadian government or people may wish to send. Instructions are being sent to the collector of customs at Halifax, who fortunately is a gentleman familiar with West Indian conditions, having been for many years connected with the West Indian trade, to make inquiries from well informed people as to what it may be desirable to send, and to purchase at once whatever provisions are available and, in the opinion of those whom he may consult, are suitable for the needs of the people of Jamaica. An endeavour will be made to have these, together with a supply of tents from the Militia Department, shipped from Halifax for Jamaica to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sure that there will be no dissenting voice in the House to the proposal of the government. It seems that the disaster has been even more appalling than we were inclined to think a day or two ago, and the action which the

goverment and parliament are to take, will, I am sure, commend itself to the people of Canada. It might not be out of place also to express the appreciation which I am sure we all feel of the prompt and generous action which has already been taken by the President and Congress of the United States in relation to the disaster.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he would be good enough to lay upon the table of the House, to-day if possible, an order in council which was passed on the 2nd day of April, 1906, with regard to the appropriation of some land on Kaien Island, Digby Island, and some other island, belonging to the Indians, for the purpose of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I expected to find it in the 'Canada Gazette,' as it related to the public domain, but I have searched in vain for it there.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The order in council was not of a nature which required to be published in the 'Canada Gazette.' There will be no difficulty in placing it on the table, but there has been no request for it so far. I will lay it on the table as soon as it can be copied.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior to place on the table the return ordered last year in reference to the Indian Department, as well as the return ordered on the same subject this session. I hope I can obtain that information before very long.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence, who appears to be somewhat of a sinner in this regard, to a return which was ordered on March 28, 1906, with reference to the old drill shed property in Halifax, which has not been brought down yet. I might at the same time mention the one with regard to the sub-target company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is being got ready. It is quite voluminous.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like also to call attention to the fact that the Australian papers have not been brought down yet.

CANADIAN FISHERIES—LICENSES TO AMERICAN FISHERMEN.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. W. S. Fielding for the House to go again into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. WM. SLOAN (Comox-Atlin). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the adjourned debate upon the subject brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean), in accordance with the notice he gave a few days ago, as follows :

> I desire to give notice that on a future day, in the latter part of next week if possible, I shall ask the permission of the House to discuss a matter of importance—the concessions granted to American fishermen to fish in Canadian waters, whether under statute or under regulation, and having special reference to the Canadian statute popularly known as the modus vivendi.

I wish to state that I am in full accord with the position taken by the hon. member, and I desire to congratulate him on the very able and convincing manner in which he has represented and brought to the attention of the House a question which has been a constant source of irritation and of conflicting interest among the fishermen of the north Atlantic coast.

Representing as I do a district largely interested in fishing, I wish to show the House that the issues which have been a fruitful source of dispute between our Canadian fishermen of the maritime provinces and those of the New England States are with the rapid development of the Pacific coast fisheries also becoming questions of grave importance to our Canadian interests in the west. I wish to point out the time has now arrived when the rights which are ours by treaty and by possession should be maintained to their fullest extent. Otherwise the policy of the past, and to a great extent of the present will have the effect of and is already a factor in building up the cities of the state of Washington and centralizing fishing interests in the United States which undoubtedly should, in the nature of things, be established and assist in the upbuilding of our own cities in British Columbia.

The undoubted depletion of many of the deep sea fisheries on the Atlantic and the fisheries of the great lakes also showing a serious falling off in production in comparison with former years. These two circumstances together with an increased population and consequent increased consumption of fish products, has quickly turned attention to the commercial possibilities of our almost virgin inshore and deep sea fisheries on the Pacific coast, and if Canada and Canadian fishermen are to be competitors in the markets of this continent they must be protected and secured in every privilege and right which is theirs by possession and natural and geographical advantages as well as treaty arrangements. These rights and advantages are not now being maintained for our benefit on the Pacific, but already Americans are being accorded privileges which are giving them the advantage in the markets of the country, while the United States policy excludes participation in their market by Canadian fishermen.

I will take for example and give to the House some facts and figures in reference to the halibut industry which will, I think,

convince you, Mr. Speaker, of the correctness of my contention.

Fifteen years ago the quantity of halibut caught on the Pacific coast for commercial use was insignificant. It had in 1896, five years later, reached a point when sixty carloads or about 1,000 tons were shipped to Boston. Since that time it has steadily increased until in 1906, ten years later, the catch was estimated at 22,000 tons. Of this amount probably 20,000 tons were shipped to eastern points and the shipping of this enormous catch would require about 1,300 cars. Figuring 130 cars to a mile would make a fish train ten miles in length. I use this in illustration to give the House some idea of the development which has taken place in the time mentioned, on the Pacific coast. This enormous business and yearly expanding although originating at the outset of the industry in British Columbia, is now nearly altogether in the hands of American companies, and will remain with them if existing conditions are maintained.

The halibut banks extend from Cape Flattery to the Behring sea; the most valuable in a commercial sense are along the west coast of Vancouver island, in Hecate straits and in Dixon's entrance, and it is from these banks that the present supply is taken. During fine weather and in summer months a fleet of about twenty small schooners and motor boats operate on the west coast of Vancouver island bringing in cargoes ranging from 8,000 to 35,000 pounds per boat.

HALIBUT ARRIVALS.

Following are the halibut arrivals by schooner, on Puget Sound during the month of August :—

Date.	Schooner.	No. lbs.
1905.		
Aug. 1	Doncaster	14,000
" 17	Doncaster	20,000
" 2	Dewey	14,000
" 21	Dewey	12,000
" 3	Edith	8,000
" 23	Edith	14,000
" 7	Deeahks	17,000
" 22	Deeahks	17,000
" 9	Lister	14,000
" 26	Lister	17,000
" 9	Yukon	12,000
" 16	Yukon	14,000
" 10	Northland	25,000
" 21	Northland	35,000
" 12	B. Gold	14,000
" 30	B. Gold	12,000
" 12	Shamrock	18,000
" 14	Crescent	17,000
" 31	Crescent	22,000
" 13	Norman Sunde	14,000
" 16	Mary	10,000
" 16	Decker	26,000
" 17	Mars	17,000
" 23	Selma	18,000
" 24	Daisy	27,000
" 25	Vida	14,000
" 25	Pilot	18,000
" 31	Myrtle	14,000

As the banks of west coast of Vancouver island are mostly inshore the greater portion of the fish caught there, between 4,000 and 5,000 tons per season, is taken illegally as being well within the three mile limit.

In Dixon's entrance and Hecate strait where operations are carried on the whole of the year and where stormy weather and heavy seas are encountered, a larger type of fishing craft is employed. I quote the dimensions of some of these boats for the information of the House:

——	Length.	Breadth.	Depth.	Tonnage.	Material.	Speed.
	Feet.	Feet.	Feet.	Net.		Miles.
Zapora	146	24	11·4	196	Wood	13
San Juan	118	24·5	13·5	128	"	12
New England	121·8	23·8	12·6	71	Steel	12
Kingfisher	122	24	15	141	"	12
Manhattan	142	24	15	210	"	13

There are quite a number of this class of fishing boats bringing down to the shipping port cargoes from 100,000 to 225,000 pounds of halibut, round trip taking from 8 days to two or three weeks, as weather and fishing conditions permit.

On the banks the fishermen fish from dories using hand trawls and herring for bait (of which I shall speak later). As soon as the day's fishing is over and the dories have all been picked up the first convenient harbour is run to, and halibut are cleaned, entrails are removed, fish washed and iced in the hold of the vessel. On completion of cargo and arrival at port of shipment, the heads are taken off and fish are packed in boxes in ice and shipped in refrigerator cars to eastern markets. The freight is about 3½ cents per pound in car lots, which will figure out $1,000 per car. Boston is the main point of shipment and on arrival there fish are then transhipped to various points in small quantities.

Such in brief is an outline of the halibut industry from a general point of view. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will now analyse a few features which are pertinent to this discussion.

The Treaty of 1818, which has been brought before you for consideration by

the hon. member for Lunenburg, it will be necessary for me to consider also. The treaty of peace in 1783, article 3, gave to the people of the United States common fishing rights with British subjects in His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America. The language of the treaty, 'shall continue to enjoy unmolested,' did not, as has been held by some, convey those rights for ever.

The treaty of Ghent which closed the war of 1812 made no mention of fisheries, but following this treaty England announced a policy which ultimately led to the treaty of 1818. Article 1 of the treaty is as follows :

Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States, for the inhabitants thereof, to take, dr and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, harbours and creeks, of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties, that the inhabitants of the said United States, shall have, for ever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau island, on the western and northwestern coast of Newfoundland, from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and also on the coasts, bays, harbours and creeks, from Mount Joly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belle Isle, and thence northwardly indefinitely along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company ; and the American fishermen shall also have liberty, for ever, to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbours and creeks of the southern part of the coast of Newfoundland hereabove described, and of the coast of Labrador ; but so soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such portion so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose, with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of ground.

And the United States hereby renounce for ever any liberty herebefore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry or cure fish, on or within three marine miles, of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, not included within the above mentioned limits; provided, however, that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbours, for the purpose of shelter and repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying or curing fish therein, or in any manner whatever abusing the privileges hereby reserved to them.

Article 2, of treaty of 1818, defined the boundary line from the Lake of the Woods west to the Stony or Rocky mountains, along the 49th parallel.

Article 3, of treaty of 1818, made provision, pending final ownership of the territory west of that point, i.e., west of the Rocky mountains, for mutual intercourse on the northwest coast of America, and is as follows :

It is agreed that any country that may be claimed by either party on the northwest coast of America, westward of the Stony Mountains shall, together with its harbours, bays and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be free and open for the term of ten years from the date of the signature of the present convention to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two powers ; it being well understood that this agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the two high contracting parties may have to any part of the said country, nor shall it be taken to affect the claims of any other power or state to any part of the said country; the only object of the high contracting parties, in that respect, being to prevent disputes and differences amongst themselves.

In 1827, a year previous to the expiration of this article, a convention was held with a view to maturing measures which had for their object a more definite settlement of the claims of Great Britain and the United States to the northwest coast of America, and agreeing to a temporary renewal of Article 3 of the treaty of 1818, which I have just read. By Article 1, of this convention of 1827, Article 3, of the treaty of 1818, was further indefinitely extended and was continued in force until the treaty of Oregon in 1846.

Article 2, of convention of 1827, provided for cancellation of this renewal on notification by either party.

Article 3, of the convention of 1827, is as follows :

Nothing contained in this convention or in the third article of the convention of October 20, 1818, hereby continued in force, shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect the claims which either of the contracting parties may have to any part of the country westward of the Stony or Rocky Mountains.

The clear and evident intention was that no rights were to be impaired, affected or enlarged, by this convention, or by Article 3, of the treaty of 1818.

When in 1846 the boundary line was extended from the Rocky mountains westward to the Pacific ocean and the jurisdiction of both countries having been definitely defined by this treaty and Article 3 of the treaty of 1818 having thus served the purpose for which it was intended, I now turn to the consideration of Article 1 of the treaty of 1818, and in this article we have the foundation upon which the Canadian rights on the Pacific coast are secured and should be maintained. Under this article the United States renounced for ever the treaty rights which they enjoyed under the treaty of 1783, and the concession of the right to fish in His Britannic Majesty's dominions was confined to portions of the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the usual privileges extended to commercial vessels were withheld in so far as fishing vessels were concerned, and fishing vessels were

restricted, in language clear, definite and explicit. They may enter our harbours only for shelter and repair, wood and water, and for no other purpose whatever. Now, in the Canadian waters on the Pacific coast these restrictions are not maintained, but on the contrary United States fishing vessels use our harbours continually; they clean and stow fish; they prepare for fishing; they purchase bait and supplies; and generally speaking have every advantage that the Canadian fishermen have in the use of our waters and of our harbours. These United States fishing boats travel for hundreds of miles through our narrow internal channels, which ensure continuously calm weather, thus affording an opportunity to repair boats and gear, bait hooks, &c. If forced to travel the outer littoral course it would involve the prohibition of these various preparations for fishing.

By those familiar with existing conditions it is contended that this invasion of our inland waters our bays and our harbours is necessary for the successful prosecution of their trade, as these bays and harbours in our northern waters are used as a general base of operation, in fact to such an extent that foreign fishermen have even established harbour lights for their sole use and benefit.

The question of bait should also be considered. Herring is the bait used by the halibut fishermen, and while the salted bait was at one time used exclusively it has been found that better results are obtained by using the fresh or frozen bait.

Puget Sound, State of Washington, was formerly the main source of bait supply for United States fishermen, but as these waters have been nearly depleted now practically the sole source of bait supply is from our inshore waters in British Columbia, Nanaimo and vicinity furnishing the major portion, and from this point hundreds of tons of fresh herring are annually shipped to Seattle and other Sound ports and there stored in freezers for use when required. All the United States halibut boats operating in Dixon's entrance call regularly at the port of Nanaimo and purchase fresh bait when the run is on, and when the herring season is over they then use from the supply in the freezers at Seattle.

In the development of our fisheries on the Pacific coast as a Canadian industry, we have in our favour a very important factor in the question of bait, but in this also we are giving foreign fishermen another material advantage, an advantage which should be maintained in the interest of the Canadian fishermen and the sale and disposal of bait should be regulated in the interest of our own industry. The government has assisted in the building and bonusing of 46 bait freezers and two large commercial freezers, all in the maritime provinces. This policy which was developed in the interests of the fisheries and fishermen of these provinces has given highly satisfactory results and should be extended also to British Columbia. On this very question of bait, Sir Robert Bond is making a determined effort to conserve the sale of bait for the benefit of the fisheries of Newfoundland. That he may be successful in his struggle for right as against might the hon. premier has my best wishes.

The specific concession which has been made to foreign fishermen in the privilege extended from year to year of allowing foreign fishing vessels and corporations to tranship in bond and permitting the use of our harbours for such purposes, and for the purchase of supplies, &c. This privilege on the Atlantic coast, as has been pointed out by the hon. member who has preceded me, is authorized under the modus vivendi licenses which exact a fee of $1.50 per ton register. With us this privilege is given by order in council under authority contained in section 78 of the Audit Act. This order in council reads as follows:

> Foreigners or foreign fishing corporations bringing fresh fish in American bottoms to any port in British Columbia shall be permitted to land such fresh fish at such port without payment of duties and tranship the same in bond to any port of the United States of America, and that foreigners or foreign corporations bringing fresh fish in American bottoms to any port in British Columbia shall be permitted to purchase supplies at any port in the said province of British Columbia, the whole under such rules, or regulations and conditions as the Minister of Customs may determine.

The New England Fish Company of Boston has taken advantage of this concession. In fact I understand that this order in council was the result of representations made by them some years ago. The New England company are a combination of wholesalers who control very largely the markets of the eastern states. This company has been established in British Columbia for about twelve years. Prior to the passage of this order in council referred to, this company made use of Canadian boats in their fishing operations. Now that they have been able to avail themselves of shipping in bond they have discarded Canadian boats and are now using United States bottoms entirely. At present they have three large steamers fishing in Hecate straits and Dixon's entrance. The amount of halibut handled for the last five years by this company was as follows:

	Lbs.
1902	7,640,000
1903	8,040,000
1904	9,594,000
1905	7,200,000
1906	9,414,330
Total	41,888,330

The disbursements of this company are very considerable. For the year 1906, for fish shipments east over the Canadian Pacific Railway, they would be in the neighborhood of $250,000; other disbursements in British Columbia, $250,000 more. This it will be acknowledged, is an important item, and has been to a certain extent effective in neutralizing criticism as to the privileges extended under this order in council, and the position of the Canadian operator has not been so strongly maintained for the reasons mentioned. But on the other hand it is contended by parties deeply interested in the development of the Canadian fisheries that so long as this special privilege is continued to foreign fishing corporations no Canadian company can successfully attempt competition, and this section of the people therefore advocate the withdrawal of this privilege and the consequent placing of Canadians on an equal footing with these favoured companies in the markets of the continent.

In order to make their position understood, Mr. Speaker, it may be necessary for me to explain that this special privilege granted enables them to land fish in any American bottom free of duty and to ship in bond to eastern United States markets, the principal point being Boston, where they are permitted to enter the fish as American caught in United States bottoms, thus escaping the duty of one cent per pound, or $20 per ton, which places them at the outset $20 per ton ahead of the Canadian competitors who are forced to pay duty on their imports to that extent; in other words, they stand in the position of receiving a fishery bonus of $20 per ton on this output as against their less favoured competitors. While, as I have before pointed out, the United States fishermen are being allowed every advantage that the Canadian fishermen have, in the use of our waters and our harbours. I will, later on, to emphasize this point, read to the House brief extracts from various reliable sources. It is obvious that until something is done to relieve Canadian fishermen of the peculiar disabilities under which they are labouring on the Pacific coast, there can be no native exploitation of a vast asset lying at the very door of the people of the west, which is thus by force of circumstances and conditions obtaining in effect handed over to the benefit of our competitors coming from the other side of the line.

The Minister of Agriculture, a few days ago, in support of his measure entitled 'An Act to encourage the establishment of cold storage warehouses for the preservation of perishable food products,' said: 'That it was a matter of regret that the fresh fish trade in Canada was to a large extent in the hands of American companies.' I quote from revised 'Hansard,' (page 663), his remarks, which were as follows:

Mr. SLOAN.

In the maritime provinces there is an insistent and a very proper demand for cold storage for fish. It has been a subject of regret to every one who has studied the Canadian fish trade that to a large extent the supply of fresh fish in Canada has been in the hands of the American companies. It is an actual fact that a very large proportion of the sea fish which is consumed in Montreal and in Ontario comes through the United States. It is caught on the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, but it is taken to the United States cities and then shipped in cold storage to the central part of Canada. The reason of that is that the United States fish companies have facilities for handling this trade which our own people in the maritime provinces have not. Incidentally I may remark that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is takng steps this year to try and provide cold storage transportation for fish from the maritime provinces to the central and western parts of Canada, and from the west to the east where the trade demands it. Complementary and supplementary to that there will be a necessity in the maritime provinces for cold storage into which fish may be put immediately after they are brought to shore and kept until a suitable time for shipping them to market. This cold storage for fish in the maritime provinces is just as much needed as cold storage for fruit, meats, eggs or similar products in Ontario and Quebec.

These remarks of the minister are to my mind, in view of all the circumstances, very timely, when we consider that in Canada we have the fish, we have in our possession many natural and geographical advantages, and we have in our favour treaty arrangements; and yet in spite of these various factors the people of Canada in our larger Canadian centres, such as Montreal and Toronto, have to pay tribute to United States companies and to United States centres on fish caught in Canadian waters and vicinity. The situation is deplorable from the standpoint of Canadian enterprise. I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on their expressed intention of meeting, to the extent proposed, the conditions obtaining which are detrimental to our Canadian fisheries. This is an evidence that the development of the Canadian fisheries in Canadian channels is receiving their consideration. The establishment of cold storages in our larger distributing centres, together with the same facilities at or near the fishing grounds, would be of invaluable assistance to our fishermen and to our fishing industry. Arrangements can then be made for fish trains to handle our fishery products, and the question of freight and express rates, also of great importance, can be more easily adjusted. British Columbia will be particularly benefited by this introduction of cold storages, from the fact that our climatic conditions are such that at all seasons of the year our fish, to be kept fresh and wholesome, have either to be packed in ice or placed in freezers. It might be ad-

visable to point out the relative importance by provinces of the value of the fisheries of the Dominion. Nova Scotia has long been the banner province in value of her fisheries, with British Columbia maintaining for years a good second. The report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1906, just issued, shows that for the year 1905, British Columbia has now advanced to first place, and leading for the year mentioned the province of Nova Scotia by about $1,600,000, and the value of the fisheries of British Columbia for this year is over one-third of the total value of the Canadian fisheries.

For the year 1905 the total value of the fisheries of the Dominion was $29,479,562, divided by provinces as follows :

British Columbia	$9,850,216
Nova Scotia	8,259,085
New Brunswick	4,847,090
Quebec	2,003,716
Ontario	1,708,963
Prince Edward Island	998,922
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta	1,811,570

My hon. friend beside me reminds me that this statement does not include the fish caught by Americans in our waters. While the quantity of halibut caught in our waters from the Pacific for the year 1905 was over 40,000,000 pounds, of this amount about 9,000,000 pounds only is credited as product of our fisheries, the balance, presumably, going to swell the value of United States fisheries.

The per capita value of the fisheries of the Dominion, taking the principal provinces for the same year, viz., 1905, is :

British Columbia	$41 10
Nova Scotia	17 97
New Brunswick	14 63
Prince Edward Island	9 67
Quebec	1 21
Ontario	0 78

The direct revenue from the fisheries of the Dominion for the year 1905 was, including licenses to United States vessels, $98,009.69, and as British Columbia contributed $51,532.50, I will, to emphasize this point, take the total revenue by provinces for the six years from 1900-01 to 1905-6, inclusive :

	Revenue.
Nova Scotia	$ 31,712 10
New Brunswick	66,873 00
Prince Edward Island	11,612 35
Quebec	28,500 81
Ontario	7,458 74
British Columbia	293,027 06

I have taken the figures for the past six years. The same proportion would maintain for previous periods also ; and I trust that these figures which are eloquent in favour of British Columbia will be so considered by the government when further necessary expenditures in aid of our Pacific fisheries are requested. Important as they are our Pacific fisheries are only in their early stage of development and the present volume of business is only a circumstance to what the production will be in a few years hence.

I would like to read to the House a letter bearing upon the subject under discussion from Messrs. Wallace Brothers, who are large operators in my district :

'Wallace Bros.'

The Wallace Bros. Packing Company, Limited.
Claxton, Skeena River,
British Columbia, April 11, 1905.

Wm. Sloan, Ottawa, Ont.

—Re Halibut.—

Dear Sir,—Having returned from a trip to the Sound cities, I find that what little halibut business we have is fast leaving us. They are erecting an immense cold storage plant at Whatcom, and also increasing the capacity in Seattle and Tacoma. They have our fish and harbours in Hecate strait as a base of operations and a one per cent duty in their favour. This season we have purchased a steamer and have cold storage facilities for one million pounds ; but it looks very much as if our efforts are not going to be of much avail against the conditions we are up against. There ought to be one-half dozen plants in operation and there would be, if our fisheries and harbours were protected. There is a certain amount of business we can do whether the government can assist or not ; but it is limited. It seems strange that vessels can use our harbours as a base of operations ; but let a Fraser river fishing boat get across the line and see how it will be handled. So far as the New England Fish Company is concerned, we have no kick coming against them. They should be given a reasonable time to turn their boats into Canadian bottoms and thus put us all on the same footing. You see they have everything by being foreign. They have duty free, the use of our fishing grounds and harbours. People say why do not Canadians get in and do something ? You see the conditions, and I am safe in saying that you will never see a Canadian company that will ever take it up under such conditions. This season we will employ not less than 36 white men around our plant and steamers, and no doubt but this number will be increased providing this fishing business would be straightened out. It is certainly an impossibility for this state of affairs to continue without leading to trouble. It is said that not one cent of revenue is received for the use of these privileges from the Americans, and they will have a moral right to certain islands, as they maintain lights in the harbours.

We trust that this matter will be seen to, as it is too valuable to lose sight of. We feel that it rests with us to bring it to your notice and as far as possible not to let it drop out of sight.

Yours truly,
Wallace Bros. Packing Company Limited.
(Sgd.) PETER WALLACE, Manager.

Here is another letter from the Canadian Fishing Company, Limited:

Vancouver, B.C., Nov. 23, 1906.

Wm. Sloan, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa,

—Re Halibut Fisheries—

Dear Sir,—About a year ago we purchased in England the steam trawler 'Celestial Empire,' brought her around to Vancouver and commen-

ced in June to fish for halibut, on the banks, which you know are situated in the neighbourhood of Hecate straits. As far as catching the fish is concerned, we have no complaint to make, but when it came to selling them it was a very different matter. We found that the market for these fish was and is in the eastern states, and that owing to the duty of one cent per pound, which is the tariff exacted by Uncle Sam, we were unable to land fish either in Boston or Chicago at a profit, and even the Canadian markets were denied us, owing to the fact that with the small duty of one half cent per pound which Canada imposes, large American companies were able to beat us even in our own country. Now, in order to protect ourselves and to obviate the necessity of dumping these fish, we were compelled to freeze and we have to-day in cold storage, here in Vancouver, three hundred thousand pounds of frozen halibut, of which, so far, we have not been able to sell a single pound, for the simple reason that American boats are bringing large quantities from the banks and with one cent a pound against us, no one will buy.

It is a well known fact, and notorious in British Columbia, that Americans are deriving all the benefits of these rich fishing grounds.

Unless the Dominion government will come to our assistance, not only will we be compelled to give up this enterprise but it will be impossible, for years to come, to interest capital of any kind in this great industry which should take its place amongst the greatest in western Canada.

We attach hereto a list of American ships and their catches and you will see at once how serious the matter is and what great sinews of empire building are simply being wheedled out of us by an alert and strenuous neighbour.

As a right to Canadian fish companies we ask that American ships be denied the privileges of our harbours to carry on the fish industry in Hecate straits, or, failing this, that the duty of one cent per pound be rebated, by the government, on all shipments of halibut from British Columbia ports.

It is not necessary for us to say how anxious we are to hear from you regarding this matter, as it is of the most pressing character and spells to us either success or failure.

We beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

The Canadian Fishing Company, Limited.

(Sgd.) HARRY H. WATSON,

Secretary.

J. M. ATKINS,

President.

I wish to read from the report of Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1906, extracts from the report of Captain Newcombe of D.G.C 'Kestrel':

During the month of August, we were cruising west coast and northern waters, calling at many of the outlying, unsurveyed harbours, where we found that the American fishermen were making use of these harbours for a base of operations, and in some cases had built small lighthouses for their guidance through the different channels. These houses were torn down and notice given the fishermen that any further infringements on our laws would be attended with disastrous results to themselves. We then cruised Hecate straits and the channels back to Vancouver.

During the past year halibut fishing on this coast has been good, and nearly double the quantity has been taken to any previous year. The American halibut fleet has increased very rapidly, principally in gasoline motor schooners. Poaching is carried on quite extensively, especially on the west coast where the motor schooners are operated during the summer season. To protect our halibut fisheries here it is absolutely necessary to have three more boats —one good smart cruiser (say 20 knots) and two smaller boats, one to be stationed on west coast and one at southern Dundas and Queen Charlotte islands, these boats to assist the cruisers in watching our harbours. With a fleet of this kind I would be prepared to stop all poaching for the present on this coast, and put any foreign fishermen out of business as far as Canadian fish are concerned.

At the present time, with our extensive coast line and the large fleet of foreign fishermen, it is impossible for any one boat, however fast she may be, to give the efficient patrol required to protect our fisheries.

It would not be necessary for the smaller boats to carry large crews, they should be the same class of boat as the fishermen, and be able to cruise when it was possible to fish. I would suggest boats from 90 to 100 feet keel; the reason for recommending the fishermen model of boat is, they would make the best sea boats and could always put to sea if required.

At the present time, under existing conditions, it is impossible for any one boat to give anything like a satisfactory patrol, and new boats cannot be had too soon.

I wrote to Captain Newcombe respecting halibut industry and received the following letter from him:

Vancouver, B.C., Dec. 20, 1905.

Sir,—Referring to your inquiry regarding the halibut fisheries and the work done by the 'Kestrel' on this coast during the year of 1905. On these two questions a great deal could be said, but I will confine my answers to conditions as I have found them.

. . . . . .

The American halibut fleet is increasing rapidly, especially in motor schooners, and poaching has been carried on extensively during the past year. During the months of April and up to the end of September these boats operate on the west coast of Vancouver island from Cape Flattery to Cape Scott, these vessels not only steal fish, but use the outlying harbours for their base of operations. Leaving Seattle and Tacoma they cruise along our coast entering harbour after harbour, and never entering at any one of our custom houses.

Four hundred miles north, poaching is carried on at times, chiefly by American Indians from Alaska who settle on some of our northern islands and fish for American companies who run the fish to Ketchikan and tranship them to Seattle and Tacoma.

During the salmon season the Alaska cannery men also make trips to our northern shores and inlets seining salmon and taking them across the border. There are also several American steamers fishing halibut in this vicinity, which although not fishing within the three-mile limit, make use of our harbours for cleaning and packing fish, &c. You ask, 'Why is this allowed'? In answer I can say that it is not allowed, but as we only have one cruiser for some 1,500 miles of coast line it is impossible

for any one boat to give the protection required and the American fishermen are not slow to take every advantage when opportunity offers. To patrol our coast properly it will take four cruisers. One good 20 knot boat along with the 'Kestrel' for outside work, then two smaller boats, one on the west coast and one in northern ports to watch our harbours and work in conjunction with the outside cruisers. Close harbours to foreign fishermen, they then will have to employ British bottoms or go out of business.

This would stop any argument as to American fishing in Hecate straits, and make those fishing there at present come to British Columbia ports to do business or stop fishing.

. . . . . .

In reference to the work done by the 'Kestrel' for the past year, I might say that she has done most valuable service. During the months of January and February we were stationed at Victoria while the 'Quadra' was undergoing her annual overhauling, since then we have been on regular patrol watching the poachers, tearing down their lighthouses, barricades for bait, &c.

In July we captured one vessel poaching, valued at $9,500, and altogether have cruised 15,200 miles during the season, this on an average speed of only 9¼ knots. Still a greater part of the coast of Queen Charlotte islands has never been touched, and it is not known what poaching is going on there.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) H. NEWCOMBE,
Commander C. G. F. C. 'Kestrel.'

Wm. Sloan, Esq, M.P.,
Nanaimo, B.C.

I have here a copy of report of Joint Committees of Trade and Commerce and Fisheries of the Vancouver Board of Trade, accepted at the monthly meeting of the Board of Trade on February 7, 1905:

Your committee is of opinion that the conservation of the halibut fisheries seems to depend upon some alteration in the present Fisheries Act, whereby foreign fishing vessels would be prohibited from making use of Canadian harbours of refuge, when, under stress of weather such vessels cannot remain on the fishing grounds. The American ports are too far distant from the halibut grounds for any vessels, excepting those under the Canadian flag, to successfully prosecute their calling on those banks.

It is also the opinion of your committee that the appointment of a close season for deep-sea fishing is advisable, but it would appear that sufficient biological knowledge of the habits of halibut and other fish frequenting these coasts is not yet in the possession of the government; it is, however, noted with satisfaction that an officer has been recently appointed for this purpose by the Dominion government to be stationed in British Columbia.

(Sgd.) A. B. ERSKINE,
Chairman.
WM. SKENE, Secretary.

I shall also quote from the Vancouver 'Daily Province,' December 26, 1905:

Year's halibut catch enormous along British Columbia coast.—Twenty-two thousand tons taken from the banks.—One-third of that poached.—Forty vessels steadily engaged in fishing.—Closing of Canadian harbours would put an end to raids.

Between twenty and twenty-two thousand tons of halibut were taken from Canadian fishing banks during the year 1905.

Just how much of this enormous tonnage was poached it is impossible to tell, but under the circumstances under which the fishing was performed it is reasonable to suppose that at least one-third was illegally taken from April to September by American vessels and transported to Puget Sound ports.

The range of the fisheries from which this great tonnage was taken came from Cape Flattery on the south to Dixon entrance on the north.

About a third of the fishing done on the west coast of Vancouver island was carried on illegally by American schooners.

In Dixon entrance and in Hecate strait to the north there was also much illegal fishing, a great deal of it carried on by Alaskan Indians, who forwarded their catches to Ketchikan, whence the fish were shipped to Seattle by American steamers operated on the Lynn canal route.

A proposed remedy, by means of which the rich halibut fisheries of the British Columbia coast—practically the only yielding banks now remaining in the world—may be preserved against alien invasion, is that all Canadian harbours be closed to American vessels, and that all halibut-fishing craft be licensed. This plan is pursued on the Atlantic coast of Canada in connection with fisheries there, and the result has been a practical cessation of poaching.

If the British Columbia coast harbours were shut against the poaching American craft, they would be practically forced out of business, for the reason that it would be well-nigh impossible for the vessels to clean their fish out at sea. This cleaning of fish must necessarily be performed in quiet waters, and on that account the poaching craft always run to a sheltering harbour to clean up after a catch.

I have here also extracts from report of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. Mr. B. E. Walker stated in 1905:

Why should we give United States fishing vessels the very privileges which enable them to undersell us in their markets? We realize that this is a matter which must be viewed broadly if any breadth of view is shown by our neighbours, but we have as yet seen little evidence of that. Canada and Newfoundland together own magnificent fishing areas, large enough to influence greatly the fish markets of the world. As the various countries of the world increase in wealth and purchasing power, the demand for fish, cured in one form or another, must steadily increase. The prosperity of our Atlantic and Pacific provinces depends virtually on the permanence and increased volume of our fisheries. Why should we hesitate to take every step necessary to protect and develop such a national asset? Indeed it is most pleasant to see that the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under the late minister, has been exhibiting considerable energy in this direction.

In the report of the same bank for 1906, the general manager made special reference to our British Columbia halibut, stating as follows:

Large quantities of halibut are now being caught by United States fishing boats off the British Columbia coast, and it is very desirable that we should not only protect our rights, but secure this trade for ourselves as far as possible. More attention is being paid to herring fishing, which seems capable of large development both at home and in foreign countries. There is practically no limit to the supply of food fishes in the North Pacific, and too much attention cannot be given by our legislators to this important source of wealth.

Recently we have had in British Columbia a commission inquiring into some phases of the fishing industry on the Pacific coast, more particularly as to our salmon interests. There are many details in connection with our salmon fisheries which might well be discussed at this time but I will defer until some other occasion. The commissioners while, as I have stated, dealing very largely with the salmon fisheries have also been inquiring into the deep sea fisheries, and I would like to quote to the House a few brief extracts from evidence which was given before the commission in reference to halibut fishing in our waters. First I shall read extracts from evidence of Mr. Grier Starrett, manager of the New England Fish Company, before Fisheries Commission in British Columbia :

Q. Do these vessels that are transhipping halibut from Seattle, are they fishing on the same grounds as you are ?

A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Do they use Canadian ports and harbours?

A. Yes.

Again in answer to another question Mr. Starrett states that 'The harbour commonly used by our boats is located at Steven's island. It is a small harbour known as Butler's Cove.'

Re employment of Canadian fishermen.

I want to make everything clear to you. About the men, there never was no agreement made between me and the government as to who are our employees.

Q. You did not give preference to Canadians ?

A. Never anything passed as to who our employees were to be. I know that because I was down there and made the whole deal. The government wouldn't commit themselves to a deal of that kind.

Extracts from evidence of Geo. S. Skinner, a fisherman who has been operating on the halibut banks:

Q. About their fishing boats coming up and using our harbours, do you think if more were done to keep them out it would stop them fishing, I mean the boats from Seattle and Tacoma that don't spend any money in Canada ?

A. Well, of course those other boats I don't see why they should use those harbours if only Canadians have a right to them.

Q. Do they gain any advantage by using them ?

A. If they couldn't use them they couldn't work in Hecate straits. They have got to run somewhere.

Q. What do you think they run in for?

A. They run in there principally for to clean their fish, fix up their gear and get fixed up for the next day.

Mr. SLOAN.

Extracts from evidence of Mr. E. G. Taylor, Inspector of Fisheries, district No. 3, British Columbia.

Q. Do you know whether there is illegal fishing for halibut by American fishermen inside the three-mile limit on the west coast of Vancouver Island ? A. From my own observations I know there is a great deal of poaching along the west coast of Vancouver Island.

Q. By American fishermen taking halibut ? A. Yes. Off the banks of Ucluelet and off the banks at Quatsino. There are quite a number of small vesels come in there and do a lot of fishing. The vessels principally come from Seattle.

Extract from the evidence of Captain Newcombe of the Dominion fisheries protection cruiser 'Kestrel,' before the commission :

It is imposible to fish and take care of fish without entering a port. These small schoonres will have twelve dories and each will average fishing over a mile to a mile and a half, and if they have a good day they will get 2,500 fish. Well, these fish are brought out of the dories and dumped on the deck, and you know what sort of a slimy mess that would be with only a few men to deal with it. If there is any roll at all they cannot take care of the fish and they have to run into harbour.

Q. Big vesels like the New England Fish Company's, they could take care of the fish ? A. No. You ask any old sailor, he'll tell you. The idea is this, I don't want to drive them away, I want to drive them here. They may say they'll go to Bellingham but they'll 'soon come back. Every captain they have, I have talked with them when they were on British boats before, and they'll tell you at once. They say that the minute you close your harbours to us we have got to go out of business. Dozens of them have told me the same thing. This year I tore down several lighthouses that they had put up, but without you have men or a boat stationed there you can't do much.

Extracts from statement made before the commission by Mr. C. F. Batson, who has been a fisherman on the halibut banks.

I want to say it would be impossible to fish on these grounds without our harbours. They must have shelter to prepare for fishing and to dress and stow cargoes. The gales are very heavy in Hecate straits and the prevailing winds are southeast.

Further comment would seem unnecessary, and I would ask that the application of the treaty of 1818 be applied to our harbours at or near our fishing bank and that a strict patrol be maintained on our western coast.

The first interim report of this commission has been to hand for some months. One of the sections of this report is in reference to a more efficient patrol and is as follows:

The commissioners urge that a more effective fisheries patrol be carried out in British Columbia, especially in the northern waters and along the west coast of Vancouver island, in order to suppress as far as possible poaching and trespassing in undoubted Canadian waters by foreign fishing boats and fishermen.

I am pleased to note that the government has recognized the demands which have been made from all quarters and that a sum sufficient for a first-class cruiser is in the present estimates, and it is expected that this increased patrol will materially lessen the poaching and other practices contrary to our regulations. I would impress on the government that another cruiser or two cannot be procured too soon.

The commissioners have endorsed the proposal made some months ago by the government to establish a marine biological station in British Columbia. The proposed establishment of the station has been everywhere accepted as being necessary in extending a more definite knowledge as to the economic values contained in our seas and the further extending of facilities for investigation and research which would be beneficial to our fisheries.

This commission has also called attention to the necessity for a more definite policy in regard to Hecate straits and Dixon's entrance. I understand that the commission has a subcommittee inquiring more fully into this matter, and as the commission meets again shortly for a final report, no doubt it will receive further consideration.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. It has been represented to the department time and again that if that privilege were taken away from the New England Fish Company, they would go to Seattle and that they would carry on their business at Seattle instead of Vancouver. What does my hon. friend think of that?

Mr .SLOAN. In reply to the question of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Capt. Newcombe is more competent to give an opinon on that question than probably any other man on the Pacific coast, and the extract I have read from his evidence, is very definite on that point. The question of territorial jurisdiction in Dixon's entrance and Hecate straits is of peculiar international importance. However, for the moment I will discuss it briefly. To do so I will return to the treaty of 1846, which defined the limits of the southern boundary between Canada and the United States from the Rocky mountains west to the Pacific ocean. Article 1 of the treaty is as follows :

From the point on the 49th parallel of north latitude where the boundary laid down in existing treaties and conventions between the United States and Great Britain terminates, the line of 'boundary between the territories' of the United States and those of Her Britannic Majesty shall be continued westward along the said 49th parallel of north latitude to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver island, and thence southerly through the middle of the said channel and of Fuca straits to the Pacific ocean, provided however that the navigation of the whole of the said channel and straits south of the 49th parallel of north latitude remain free and open to both parties.

This language being general and vague in terms as to actual metes and bounds a dispute arose later as to whether the line was intended to go through the Rosario straits or Haro channel, and in Article 34 of the treaty of Washington, 1871, provision was made by the appointment of the Emperor of Germany as arbitrator for a decision, and his award given in 1872 was in favour of the claim of the United States. In 1873 a conference was held at Washington for the purpose of tracing out and charting the line in accordance with this award, and a further definition of the line as laid down in the treaty of 1846; and the boundary agreed upon at this conference is a perpetual record of agreement between the two governments in the matter of the boundary line between their respective dominions in accordance with the treaty of 1846.

The Hon. Hannis Taylor, who was one of the counsel of the United States in the presentation of their case before the Alaska Boundary tribunal, in a recent publication on international law in discussing the question of 'sovereignty and jurisdiction regarding property,' states 'that while the disposition in regard to territorial waters tended towards the curtailment of any unreasonable claim to jurisdiction outside the marine league and that there is also a general disposition to regard all straits only or less than six miles wide as wholly within the territory to which they belong,' and Mr. Taylor cites the settlement of the southern boundary line under discussion as a notable exception to this general rule. In this connection I quote from Mr. Taylor's work, page 279 :

Straits less than six miles wide an exception. There is a general disposition to regard all straits only or less than six miles wide as wholly within the territory of the state or states in which their shores belong. When they have more than that width the space in the centre outside of the marine league limits is considered as open sea. As a notable exception, however, to the general rule that territorial rights cannot be extended over straits more than six miles wide reference may be made to the final settlement of the northwest boundary line between Great Britain and the United States originally provided for in the treaty of 1846, which declared that such line should follow the forty-ninth parallel of latitude to the middle of the strait separating Vancouver's island from the continent and thence down to the middle of the Strait of Fuca in the Pacific. When disputes as to the title of certain islands arose the boundary question was submitted under the treaty of 1871 to the arbitration of the German Emperor ; and in 1873 a protocol signed for the purpose of carrying out his decision, extended the line for fifty miles to the Pacific through the middle of a strait fifteen miles wide, after passing it across a body of water thirty-five miles long and twenty miles wide.

Mr. W. E. Hall, who is recognized as an eminent English authority on international law, in discussing the question of the territorial property of a state, 4th edition, page 163, states :

> The power of exercising control is not less when water of a given breath is terminated at both ends by water than when it merely runs into the land and the safety of the state may be more deeply involved in the maintenance of property and of consequent jurisdiction in the case of straits than in that of gulfs. Of practice there is a curious deficiency ; but there is one recent case from which it would appear that both Great Britain and the United States continue to claim as territorial the waters of a strait, which is much more than six miles in width. By the treaty of Washington of 1846 it was stipulated that the boundary between the United States and British North America should follow the forty-ninth parallel of latitude to the middle of the straits separating Vancouver island from the continent, and from there should run down the middle of the Strait of Fuca to the Pacific. Disputes involving the title to various islands having arisen, the boundary question at issue between the two nations was submitted to the arbitration of the Emperor of Germany, and in 1873 a protocol was signed at Washington for the purpose of marking out the frontier in accordance with his arbitral decision. Under this protocol, the boundary, after passing the islands which had given rise to dispute, is carried across a space of water thirty-five miles long by twenty miles broad and is then continued for fifty miles down the middle of a strait fifteen miles broad until it touches the Pacific ocean midway between Bonilla point on Vancouver's island and Tatooch island lighthouse on the American shore, the waterway being there ten and a half miles in width.

The Straits of Fuca, the middle of which is the southern boundary referred to between Canada and the United States, vary in width from 12 to 20 miles and extend in an unbroken channel over 70 miles from the ocean. It will be noted that the whole of the straits are to remain free and open south of the 40th parallel of north latitude for the navigation of both countries. The parties to the treaty by this article also clearly established to themselves a territorial claim to the Straits of Fuca and it has been recognized by them at least, for while these waters are free and open to the commerce and peaceful navigation of both countries the waters in question are patrolled by officers of the respective governments up to the line, and in 1899 six Canadian fishing boats were seized by the United States authorities on the United States side of the line in the vicinity of Point Roberts through which the 49th parallel runs, for an encroachment upon United States waters. They were released as it was recognized they had drifted over the line unwittingly, but the claim was maintained by the United States and recognized by Great Britain and is now a matter of public record.

I will now return to a consideration of the northern boundary between Canada and the United States as finally determined by the award of the Alaska Boundary Tribunal of 1903, and the question of territorial jurisdiction in the waters adacent to that line, known as Dixon's entrance. I have placed upon the Table of the House a map showing the boundary line in question.

I will not in the discussion of this go beyond the year 1821. In that year Russia issued a ukase claiming sovereignty over the Pacific ocean north of a point 51° north latitude extending oceanward 100 miles. This usurpation by Russia was resented as being beyond any reasonable claim, and immediately, protests were made by Great Britain and the United States, with the result that in 1824 a convention was held between the United States and Russia. By the terms of this convention Russia receded materially from the claims she had advanced in 1821, and further agreed that no establishment should be created by Russia south of 54° 49′ north latitude. Following this in the year 1825 a treaty was signed between Russia and Great Britain in which Russia abandoned all claims south of 54° 40′ north latitude on the northwest coast of America, by agreeing upon a line of demarcation as a boundary line between the possession of the two powers. This is set out in Article III of this treaty, the accepted English version of which is as follows :

> The line of demarcation between the possessions of the high contracting parties, upon the coast of the continent, and the islands of America to the northwest shall be drawn in the following manner :—Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called Prince of Wales island which point lies in the parallel of 54°, 40′ north latitude and between the 131st and 133rd degree of west longitude (Meridian of Greenwich), the said line shall ascend to the north, along the channel called Portland channel as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the 56th degree of north latitude. From this last mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude (of the same meridian) ; and, finally, from the said point of intersection, the said meridian line of the 141st degree in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean shall form the limit between the Russian and British possessions on the continent of America to the northwest.

In 1867 that part of Russian domain in America known as Alaska was ceded by treaty to the United States upon payment of $7,200,000, the United States accepting as the limits of the eastern boundary the line of demarcation contained in the third article, which I have just read, of the Treaty of 1825. This line of demarcation having been defined on the limited knowledge then possessed and being also indefinite in many particulars was subject to various interpretations and soon became a matter of contention between Canada and the United

States, and it was not until after repeated attempts and failures that in January, 1903, a convention was concluded at Washington between Great Britain and the United States which it was agreed to refer to a tribunal the points in dispute, and on the 20th October, 1903, by a final award of the tribunal, the question of interpretation has been definitely settled.

By referring again to Article III of the Treaty of 1825:

> The line of demarcation between the possessions of the high contracting parties upon the coast of the continent and the islands of America to the northwest shall be drawn in the following manner :—Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called Prince of Wales island the said line shall 'ascend to the north' along the channel called Portland channel.

The course of this line 'shall ascend to the north' being one of the points in dispute referred to the tribunal, has now been definitely charted and traced upon the maps by this tribunal, and commences at point A marked upon the map, at low water mark at Cape Muzon, Prince of Wales island, and extends almost due east through the upper portion of Dixon's entrance, as shown, to point B between Sitklan and Wales island, and is a portion of the continuous line of demarcation between the possessions of the high contracting parties to the Treaty of 1825.

While the Treaty of 1825 is not perfectly clear as to the course or nature of this line the convention in 1903 in ordering a decision by the tribunal as to the course which this 'line of demarcation between the possessions' should follow by that demand, declared that it was a line of demarcation between possessions, that is, a territorial boundary. It has now been laid down by the tribunal and has now an actual existence across the sea between the points A and B, just as the line in Fuca straits has an actual existence as laid down by the conference in 1873.

Dixon's entrance divides Prince of Wales island and Graham island and extends to the mouth of Portland channel, and is in width from Point A, the initial point of the dividing line between the possessions to Graham island, about 28 miles. Dixon's entrance possesses many features in common with the Straits of Fuca, with the exception that Russia in 1825 did not reserve any privileges of navigation.

In Dixon's entrance the line of boundary is defined in the Treaty of 1825 as 'the line of demarcation between the possessions.' In the Straits of Fuca, by the Treaty of 1846, the dividing line is defined as the 'line of boundary between the territories.' Both are equally expressive of an admitted ownership on either side of the boundary line and a recognized power to convey as between the parties, and having been so recognized and the line of demarcation between the possessions being now marked upon the maps which accompanied and formed part of the award of the tribunal, and the question of the limits of territory and consequent jurisdiction is now clearly defined as between Great Britain and Russia, in the Treaty of 1825, and further also recognized and ratified by the United States in 1903.

In recognizing the Straits of Fuca as territorial waters we have, as has been pointed out, a very notable precedent created by treaty and agreement for the extension of the usual limits of jurisdiction over waters in Dixon's entrance, we have created by treaty and convention, a case precisely similar, and another notable precedent to the question of territorial jurisdiction extending to straits of only or less than six miles in width.

Dixon's entrance, more especially that portion to the south of the line and approaching Graham island, is the most vaiuable halibut fishery ground which we have and is being daily invaded by American fishermen, and unless prompt measures are taken to effectively patrol these waters the constant inroads will seriously deplete this very valuable territory. The halibut fishing in Dixon's entrance is carried on without regard to the spawning season or the observance of conditions necessary to a continuous supply, and it is being urged that regulations be enacted and enforced with a view to prolonging and maintaining unimpaired the present commercial value of these very important fisheries.

It is recognized and it is admitted that the present system of extending privileges and of allowing the invasion of our harbours is building up American fisheries at the expense of Canada. In other words this policy will destroy every prospect of an extensive Canadian development of our fisheries. Discontinue this policy and pursue a policy which will encourage Canadian enterprise in every branch of the fishing industry, give a bonus on shipbuilding, pay a bounty on fish caught in Canadian bottoms, close our harbours, bays and inlets, protect and patrol our coast line and our territorial areas, establish cold storage and favourable transportation facilities, and in a few years, and very few, the two or three hundred thousand dollars which are now paid out by those carrying on the deep sea fisheries in British Columbia will be in the millions mark. Our cities and industries will receive a new impetus, our larger centres will then no longer pay tribute to United States points and our Canadian carriers will transport very largely the products of the Pacific instead of as at present handling only a small portion of the transcontinental business emanating from the fisheries of our western coast; and now, Mr. Speaker, is the time to consider seriously the case of the Canadian fishermen in the west, otherwise we will shortly awaken to a realization of

the fact that we have been grasping at the shadow while a strenuous competitor has carried off the substance.

The issues which have been discussed today are international in importance, and a portion of the Alaska boundary as finally determined by the tribunal having been under review, before leaving the subject may I be permitted to say that while by the award of the tribunal, Portland channel is so defined that Sitklan and adjacent islands westward are not retained to Canada, it is much more to be regretted that the width of the 'lisière' was by the same award so extended that Canada has been deprived of a harbour on Lynn canal. The present Minister of Justice, who was a member of the tribunal, and his associate, Sir Louis Jetté, did not concur in the award, but on the contrary both maintained a strong position in support of the claims of Canada. In passing, may I remark that a change of policy upon the part of Great Britain and according more extensive treaty making powers to Canada, may be of mutual benefit and certainly desirable from a Canadian standpoint. The various matters discussed today may also receive the consideration of the imperial authorities. In their consideration of these and all other issues of vital moment to Canadian interests, I trust that never again will these interests be sacrificed on the altar of indifference or expediency.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been trying to follow my hon. friend as closely as possible. I would ask him if Dixon's entrance near Graham island is south of the line or not?

Mr. SLOAN. That is not a matter of dispute, I presume.

Mr. FOSTER. Also with reference to Hecate straits between Charlotte islands in the mainland.

Mr. SLOAN. That would be open to contention.

Mr. FOSTER. Both are propositions that can be argued for and against?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have in brief, pointed out to the House some features of the Pacific fisheries requiring the serious attention of the government, and while the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues since assuming office in 1896, have done much for Canada, there is much yet to do. His government has been progressive, and they have been aggressive. On all occasions they have shown their faith in the great future of this Dominion. Emblazoned on the banner of their administration is the larger Canada, and it has been stated, and rightly stated, as a result that to Canada belongs the twentieth century. And in this Canada of ours from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the great east to the larger west with all its vast resources, varied interests and multiplicity of enterprises, there is no portion so full of promise, so pregnant with possibility as the province of British Columbia. We have an ideal climate. We have many fertile valleys. Our fruit lands produce the best. Our grazing lands are of very large extent. Our forest wealth represents millions. Our coal and mineral resources are unsurpassed. Our fisheries, especially our deep sea fisheries, are of a variety and extent above and beyond our most optimistic estimate and are as yet almost untouched, and with legitimate encouragement, judicious development and proper protection, will be a lasting and valuable asset to Canada for ages.

The construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will materially assist in the early development of these resources. Prince Rupert, the Pacific coast terminus of this route, with a splendid natural harbour, will be an important commercial centre. It will be a prominent trans-Pacific port, and, conveniently situated as it is to our deep sea fisheries, is destined to become one of the greatest, if not the greatest fishing ports in the world, and the Grand Trunk Pacific system will also distribute to all portions of the American continent the harvests of the sea.

From the fact that the premier and his colleagues are fully alive to the requirements and opportunities of our growing importance, will it be necessary for me to further urge the early introduction and intelligent operation of a policy which will have in effect the conservation of the enormous wealth of our deep sea fisheries for the benefit of Canada, Canadian enterprise, and our own Canadian people?

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I would like, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two in support of the resolution and also to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the wide and intelligent view they take of the question and the research they have evinced in producing statistics and tracing the history of this question. While my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) was making his speech yesterday afternoon, there was one fact which, I think, escaped his notice and that was with reference to the treaty of Ghent passed in 1818. I think the facts are these. The American commissioners were Henry Clay, Albert Gallatin McWheaton, who was ambassador at the court of Berlin, and John Quincy Adams. A dispute arose with regard to the settlement of the fishery dispute on the Atlantic coast. The American commissioners were disposed to settle it definitely, but Lord Gambier, who was the commissioner on behalf of Great Britain, proposed, as an off-set to the American claims, that British vessels should be allowed to navigate the Mississippi. That was rejected by the American commissioners and no settlement arrived at on that point. I do not think that many hon. members of this House remember the controversy of 1852, when the British government sent out their men of war and captured American

fishing vessels and towed them into the port of Halifax. The Nova Scotia government also fitted out some fast sailing schooners which captured prizes and brought them in to that same Canadian port. An immense furore was excited among the American people. The press took up the question and agitated it in the true American fashion. The eagle screamed and the British government rather thought they had provoked the American bird of freedom too much. However arrangements were made to stave off the question for a time and the reciprocity treaty negotiated shortly afterwards temporarily settled the matter.

I do not know what the British Columbia fresh fish tastes like, as I have not had the pleasure of visiting that coast and partaking of it there. But judging its quality, as it comes in cans, it is far below the quality of the fish we have in Nova Scotia. If you want to taste good fish, come down to Nova Scotia and get it before it goes into cold storage, because every half hour that elapses after the fish is taken impairs its flavour and value. If some of our hon. friends from the west want to taste some really good fish, let them come down to Nova Scotia and taste our salmon in the season, as it visits our coasts, or some good fall mackerel as it comes out of the boats. They would then be able to discriminate between our fish down there and the fish that is served us in this city, especially that which comes from the British Columbia coast. They would then taste fish worth eating.

My object was to call attention to the fact that the Minister of Marine has established in Halifax a bait-freezing plant. I had the pleasure, on my last visit to Halifax of going through that plant, where I saw the bait fish and also the other fish held in cold storage. This bait-keeping establishment has been a great advantage to the fisheries. Formerly vessels had to go from harbour to harbour pursuing the bait fish and procuring a precarious supply for their voyage. To-day, a vessel can go to the bait-freezing establishment, take what bait it requires and go out immediately on the banks and catch fish. Also, as I have suggested, a considerable quantity of fresh fish is held in cold storage. That article is superior to the ordinary fish placed upon the market, still in no respect can fish preserved in that way be compared with the article shipped immediately from the boats to the trains and quickly carried to the consumers. I am in hopes that we shall not be compelled to resort to storage fish or preserved fish, or any article held back in that way, but that trains, with which the boats and steamers will immediately communicate, will take the fresh fish caught upon our coast, and, within a few hours distribute them in the great cities of Canada, so that the deprived and unfortunate inhabitants of those places, may be able to participate, in some degree, in the luxuries which we upon the coast are enabled to enjoy. Therefore, on behalf of my constituents, I thank the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who listened to the request I made and carried out the experiment of establishing this bait-freezing plant which has been of incalculable advantage to the fishermen of Halifax and Lunenburg counties. With regard to the larger question whether the back of the British government is as stiff at it was in 1852, I must say that I have very grave doubts that that is the case. If Canada were to take a bellicose attitude, or if Canada were very rigid in maintaining its rights, I doubt that the British government would sustain the contention of Canada. I fear they would be more likely to indicate to Canada that perhaps some other solution of the question could be had. But it looks as if the desire to maintain the good will of the United States preponderated greatly in the councils of Great Britain and that a much greater regard is paid to the sensitiveness of the American than used to be paid in my boyhood days. It may be that there will be a turn of affairs and the amicable feeling at present existing may cool. But I think we ought to do nothing to impair the amicable relations existing between Great Britain and the United States. On the other hand, as the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) has intimated, we should not allow our rights to be thrown in as a propitiation of any clamorous element in Great Britain demanding that that be yielded which belongs to the colonies in order to save the trade and existing amicable relations now existing between the mother country and the United States.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). I do not purpose detaining the House at any great length with my remarks. I wish to compliment my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) on his excellent speech, a speech covering so well the facts in this case, and those facts so well marshalled. Still, I think I can say a few words in connection with the British Columbia fisheries which may help to throw a little further light upon the subject.

I think that, at the outset, we can lay down the hypothesis that the Americans have no right in Canadian waters. I do not think that any hon. gentleman will base an argument upon the assumption that the Americans have any such right. If the Americans have no right in Canadian waters and if they enter upon and fish in those waters, they can only be regarded in the same way as a man who enters another's house under cover of the night for the purpose of robbery. They are nothing more or less than robbers. We put it, possibly, in the mildest way when we call them poachers. The Americans are operating very largely in Canadian waters, their base being

the Puget Sound ports as shown by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin. Eight years ago there were just three vessels operating out of the ports of Seattle, Tacoma and Whatcom. To-day—and I wish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would bear this in mind—there are no less than forty-six vessels operating out of these ports. And every one of these forty-six vessels is operating in Canadian waters and taking Canadian fish. Now, the name has been mentioned here this afternoon of the New England Fish Company, with headquarters in Boston, Mass., and operating out of the port of Vancouver. Let me say a few words about that concern in order that the position may be understood. Mr. Grier Sterrett, who is the manager of that company, was a fishermen in the province of British Columbia, coming from the same city as my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy). Going into the halibut fishing business, he succeeded in getting a good deal of money put into it by people who, later had cause to regret it, for the result was that some $40,000 was lost in halibut fishing as at first attempted in British Columbia. Mr. Sterrett, a keen, shrewd business man, recognized the fact that we had plenty of halibut in our waters, and also the fact that there are eighty millions of people to the south of us who, as a body, are good fish eaters. So he asked himself: Why not get somebody who has money and can handle the output to take an interest in this business? So Mr. Sterrett went down to New York. And I may say that, practically, he had not a dollar to his name, having lost his all in the previous venture. He succeeded in getting together enough money to pay his expenses to New York and keep himself there for six weeks. He frequented the fish establishments there, endeavouring to find people handling fish, who might possibly take an interest in the British Columbia fish business. He met a gentleman connected with the New England Fish Company, of Boston. Getting that gentleman interested in the project, he went for a time to Boston. The result was that Mr. Sterrett and the New England Fish Company entered into the project. A Canadian boat was hired. It was not a very good venture—circumstances were not propitious. The New England Fish Company however—people of vast means, splendid people—came up to our government and said, as was shown by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) this afternoon: If you will allow us to ship through in bond American fish that are taken in American waters—that is, outside the three-mile limit of the British Columbia coast—we will undertake to operate from the city of Vancouver and ship over Canadian lines to the city of Boston. The result was that a year's permit was given to the company—what is known in our country as the New England Fish Company's permit. They put out two boats to catch American fish and to ship to American markets. Only fish caught in American bottoms can be sent to the United States free of duty, under the American customs law. So American bottoms were sent out, the 'Kingfisher' and the 'New England,' as has been stated by the hon. member for Comox-Atlin. The captain is the only one of American allegiance on board the boat. Their crews were hired in Vancouver; their fishermen were hired in Vancouver; their boats were bought in Vancouver; their bait was bought in Vancouver; the coal used to propel the boats was bought in Nanaimo.

Every particle that goes to make up the ship's complement in provisions or crew has been, from the inception down to the present time, received from British Columbia coast cities. Last year, as shown by my good friend, nine million pounds of halibut were shipped by the New England Fish Company operating entirely through British Columbia ports. Thirty-one odd million pounds of halibut were shipped out of the city of Seattle. These 31,000,000 pounds were just as easily got in our waters as were the 9,000,000 pounds taken by the New England Fish Company. Within the last year the New England Fish Company paid the Canadian Pacific Railway, in express rates alone over $300,000, and I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I care not who operates or in what name they may operate, whether they be American, French, Spanish, Barbarian, Sythian, bond or free. Capital is nationalized the very moment it crosses the border and the capital that has been put into the operations of the New England Fish Company is to all intents and purposes, Canadian capital. These people have operated out of our harbours and they paid last year over $300,000 to the Dominion Express Company for fast express carriage from the city of Vancouver to the city of Boston. They paid over $45,000 to the coal miners of the city of Nanaimo; they paid $40,000 to the box manufacturers of Vancouver and they paid $15,000 to the ice factory in the city of Vancouver. They paid directly and indirectly to the city of Vancouver for supplies, over $300,000 last year alone. Some 160 men, all of whom are ratepayers in the city of Vancouver, and whose names are on the voters' list, received all the way from $125 to $250 per month from the New England Fish Company and that is paid every month in good Canadian coin. I am not here to make any special plea for the New England Fish Company. The New England Fish Company is no more to me than any other fish company, but I do say that the government, which, with one fell swoop, would disturb a business like that I do not think would be acting, to put it mildy, very wisely. So much for the New England Fish Company. These men say that they do not wish to break any of the laws or regulations of the fishery department or of the Dominion

of Canada, but, Sir, if you say that the permit shall not go on longer to the New England Fish Company they can get their 9,000,000 pounds of halibut just as easily as the 31,000,000 odd pounds of halibut were got last year by the poachers. They can move their extensive operations eighty miles down to the thriving city of Seattle and instead of half a million dollars of good American money going into the coffers of our Canadian merchants and Canadian carrying companies, that half million dollars will be placed in the coffers of our American cousins. I am not here, I say, to make any special plea for the New England Fish Company, but I am here to propound what I believe to be a business proposition. The people of Canada have never attempted—and I speak in no disparaging terms of any government that may have been in power—to properly control the great Canadian Pacific coast. I will say that there was an attempt made six years ago when the 'Kestrel' was built upon Messrs. Wallace Brothers' ways in the city of Vancouver, and sent up to protect 4,000 miles of sea coast. Up to that time we did not have one solitary boat that could attempt to enforce any of our laws regarding the coasting trade of fishing. The 'Kestrel' is a nice little boat and she has been and is to-day doing good work, but I will tell my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)—and I know he appreciates it, and I am very pleased to see his appreciation of my statement in the fact that to-day there is in the Estimates, $250,000, I think, for the placing of a fast cruiser on the Pacific coast—that the steamer 'Kestrel,' well officered and well manned as she is, with every good intention and operating twelve months in the year, is no more fit to catch these fast boats out of the city of Seattle than a wheelbarrow is to catch an automobile. You are obliged to catch boats that will easily steam from 20 to 22 knots an hour. I might tell the hon. minister that to-day there is on the ways of the city of Seattle a large boat which will steam 18 knots per hour, being built for a halibut fishing company in Seattle. That boat has no other intention than to poach upon the fishing banks off the coast of British Columbia, and the minister must have a boat just as fast as that boat is. She will be captained by a gentleman who comes from the province that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) comes from, who understands how to handle these boats and who also understands, I believe, how to do a little poaching. Every time the steamer 'Kestrel' leaves Vancouver it is flashed down to Seattle, Tacoma and Whatcom by paid emissaries of the fish company on the American side that the 'Kestrel' is now leaving and to look out for her. They can easily look out for her. All they have to do, when the 'Kestrel' comes along, is to haul up their lines, bring in their dory, and have no evidence at all of catching fish inside the three-mile limit. They will tell the captain of the 'Kestrel' that they have been in getting fresh water. The captain of the 'Kestrel' sees them inside of the three-mile limit but he cannot see them fishing because it takes him three hours to come up to the boat, and by that time every trace of illegal fishing is gone and all that the captain of the 'Kestrel' can do is to twiddle his thumbs and wish to the Lord that he had a fast boat. During the past summer I spent three weeks on the west coast of Vancouver island and I saw boats outside of Clayoquot, outside of Barclay passage, and up as far as Nootka sound, within the three-mile limit. These halibut boats get inside of the three-mile limit, while the 'Kestrel' is possibly 500 miles away.

If my hon. friend or this House or this government want to stop illegal poaching in our country they have one thing to do and one thing only, to obtain a boat that is fast enough and big enough, or rather two boats that are fast enough and big enough, man them well and put them out on our coast and I will undertake to say that every solitary boat that is to-day operating from Seattle, Tacoma or Washington, if they want to stay in the business, will have to operate from our Pacific coast cities. That is the solution. It is not necessary for us to claim what belongs to us, but it is necessary that we shall have an arm strong enough when we lay claim to say: What we have we hold. It will be all right for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the government to say we cannot give the New England Fish Company a permit any longer. What good will that do? It will simply drive away an industry that is operating there to the American side. I trust I have shown to the satisfaction of the House and of the government that this is the case. Then after you have got your boats that are able to protect your rights you can go to the New England Fish Company and say: You have been operating through our coast cities, and you have done well, but we wish to put you in the same position as others, we will close our harbours to every one but Canadian bottoms; we will stop all permits to carry American fish through our ports. Then and not till then will you be able to do anything for the halibut industry in the province of British Columbia. I do not for one moment wish this question to be clouded, I want the line of demarcation to be throughly shown, and I trust I have made myself plain to the minister. I recognize the fact that there is a rival company in the city of Vancouver, the Canadian Fish Company, made up of good friends of mine. I was talking to the secretary of that company before coming here the other day. He said: We can sell our fish to-day only to the New England Fish Company of the city of Boston. The New England Fish Company have, I believe, entered into a compact with them for a year's engagement. The

New England Fish Company are the big dealers in the fish business throughout this continent. Many carloads a day I believe are sent out of Boston to the many towns and cities in which they operate.

Mr. FOSTER. The New England Fish Company which operates out of Vancouver, catches its fish and tranships them over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Boston. It does that by virtue of some customs arrangement, not by virtue of the modus vivendi.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, it is entirely by permit, entirely a customs arrangement, I thought I made myself plain on that. They are the big fish operators on the American continent to-day. How much fish is taken by the city of Montreal or the city of Toronto? How long would this great Dominion of ours keep our fisheries going? A very short time. We all recognize, therefore, that we have to look to the American side for our market and I say, do nothing that will disturb a market that we are operating to-day, until such time as you can clean out the poachers who are operating in our waters and doing everything that is detrimenetal to the best interests of Canada.

Mr. ALBERT J. S. COPP (Digby). Mr. Speaker, I shall not follow the hon. gentleman who has preceded me as to the treaties existing between Great Britain and the United states; that I think has been most exhaustively entered into and nothing has been left for me to say. I shall direct my observations from the point of view that under the modus vivendi American vessels are permitted to get bait in Canadian waters, whereas under the treaty of 1818 they are not allowed to procure bait in Canadian waters.

In the year 1903, I had the honour of being a member of the commission appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that day to investigate the herring industry in the Bay of Fundy. Great complaint had reached the department, I believe, of the scarcity of herring and the depletion of that industry, and an effort was being made to find out the cause. Associated with me on that commission were Col. Tucker, of St. John, whom I think every member of this House knows well; I know that I need not say anything as to his capabilities to serve as a member of that commission. He is one who has always taken a very deep interest in the fisheries of the maritime provinces and he is capable of forming a good judgment in relation thereto. Another member was Mr. Bowers, of the county I have the honour to represent. He is a practical fisherman, a man who has devoted his whole lifetime to the fisheries of the maritime provinces, and probably no more capable man could have been found. Mr. Armstrong from Charlotte county was also a member and I need say nothing about him. He is a newspaper man and that of itself would make him a competent man to act on a commission of that kind. Then we have the assistant commissioner of fisheries, Mr. Venning. We all know him and know that he is one of the most capable men in the Department of Marine and Fisheries to-day. We entered exhaustively into an examination as to whether or not the herring industry was decreasing, and if so what the cause of it was. We first had statistics prepared, showing the total catch of herring in the Bay of Fundy, including Shelburne, Yarmouth, Digby and Charlotte, the four largest counties on that bay, from the year 1880 to the year 1903, and we found a remarkable state of affairs. We found that the herring industry had not only become depleted but very nearly exhausted. We then set ourselves to, if possible, ascertain the cause. Now, Mr. Speaker, we held meetings in different parts of Charlotte county, we held meetings also in different parts of Digby county, and we procured all the information that we could procure in order that we might make recommendations to the department that would be of benefit to the industry and of benefit to the fishermen as well. I may say that all of the recommendations made by the commission have been adopted by the department except two. We not only had the herring industry to investigate, but we also had the lobster industry and the spawning ground as well, and every recommendation made by that commission except two has been followed by the department, and I think the Minister of Marine will say that in that way he settled the grievances that existed among the fishermen. But two recommendations made by us have not been carried out. The first of these was:

> That in view of the fact that the United States government imposes an import duty on the fish entering the United States when carried in British bottoms and that as a consequence all the fresh herring carried to United States factories, are in United States bottoms in order to escape United States duty, and in view of the further fact that the United States boats are allowed to enter Canadian waters for the purpose of obtaining these fresh herring without reporting regularly at customs, the Canadian customs laws be enforced, in respect to the United States boats carrying such fresh herring from Passamaquoddy bay, in the same manner as in all other ports and waters of Canada.

When we made that recommendation we thought that all we would have to do was to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that the Canadian customs laws enforced in all parts of Canada as against all classes of people, were not enforced in the county of Charlotte. We thought in making this recommendation that we were simply recommending what ought to be done not only in Charlotte county but in all other counties on the Bay of Fundy and all over Canada. The second recommendation in the report is:

That an export duty be imposed upon all fresh herring exported from Canada to the United States in United States bottoms, equal to the import duty imposed by the United States government upon the same article when imported in Canadian bottoms.

We were aware that this would be new legislation, but we were thoroughly convinced that the conditions justified us in making the recommendation. It is only fair to say that Mr. Armstrong who is a resident of Charlotte dissented from both these recommendations. The other four commissioners were unanimous in regard thereto, but Mr. Armstrong for some reason or other asked that he be put down as dissenting. Exception has been taken to these two recommendations both in this House and in the New Brunswick legislature by the gentlemen who represent the county of Charlotte. In the New Brunswick legislature last session, Mr. Hill, the member for Charlotte, moved the following resolution:

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this legislature that the Fisheries Commission recently appointed by the government of Canada have submitted to the government the following recommendations:

(a) That an export duty be placed upon sardine herring.

(b) That the customs laws with regard to the entering and clearing of vessels be strictly enforced against the sardine boats.

(c) That the present weir license fee of $5 be increased to a minimum figure of $20 with a maximum of $60.

(d) That no new weir licenses be granted.

And whereas, this legislature is satisfied that the enactment of these recommendations would practically destroy the sardine herring fishery of Passamaquoddy bay, upon which the fishing and trade population of Charlotte county, in the province, largely depend, that until an ample market has been secured for the product of this fishery to take the place of the market the fishermen of said county now enjoy in the United States, it would be unwise to impose an export duty or take any action to disturb existing conditions, that the only immediate effect of such a duty would be to divert the fishery and the profits of the same from New Brunswick and its people to the state of Maine and the fishermen of said state; that in respect to the entering and clearing of boats engaged in the sardine carrying trade, this business cannot be successfully carried on if a strict interpretation of the customs laws in that regard be insisted on.

Therefore be it resolved that this legislature place on record its disapproval of the recommendation of the Fishery Commission above set forth, and respectfully urge upon the government of Canada that, under the conditions existing in the sardine fishery, the enactment of the said recommendation is not advisable, and that such enactment would be attended with incalculable injury to a large portion of the population of the county of Charlotte, one of the most important sections of the province of New Brunswick.

In support of the resolution Mr. Hill said:

This large business would be destroyed if either of these recommendations were carried out and we would be driving away our young men to foreign lands.

The islands of Charlotte contain an intelligent class of people whom we cannot afford to lose. They are a healthy and hardy race, and the day may come when the mother country may need their services for the navy. As Kipling says in one of his poems, 'and you called on the younger people the men who can ride and shoot.'

I do not know Mr. Hill personally but I have always understood he was a fair-minded man, and I cannot believe he would advocate a resolution of that kind if he had the slightest idea of the conditions existing in his own county.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do you refer to Mr. Hill of Charlotte county?

Mr. COPP. Yes. Mr. Hill was followed in the debate by Mr. Hartt who said:

The fish taken in Canadian waters belong to the same school as the fish taken in American waters, and the catch in the American weirs has been increasing. If the Eastport canneries could not get their fish from Canadians they could buy them from American fishermen.

All I can say is that Mr. Hartt knows nothing of the fishing industry of the Bay of Fundy when he makes that statement. Mr. Clark who was the other representative from the county of Charlotte, and whom I know, spoke as follows:

There is no other source from which these people can seek support. The evidence submitted to the commission gave absolutely no warrant for the recommendation made.

I intend to read the evidence given by the fishermen of the county of Charlotte before the commission, and then we will see what there is in that statement. He continued:

The winter herring which were once very plentiful disappeared for fifteen years and then turned up again just about the time the commissioners were making up their report.

The fisheries of Charlotte county have not been injured by the sardine fisheries and the catch is larger now than it was ten years ago.

The imposition of these regulations would ruin the fisheries of Charlotte county, and the people of Charlotte almost to a man are opposed to them.

Later on, and during the session of this parliament the hon. gentleman from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) spoke in this House in regard to this industry, but his remarks I will not refer to just now. Mr. Speaker, one would be led to believe by reading the speeches of Mr. Hill, and Mr. Hartt and Mr. Clark, that great prosperity had come to the county of Charlotte through this sardine industry. The sardine industry was first introduced in 1880 and all the inquiry of the commission was directed to it from that year up to the present. Let me give you the census of the county of Charlotte, and we will then see where the

young men are who can 'ride and shoot' and whose services the country may have to call on. In 1870 the population of Charlotte county was 25,882; in 1880—when the sardine factory was established at Eastport and when the Americans took charge of the industry in the Bay of Fundy—the population of Charlotte county had increased to 26,087. But what followed. In 1890 the population of Charlotte had fallen to 23,752, and in 1900 it had fallen to 22,450, or a loss in twenty years of over 4,000 population in addition to the natural increase. And yet, Mr. Hill tells us we are driving the young men away and that in order to keep them in the county of Charlotte we must allow the existing conditions there to continue. Let us look at the history of the fishing industry in Charlotte county. In 1880 that county was one of the most flourishing fishing counties in the whole of the maritime provinces and the following statistics, which I quote from the year 1876 down, will show just what effect the sardine industry has had upon the county of Charlotte. The following is the number of barrels of herrings packed in Charlotte county for the several years:

	Barrels.
1876	77,850
1877	89,198
1878	80,693
1879	69,016
1880	72,000

You can realize just what that means to the county. First, there is the cutting of the wood, then the making of the staves, then the making of the barrel, then the curing of the herring, then the packing of the herring, and lastly the shipping of the herring to the market. The sardine industry was introduced in 1880, and from that time on the number of barrels of herring put up in the county were as follows:

	Barrels.
1881	27,030
1882	67,174
1883	43,180
1884	29,478
1885	29,578
1887	14,442
1888	23,700
1889	21,125
1890	16,009
1891	11,270
1892	15,341
1893	15,435
1894	5,265
1895	7,740
1897	10,765
1898	27,800
1900	6,234
1901	7,931
1902	3,386
1903	5,458
1904	8,643

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where were these caught?

Mr. COPP. In Charlotte county by the Charlotte county fishermen. These statistics show that the sardine industry has almost completely wiped the herring industry out of existence. Now, let us consider the value. To-day herrings are worth in the markets of the world from $8 to $10 a barrel, although they have been sold at as high as $14 a barrel. In 1880, as I have stated, the number of barrels put up in Charlotte county was 80,693. Taking these at $8 a barrel, nearly $700,000 worth of herring were put up in that one county alone in that year. In the year 1904 there were put up only 8,643 barrels.

If you were to be guided by the speeches made in the local legislature by these hon. gentlemen, you would naturally suppose that the fisheries of Charlotte county had increased. Let us look at the facts. The value of the fisheries in the county for the various years is shown by the following statistics of the value of the total annual catch:

1876	$ 738,702 90
1877	865,866 15
1878	887,679 52
1879	885,598 10
1880	1,019,306 65
1881	1,220,769 30
1881	1,240,765 20
1883	1,334,421 90
1884	1,407,020 50
1885	1,340,948 95
1887	1,482,368 95
1888	1,173,449 50
1889	1,553,780 80
1890	1,373,589 26
1891	1,062,756 10
1892	1,279,977 19
1894	771,182 35
1897	968,203 50
1898	1,108,701 76
1901	1,216,259 95
1902	638,890 65
1903	1,108,543 50
1904	847,850 50

So that you will see that the value of the fisheries has declined. It may be remembered that I brought this matter up in this House some sessions ago, and a short time afterwards I received the following letter:

Vancouver, B.C., October 24, 1903.

Mr. Copp.

Dear Sir,—I notice by the St. Andrews 'Beacon' that a Mr. Copp, of Digby, is fighting against the destruction of herring around Quoddy, and am glad to hear of him. I just returned to British Columbia after a few weeks' visit to my old home on Campobello, had been from there near ten years. During the eighties I doubt if there was a man in those parts who handeled more herring than I, but what a change. I think it was during the winter of 1883 that 104 Gloucester and coasting vessels loaded with frozen herring about 40,000 barrels were shipped from Eastport, Maine, to the States, besides what were used in Canada, used for bait. Many were salted and hundreds of thousands of boxes were smoked for bloaters and hard herring. There has not been any caught in nets since the winter of 1889. Some are wondering what have become of our herring. I can tell them. They have been

taken by all kinds of traps and nets, put into American boats and carried to American establishments across the line. Have known my brother and I to have 250,000 boxes of smoked herring on hand at one time. You could not get 100 boxes on Campobello Island. When I was there our wharfs and curing houses were worthless, parties were actually cutting the logs up for wood. While I was there many families had left home to work in sardine canneries in Lubec and Eastport, Maine, which depend upon our Canadian herring, but so few have been caught they will return with empty pockets. The government should have stopped this raw material going out of this country long ago, they have not only destroyed our herring fishing in the Bay of Fundy, but taken our people with it. At Grand Manan, I found many had left for the Maine coast saying they could not get herring enough for bait let alone for curing, as soon as any were caught (which was seldom) and Americans bought them.

Our government should at once stop the exportation of herring from Canada except when put up cured and ready for food. I see a commission is to be appointed to look into the matter, the cause of scarcity of herring is plain, all kinds are now called sardines. American boats used to come for sardines and take cured packed in boxes and barrels, and carry them in free before I left home. I should like to be a witness before that commission and tell them what I have seen done with our herring at Eastport, boat load after boat load carried away for manure no longer than one's finger. I do not know who you are Mr. Copp, but would like to hear from you. I might hunt up some of my old books that give account of some years catches. Prohibit the exportation of our herring except when put up as an article of food. Out here we have placed an export duty on logs which has caused some twenty-five mills to be built in vicinity of Vancouver, but I do not think export duty would do for herring back there.

Yours faithfully,
C. F. BATSONS.

I do not see where our vessels back there will get bait if something is not done at once. There twenty-five mills have been built since export duty was put on, in addition to mills many of which we had before.

I do not know this man at all, but I took pains to verify that letter and ascertain whether its contents could be relied upon, and I found, as the result of my investigations, that the man had written to me what was absolutely true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read from the evidence given before the commission in regard to this industry in the county of Charlotte by the Charlotte county fishermen. I read this evidence because Mr. Clarke said that there were no fishermen in Charlotte county in favour of these recommendations. I may say that all these meetings are advertised for a week or ten days in advance, so that the people knew of them. The first meeting was held at North Head, in Grand Manan, and was attended by 100 to 200 fishermen. At the beginning of the meeting the chairman told those present what they were there for, and asked them to come forward and testify, or to appoint some of their number to testify for them, and at the conclusion of the meeting he asked if there were any dissenting voices, or if any one had anything to say in reply to the evidence that had been given. The first was Mr. Wm. Dalziel, whose evidence was as follows:

The defects of the fishing grounds are pretty bad. We have no herring as we used to have, we have not many small or large herring, and the cause is that the fish are destroyed. I might say what has done this is the sardine business. This business has destroyed all the small herring so that they are not allowed to grow. At the time of the beginning of fishing there were plenty of large fish; but now the fishery is nothing at all. I remember when I was fishing years ago that Charlotte county used to supply our home market with large herring, pickled, smoked and frozen. That is all gone. We do not sell any frozen herring and very few smoked herring.

Commissioner Copp. How does it affect the bait question?

Bait is very scarce. To-day men cannot get bait to fish with. Men have been remaining idle for several days.

Commissioner Venning. Did you ever find difficulty in former years in getting all the bait you wanted? No, the herring used to come on this shore at that time.

Do you attribute this to the sardine fishery?

Yes.

Did I understand you to say that the sardine industry has fallen off?

Yes.

The weirs do not catch as many?

No.

Commissioner Tucker. How long have you been fishing?

I have followed fishing for thirty-five years.

When you first commenced fishing can you form any idea of the quantity of herring that were caught?

No.

Were the boats the same size as now?

No, they were smaller. Sail boats about 14 or 15 feet keel.

How long would you be out fishing?

About half a day.

Would you fill the boat?

Yes.

How long would that take you now?

You could not get a boat-load if you remained out all day and all night.

Commissioner Venning. Do the weir fishermen catch as many fish now as in earlier years?

No.

Do they catch as many as one or two hundred hogsheads?

Yes. When the first weir was built in Seal cove—the 'Admiral'—I have seen that weir with two at a time seining, seine up from two to three hundred hogsheads at each tide. It ran on for about two years at that rate.

Commissioner Armstrong. Was that an abnormal condition?

That was the best of it. It began to decline.

Commissioner Copp. In years gone by did they not sell large quantities for bait to Americans all round the islands?

Yes.

Have you any idea of the amount of bait sold?

American vessels used to all come here and bait in the spring of the year on their way to the banks. They do not come here now.

Why ?

There is no fish for them.

Commissioner Armstrong. Do many Nova Scotia vessels come here for lobster bait ?

Yes.

They get the small fish ?

Yes.

Do you think fishing is injured to some extent by taking the small fish ?

Yes.

Commissioner Copp. Would not taking somewhat larger fish injure them in the same way?

Yes.

Commissioner Tucker. Are there many schools of herring around the island ?

Yes.

Were there in years gone by ?

Yes. It was all one solid school at that time. The herring would extend for miles.

How do they run now ?

They run by. We do not get them.

I am given to understand that there were two or three large schools in the Bay of Fundy years ago. Since that I am told that these schools have practically reduced until they have become one school ?

Yes, but that school is pretty hard to find sometimes. Sometimes from week's end to week's end you will not find a school of herring.

Commissioner Bowers. Are there any herring taken in the winter and frozen ?

Very few.

How many, as compared with former years ?

Not one-sixteenth as many. No vessels come here now to take frozen herring. They all go to the eastward.

Commissioner Armstrong. Have you any suggestions to offer to improve matters in any way ?

One suggestion would be that there should be restriction on the taking of small herring.

You have them protected against being taken as lobster bait to-day ?

Yes, that is one suggestion.

Then there are references to the spawning ground, to which I shall not refer at present.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was that witness ?

Mr. COPP. Mr. William Dalziel, of North Head, Grand Manan. Then Mr. Dalziel continued :

Commissioner Tucker. Will your figures give us the quantity taken for stringing purposes ?

I can tell you the quantity taken this year on the front part of the island; 50,000 boxes would cover the ground.

Commissioner Copp. Take ten years ago, and how many boxes would there be ?

From White Head bay I should say 800,000 boxes.

Commissioner Armstrong. Have there been many seasons during the past twenty years when fish were as scarce as at present ?

No ; there never has been such a scarcity in the waters of Grand Manan. The fishery has been falling off for the past six years. We noticed it before that time ; but it has been impossible to get a living out of it since.

Commissioner Copp. You do not think the dog-fish have anything to do with the decline in the industry ?

No ; the small herring is the trouble.

Commissioner Armstrong. Do you think the same school visits this shore ?

I think it is a separate school.

If it is a separate school would the conditions that obtain here be the same all over the bay?

Herring are scarcer over the whole Bay of Fundy.

Commissioner Tucker. Do you believe in these deep water weirs ?

No ; I think they are a serious injury to the fish.

The next witness was Mr. E. A. Calder. I did not know him until then, but a more intelligent man and a better fisherman probably I never met, and I shall give you his evidence. He filed a statement which had been prepared by the fishermens' association and placed in his hands. Mr. Calder said :

I have compiled these figures from the statements of a number of fishermen who have been in the business for about sixty years. These figures are from personal observation. The man to whom I refer could not be present and I have taken his figures, and shall give them to you. This document is in connection with the lobster bait that is taken and the sardine fishery as well. There was caught for lobster bait for forty-seven cargoes in the year 1897, averaging three hundred barrels per vessel. We have just checked the figures for one year. That gives us 14,100 barrels of what we call 'britt.' Each barrel contains ten ordinary water pails or buckets, that is 141,000 buckets. Each bucket holds 1,000 small fish, though 1,200 have been counted ; that is equal to 141,000,000 taken for lobster bait in one year. If these fish were allowed to grow to 2½ inch herring, they would make 282,000 barrels, each barrel containing 500 fish.

The same year there was packed for sardines 500,000 barrels.

Can you imagine 500,000 barrels of small immature herring taken out of the water and brought across the line to American factories and there manufactured into a product and sent out to the world ?

Mr. FOSTER. Would that be 1,000 to a pail ?

Mr. COPP. Each bucket holds 1,000 small fish, although 1,200 have been counted.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the 500,000 barrels be of that kind of fish ?

Mr. COPP. Yes.

The same year there was packed for sardines 500,000 barrels. The average is ten cases of sardines to the hogshead. Each hogshead contains fifty buckets; that is 5,000,000 buckets. Each bucket contains 500 fish. If these fish were allowed to mature, each bucket would make a barrel of two and a half inch mesh herring. If this estimate is thought too large, allowed 250 fish to the bucket, as some fish are mustards, and you have 2,500,000 barrels of net herring. I am speaking of the county of Charlotte.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be a slaughter of the innocents.

Mr. COPP. That is just what it is. Mr. Calder continues, in his evidence, as follows :

Commissioner Tucker. What is their contract price ?

I do not think they had a contract price. Last year it was $4 per hogshead, but this year it ranged from $2 to $20 as the schools were very scarce.

Commissioner Copp. What would be the value of the sardines if allowed to mature ?

At $5 per hogshead it would give $500,000.

It will be seen that he gives a value of $5 per hogshead. But, as I have stated, the average price, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can tell us, is from $8 to $10 per barrel for herring put up under the Cowie system.

At $5 per hogshead it would give $500,000, and if allowed to mature it would give $5,000,000. This would be at $2 per barrel.

Commissioner Venning. That is assuming that you caught all these fish, if allowed to mature ?

Exactly so.

Would that be possible ?

It would be possible if they were allowed to grow but not otherwise.

Commissioner Armstrong. Have you figured out the number of people that would be employed in the operations if the sardines were allowed to mature ?

No, I have not had time to do that, but I could give you the figures of what Grand Manan is losing annually by having our waters overfished. We have about fifty families that go over to Lubec and Eastport every year. The average earnings of these families would be $500 per season. That would give $25,000. This is earned by these families in packing our own sardines or raw material. The cost of living over there is about 75 per cent of these earnings, so that we leave something over $180,000 and bring back about $6,000. There was a time previous to 1882, for twenty years when we used to get great net fishing all around here, and on an average we would export from Grand Manan about 1,000,000 barrels frozen herrings which we used to sell to American vessels, which we have sold as high as $1.50 per 100 pounds and as low as 35 cents but on the average 50 cents per 100 pounds, that is $50,000. Since 1888 which is about the last year that we got frozen herring to any extent which came in February they have been dwindling down to about nothing, however, last year was about the best we had, there having been caught about 300,000 pounds.

Commissioner Armstrong. Do any Americans own any of the weirs in Grand Manan ? I do not know of any.

Do you know of any weirs that are sold to Americans ? No, I do not think that state of affairs exists, but I am not positive about it. I do not know who owns the leases. It is common talk that a firm from Lubec owns the fishery at Dark Harbour.

Commissioner Copp. Could you give us any figures as to the amount of herring smoked in Grand Manan, say ten years ago and now ? It was 1,000,000 boxes ten years ago. I think to-day about 800,000 boxes are smoked. I think this is excessive.

Commissioner Armstrong. How many factories on the island put up kippered herring ?

Four.

Is that a new industry ? Practically so.

Would that take the place to some extent of the smoked herring ? Not so very much. No, because our smoked fish do not go to the same markets. Our kippered herring go principally to Canadian and the smoked herring do not.

Commissioner Copp. Do you put up many bloaters ? Yes, when they can get them. I have given an estimate of 800,000 which I think is excessive. I would put the average this year at not more than 600,000 boxes—that is small boxes. The pack of kippered herring this year is not very large.

Commissioner Venning. How many barrels of pickled herring were put up this year on the island ? 7,700 half barrels, say 3,000 barrels.

Commissioner Copp. Will you explain to us the method of the sardine fishery in procuring the fish ? The raw material is taken in our waters and taken over there in American bottoms by either native born Americans or Americanized Canadians. Our boats are debarred from taking them there. My experience is that about two-thirds were formerly Charlotte county boys. There is a United States duty on these fish, but they exempt their people, but Canadians have to go through the customs and pay a duty of three-quarter cent per pound. I would advocate, to give our Canadian bottoms a part of the carrying trade, to impose an export duty equal to at least the United States import duty if the sardine industry is to continue and we are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Yankees. Many of us are of opinion that we could have a nice little canning business in our own country without becoming American citizens, which is necessary in order to get the benefits of that country. These American boats cannot comply with the customs regulations and pursue the business. They do not enter and clear every time. Our boats are compelled to enter when they go there to do business and have to pay quite a fee, and here the Americans have to pay only 25 cents and if he does his own brokerage, it deos not cost him anything.

The next witness was Mr. T. M. Dakin, and his evidence is as follows :—

I would like to begin where Mr. Calder left off, in the advantage which their boats have over ours. Under our customs laws we are compelled in trading between our own ports to go to the custom house every trip. At one time one boat for not reporting at the custom house on our island was fined $75. That $75 was sent to Ottawa. The consequence was that some time afterwards that American fisherman got $65 back. Had it been my boat I would have had to pay $400 and I doubt if ever I would have got any of it back. That is one advantage. They come here just that way. They have the privilege of buying herring where they are not allowed to catch them. The weirs are allowed to catch them and sell to their boats, and take them to a foreign country where we are prohibited from taking them as there is no duty on fish taken in American bottoms.

It is pretty hard to estimate the number of net fishermen on Grand Manan. What we want is equal rights. We do not want to see the weirs cut down and then not to get any fish, but we want the chance to fish with them, but to see them fish there the year round for the

small sum of $5 while we cannot fish there is too much.

The next witness was James Scovill, who was questioned by Commissioner Tucker:—

How long have you been fishing? Since I was fifteen. I am not sixty. You have no doubt heard what has been said by the different witnesses. Should you not agree with what they have said we should be very glad to hear in what you disagree? I agree with all that has been said. I am a vessel fisherman. We have quite a grievance about fishing on the spawning ground. Now, on the spawning ground men go net fishing once in a while. Fish have become so scarce that it is necessary for fishermen to get them anywhere they can. . .

Commissioner Tucker. Do I understand you that the herring have become so scarce that they are all gathered at one particular point? Yes.

You do not find them at other parts of the island? No.

Has any reduction taken place in the herring at the other end of the island? Some, but not much. There has been a reduction all over the bay. From here to Bauld rock is a splendid ground, but it has become a failure through catching small herring. There is another spawning ground on the New Brunswick shore which never was protected and it has become a failure through catching small herring.

Is there another on the side of Digby gut? None that I know of nearer than Scott's bay. These have become a failure through catching small herring. Of this there is no doubt. Forty years ago you could set your net here and catch any quantity of bait, and men with a small boat net would put from 100 to 150 barrels of herring in a season, and to-day you cannot catch enough to make a fry. When I first came to this island schools and schools of fish could be seen. To-day you could lay there until your heart ached and you would not see one. This was the case along the Nova Scotia shore and to-day the bait is all gone, for no other reason than that the small herring are all being taken and used up. A herring as long as that knife is just as much a spawn herring as just before it spawns. It is only a matter of a little time. Before it gets big enough to be caught in a net it spawns from one to six times.

How long since there was fishing for herring at Ten Mile creek? There were some there last year, but not many.

Do you think it would be a good thing for the government to put an export duty on sardines? Yes, on American bottoms.

Can American boats enter and clear each trip and make the business a success? They do not do it. If the custom houses were handy they could enter and clear.

Commissioner Armstrong. Do you ever fish for sardines? No.

Commissioner Bowers. What is your idea about small herring taken for lobster bait? I think these are the little herring that are ruining our fishery.

Would you not allow the small herring to be taken? Nothing under six inches.

What would be done for lobster bait? Let the big ones be used.

The next witness was Mr. George Green who was questioned as follows :—

Mr. COPP.

How long have you been fishing? All my life time. You want to take and cut down all the weirs so that every man may have a chance. The nets would not catch enough small fish to hurt, and the fish would grow, and give plenty of fish for everybody. As it is now there will not be a herring for ten years.

The next witness was Mr. James Griffin:—

I have been fishing about thirty years. At this day you will find some of our fishermen leaving because they cannot get any small herring for bait. You deprive us of that privilege, and where will people get bait to bait their trawls, and there does not appear to be any oher kind of fish around here but these small fish. I have been driven across to the American shore to earn a living because under the laws here we cannot make a living. I think fishermen should have the privilege of lighting a torch to get bait to make a living with for his family. I do not think this is anything more than justice and I do not think any man will disagree with me.

On that point a letter was handed in to the committee which I will read. It was a letter addressed to the commission by Mr. John R. Moses. I do not know the gentleman but this is what he has to say in reference to the sardine industry :—

Grand Manan, Dec. 11th, 1903.

When the fishing treaty expired some years ago. our friends on the other side of the water, especially Eastport people, gave us to understand that we would have a hard chance to live, in fact they said we would starve to death. Well we have not starved yet, and if Canada will protect our small fish we will run our own risk of starving. All we Canadian fishermen ask is fair-play, and I hope that Canada will have it thoroughly understood, that we fishermen must have these small fish protected especially small herring, for they are getting scarcer as fast as time can bring it about.

(Sgd.) JOHN R. MOSES.

A letter was handed in addressed to me by Mr. Peter Dixon which was read to the commission as follows :—

Gentlemen,—Why is it that the Americans carrying fish can have free access to our ports and we have to abide by our customs laws in the strictest sense? Our people have to go to the states to reap the Canadian fisheries harvest, and by becoming Americans they have the freedom of our customs laws and fish exports, and our country gets no credit for fish exports in American bottoms, or what they call double enders. and we cannot carry any fish to their markets without paying the highest duties and all customs expenses, so you see by this business they carry all the sardines and spawn herring, and we are simply living to enrich Americans.

A great many of our people seem to think it is all right to build up American industries out of our raw material, and impoverish our own fisheries and what might be our own industries built out of our own raw material, if our country's laws were enforced and regulated to benefit our people, instead of Americans.

We hope the men of this commission are Canadians, and are looking after the interests of Canadians at home, and not for Canadians' interests in the United States.

When Upper Canada wants the benefit of her raw matrial they put on export duties, why are they not good for us ? We firmly believe that the only thing that would benefit our island and county is an export duty on all fish going out in American bottoms, and that will bring us on a level with them, which will eventually bring canning industries in our own country. As to our own Canadian fisheries, our country entitles us to equal rights, which we are unlawfully deprived of by unrighteous laws now existing on what is known as the Southern Head spawning ground. There are a few people that have been successful in getting this pretended protection for their own benefit and American buyers as well.

They have been very clever indeed in pulling the wool over our Fishery Department's eyes, and they have granted them licenses to build and fish weirs right in the very heart of what is calld our protected spawning ground.

We pray that this commission will have this wrong made right, and that our fishermen will no longer have to steal what lawfully belongs to them, our own fishing privileges.

N.B.—From the first fisheries at Grand Manan there was abundance of large herring, and until 1882 great exports were made, amounting to $50,000 yearly from Grand Manan alone. This great fishing industry extended along the sea coast of Charlotte and into St. John county and harbour. What herring fisheries have we to-day of this description ? None. And how can we account for the failure of these large herring? Only through the destruction of small fish. As the sardine industries of Quoddy river increased, our herring fisheries decreased, until to-day they are about worthless. The above exports were for fresh and frozen herring.

That finished the meeting at North Head, Grand Manan. The next place visited was Grand Harbour on the island of Grand Manan, and the first witness examined was Mr. J. L. Guptill, Jr.

How long have you been fishing ? 25 years.

How would the size and number of fish 25 years ago compare with now ? There was no limit to the fish 25 years ago.

Were the fish larger ? They were more plentiful. The size was about the same.

How do the number of fishermen compare with that time ? There are now more than half as many more.

What is your principal grievance at the present time ? The fish are being depleted and our business is going down, and in a few years there will be no fishing at all. I am speaking of the herring.

Have you formed any idea as to the cause of this depletion? Yes ; I think the small herring of a certain size should be protected, as well as the spawn herring. Herring under six inches should be protected.

Have you no protection as far as season is concerned ? Yes, on our large herring, but not on the small.

Is it customary for the fishermen to catch as many fish as they can ? Yes.

Do you feel that there should be a limit on the catch ? I think there should be protecion on the size of herring. No herring under six inches should be taken, and the spawn herring should be protected on the spawning ground up to the 15th October, as the law is now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this witness also brings up a point that I propose to refer to later on and that is the herring industry on American shore.

Mr. FOSTER. Before my hon. friend goes to that will he just make clear the methods by which these small herrings are taken ? Is it all weir or is it partly weir and partly net ?

Mr. COPP. All weir.

To whom do you sell the bulk of fish caught in your weirs ? To the Americans of late years.

Do you sell them fresh ? Yes.

Do you get many for sardines ? Not usually. This year we got more than for years. We never have small herring here fit for sardines.

Take the sardine industry as it is carried on between Charlotte county and the United States does in your opinion influence the herring fishery of Grand Manan ? The sardine industry, so far as we are concerned, does not amount to anything. I do not think if the limit were six inches it would be very injurious to the herring fishery.

Do you smoke anything under eight inches ? Seven or eight.

Do you salt anything as low as six inches ? Very few.

Do you think the stopping of catching anything under six inches would bring the fishery back to its old standard ? Yes.

The little herring taken for bait are too small for sardines ? Yes.

What is the inducement to buy these little ones ? The supply of bigger ones is short.

As I upnderstand it, the bait that is sold for lobster bait, is sold to Canadians ? Yes.

To be used in other industries in Canada ? Yes.

Sardines are sold to Americans ? Yes, $10 American is better than $1.50 Canadian.

The next witness was Mr. Henry Franklin :—

Have you any improvements that you would suggest along any branches ? I blame the sardine industry for the destruction of the herring fishery. Years ago we put up 300,000 or 400,000 boxes of herring and to-day we put only 30,000. I attribute this to taking the small herring for sardines and lobster bait. The lobster bait amounts to nothing compared with the sardines.

Mr. Frederick McLaughlin was the next witness:—

The smoked herring industry gives employment to five times as many people as the pickled herring. It keeps mills going. It keeps men in the woods, and men making boxes.

He is speaking of the large herring industry as compared with the sardine industry.

Mr. Isaac Newton was the next witness. I think that Mr. Newton is known to some at least of the members of this House as a man whose opinion can be relied on, probably one of the oldest fishermen in Charlotte county, a most influential man. This is what he has to say :

How long have you been interested in the fishing business? Since I was ten years old.

You have heard what has been stated; if anything remains that has not been covered, we should be very glad if you would state it? I only endorse the resolutions passed at the convention, I believe the small herring should be protected, especially on the American side. Why should we be put to all the trouble of affording spawning grounds to supply raw material for the American canners, when we are met in their markets with a prohibitive duty? I advocate an export duty equal to the import duty imposed on the American side on our fish. I would place the size limit at seven inches. In days gone by we would throw the small ones away because they were of no value. I propose, if one-half is large, take them out; if less leave them in the water. This would deprive the sardine factories of their product and render smoked herring a good price. The price formerly paid for sardines was $4 per hogshead. In the one case it would be building up a United States industry and in the other a Canadian one.

How old a man are you? Seventy-two and I was born here.

Are you largely interested in the fishing industry here? Yes, I own two of the first weirs that were built here. I was actively in the business for about thirty years.

The next witness was Willard Ingals:

How long have you been fishing? Twenty-five years.

Do you agree with all the evidence taken? To a great extent.

I have some personal opinions; what affects me personally affects this island generally, and that is the scarcity of herring, which naturally causes us to look why they are scarce. This scarcity brings the netters and weir fishermen into conflict because we cannot get all the herrring we want, and we both try to get the largest half. One great cause of the scarcity of herring in my opinion is the dog-fish and the sardine factories.

This is only part of the evidence so far as the county of Charlotte is concerned. I can go further and give you the evidence taken at all the meetings, on the opposite side of the bay, to show you that exactly the same condition exist there as exist in Charlotte county.

Mr. DANIEL. Did you ascertain whether dynamiting was having any effect in depleting the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. COPP. We did investigate that and found there was no dynamiting going on. Only one year I think did one party attempt to do anything of the kind and he was stopped, and it did not amount to anything.

I wish to show the importance of the sardine industry to the Americans and what it amounts to to the Canadians. I have here the American statistics for Washington county for the years 1897 to 1904. It is shown in the following table:

Year.	Employees.	Amount of Wages.	Value of Pack.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1897.....	5,126	664,892	1,717,883
1899.....	5,103	824,780	2,826,921
1901.....	7,257	1,044,442	3,564,762
1903.....	6,285	892,739	2,818,119
1904.....	6,573	1,137,024	4,378,853

This value is computed at a little over .03 a can. The Charlotte County Sardine Packers compute the value at 5 cents a can. If we were to compute the value of Washington county pack at 5 cents a can the value of the pack instead of being $4,378,853 would be $7,103,765. These figures are taken from the sworn statement sent to the Washington Bureau of Statistics, by the sardine manufacturers and of course they are correct.

This is what the report of the commissioners of sea and shore fisheries in the State of Maine say in regard to this industry:

The sections of the state in which these factories are running are being rapidly built up and are fast growing in valuation, population and importance, while the tin-plate manufacturies, the can-making factories, the box and case manufacturers and the dealers in all supplies are doing naturally a prosperous business, and we should not forget the many transportation companies which are getting a large and profitable business in bringing in supplies and taking to the market the manufactured product. Steamboat lines have been established and railroads will be built as the necessary modern mode of communication so necessary to the business of the day in these sections not already favoured and convenienced.

And, Mr. Speaker, that has been brought about simply by the Canadian people being forced and compelled to go over there and earn a living in these American factories and to become American citizens. Imagine a value of manufactured goods of $4,378,853, whereas all they paid for the raw material which made up that value was about $400,000. For $400,000 of raw material they produced a manufactured article worth $4,378,853.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). What kind of labour do they employ in the factories?

Mr. COPP. All kinds, girls and boys and men, all kinds. I wish to read a petition which I have received from the fishermen of Charlotte county in regard to the two recommendations made by the commission which will I think clearly show this House how the fishermen of Charlotte county view this matter.

Grand Manan, March 21, 1905.

A. J. S. Copp, M.P., Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Having read with considerable interest the report of the Fisheries Commission, we

take the liberty of writing with the view of strengthening your hands in safeguarding the fishing industry of our country, and will endeavour to give you a few unanswerable facts. In the first place our staple industry, the herring fishery, has for the past twenty years been declining, caused chiefly by the extravagant and destructive methods employed in taking young herring for sardines and other purposes, facts and figures having been given in evidence before the Fisheries Commission when in North Head and unnecessary to repeat herein. We are pleased to notice that a size limit has been recommended which if adopted will certainly afford considerable protection to young herring. Let us consider the sardine business as an industry and its great importance to the best interest of this county if properly protected since the inception of the packing industry covering a period of thirty years the people of Eastport and Lubec in the state of Maine have obtained their raw material from Canadian waters, also drawing largely from this county for labour, hundreds of families of late years being compelled to go there during the canning season by reason of the depletion of our fisheries to labour on the raw material taken from our waters to enrich and build up the towns herein named, while our own are going to decay.

Now the average annual pack of sardines for the past ten years has been 1,500,000 cases, putting them at a fair cost of $3 per case gives $4,500,000 out of this we get simply the cost of raw material which would be on the average of $4 per hogshead, and as a hogshead of fish is allowed to make fifteen cases of sardines gives us $400,000 of the above sum, together with whatever labourers bring back which will not exceed twenty-five per cent of their gross earnings and many of them have gone to stay. The American customs laws allow the raw material in American bottoms to enter duty free, while Canadians are met with a duty of $5 per hogshead, which practically excludes our people from participating in the carrying of our raw material to theirs, the United States market. We understand that the sardine weir owners as well as boatmen of Deer island and along the north shore in this county seemingly wishing to continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans, backed by the large packers of Maine, are circulating petitions against the proposed duty, and right here permit us to give you some facts in connection with the masters of boats engaged in carrying sardine fish to the State of Maine. A very large majority of them are native born Canadians residing in Deer island, Back bay, Le Tete and other places in this county who in order to participate in carrying Canadian fish to market have been compelled to take the oath of allegiance, and we certainly have the right to assert that a system, a state of affairs which compels our people in order to derive any benefit from their own province have to swear allegiance to a foreign one, is certainly disastrous to the best interests of this young nation if it may be so called. Next let us discuss the smoked herring industry which by the way is our staple in Grand Manan, twenty years ago we controlled this important branch of the fishing industry to-day Eastport and Lubec have control. This business requires a larger herring than for sardine purposes, and Grand Manan waters furnish the great bulk of raw material which if kept at home would make up about 4,000,000 boxes of the cured article at a fair total value of $4,000,000 annually, the curing of which would employ a vast amount of labour directly and indirectly to the woodsman, millman, miner, nail manufacturer and so on. Under present conditions the average annual pack is about 800,000 or 1,000,000 boxes, the curers of Maine having the advantage of getting their raw material from our waters and taking it in duty free and also the protection of three-quarters of one cent per pound on the cured article in the very markets we ship ours to. What has been the result ?

Simply that this business has fallen fifty per cent, and that scores of our people have gone over into Maine to pursue the business there, and in some cases have torn down their curing establishments and taken them over also, and what is true of this industry is also true of the pickled herring business. We notice with some degree of satisfaction that recommendation for an export duty has been made and while we do not consider this equal to our needs and adequate protection of this important industry, yet we feel that it is a move in the right direction and if adopted will be the means at least of giving the carrying trade to our own tradesmen as the American canners must in order to carry on their business obtain fully ninety per cent of this raw material on this side of the line and free admission in Canadian bottoms will be the result. We believe that the greater part of the canning business should under stringent regulations be conducted on this side of the line, and that in place of any export duty of half a cent per pound that at least one cent should be adopted which would be the means of establishing the canning business in Canada, keeping our labour at home and bringing about more favourable conditions for the admission of our products into the markets of the United States, and also branch out and develop trade in this line with other countries as we did at the time of the enactment of the McKinley tariff in other lines of goods.

In conclusion we firmly believe that the time is ripe for legislation and that a golden opportunity lies at the very door of the government at Ottawa, which if allowed to pass by, means decay to the fishing industry in this county and in all other parts of Canada where fishing is the staple industry, as the success and developments of all other branches of the industry, depend upon the protection of the small herring.

Hoping that you will use your efforts to urge this matter upon the government.

We have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
E. A. CALDER,
PETER DIXON.

This petition is not only signed by Mr. Calder and Mr. Dixon, but by several hundred others.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PATENT OF WILLIAM A. DAMEN.

House in committee on Bill (No. 8) respecting patent of William A. Damen.—Mr. Campbell.

On section 2—existing rights saved——

Mr. PRINGLE. I desire to move that this section be amended by inserting after the word 'Act' in the 29th line, the words, 'made substantially and bona fide any preparation for manufacture or,' and by inserting after the word 'may' in the 30th line the words 'manufacture and.' My reason for moving that amendment is that the patentees who permitted their patent to expire in 1904 made no application for nearly three years for an extension of time of that patent, but permitted others to expend a large amount of money in preparation for the manufacture of tires which are really covered by this patent, No. 40,630. When this matter was before the committee I moved a similar amendment. Some parties at the time thought that the Canadian Rubber Company, who were interested, had not bona fide expended money in preparation for the manufacture of tires which were covered by this parliament. We had the statement of the solicitor for the company, and we also had a petition of the Canadian Rubber Company, signed by the president, I think, and some other officials of that company. The president, Mr. Stephens, is a well known man, who has, I understand, been appointed by the government recently, to a very important position on the Harbour Board of the city of Montreal. I felt that any petition emanating from that company was entitled to every consideration from the committee. I have now in my hand an affidavit of the assistant general manager of that company, which, if I may be permitted, I will read :

I, Fleetwood H. Ward, Esq., of the city of Montreal, do solemnly declare as follows :—

1. I am the assistant general manager of the Canadian Rubber Company of Montreal, Limited.

2. In view of the approaching expiration of patent number 38,384, the natural life of which expires on the fifteenth of February, 1907, and in view of the fact that patent number 40,630 had expired on the 11th of October, 1904, for non-payment of the fee for the last term of six years, the said The Canadian Rubber Company of Montreal, Limited, made very extensive preparations for the manufacture of articles covered by both of the said patents.

3. The said company being, under the circumstances, certain that it would be able to manufacture bicycle tires, was induced to consider the manufacture of tires for automobiles, and with these objects in view the said company sent certain of its officials to visit the large factories in the United States, with the result that your petitioner decided upon erecting a new factory building, which is now under construction, at an estimated cost of $250,000 exclusive of the land, for which the sum of $60,000 was paid.

4. In addition to this, the said company has, for the reasons above given, extended its selling force throughout the country, has partitioned off a separate department in its factory to be used as a workroom for the goods in question until the new factory is completed, has engaged the services of skilled workmen in this particular line, has ordered the moulds requisite for the manufacture of these goods, and has also expended from $8,000 to $10,000 in the various preparations for the said manufacture.

5. If it had been contemplated that the said William A. Damen could revive the said patents as prayed for by his Bill, the said company would not have incurred the expenditure and made the preparations above mentioned.

6. If the said Bill passes in its present form the said company will suffer very heavy damages.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and in virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

FLEETWOOD H. WARD.

Acknowledged before me this 17th day of January, A.D., 1907.

S. J. LeHURAY.

Commissioner of the Superior Court for the district of Montreal.

Now, there is no precedent for the extention of a patent when the patentee has allowed over two years to elapse without coming to this House and asking for an extension. We can quite understand the case, which is the ordinary case, where the whole term has not expired, but through some carelessness or oversight the patentee has neglected to renew, and he comes to the House to get relief. That is not this case. Twelve years of their patent expired on the 11th of October, 1904, and they have only now, in this year 1907, come and asked for an extension. I do not wish in any way to delay the passage of this Bill if the feeling of this House is that it should go through in its present form; but I feel very strongly that if this House grants to the parties who are endeavouring to get this Bill through the concessions which they are asking, it will be only fair to protect those who have expended money in good faith in preparation for the manufacture of this patent.

In this Bill there is a clause which will protect those who have actually commenced to manufacture, but, as I understand, nobody has actually begun the manufacture of this tire. The Canadian Rubber Company however have expended a large amount of money in making preparations to manufacture it. When we consider the history of patent legislation, not only in this country but in Great Britain and other countries, we cannot fail to see that its object is not to create a monopoly. Its object is to permit those who, by their inventive genius, have discovered some new and useful process of manufacture, to have a monopoly of that process for a certain period. But when that period expires or if they allow the matter to drop, it is not the intention to allow the monopoly to be continued longer than provided by statute. Prior to 1892, the duration of a patent was

limited to fifteen years, but in 1892 the Act was amended and the term extended to eighteen years. Twelve of these years had expired, and evidently the patentee made up his mind to let the patent run out. At one time the Dunlop tire was almost universally used throughout this country on bicycles, and in 1904 the automobile had not come into prominence, and I do not think that this tire was used on the automobiles then constructed. Since then, however, the patentee discovered that the Dunlop was a proper tire for automobiles and that he had been a little lax in not renewing his patent. He therefore now, after other people have expended money in good faith in making preparations to manufacture that tire, comes to parliament and asks us to renew the patent and thus prevent the Canadian Rubber Company of Montreal from going into that business. The Act is very clear. It provides that if a partial fee only is paid—which is what was done in this case :

If a partial fee only is paid, the proportion of the fee paid shall be stated in the patent, and the patent shall, notwithstanding anything therein or in this Act contained, cease at the end of the term for which the partial fee has been paid, unless at or before the expiration of the said term the holder of the patent pays the fee required for the further term of six or twelve years, and obtains from the patent office a certificate of such payment in the form which is, from time to time, adopted, which certificate shall be attached to and refer to the patent, and shall be under the signature of the commissioner, or the signature of any other member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada acting for him.

He did not do that, and under the statute that patent became absolutely void. I can quite understand that if he had come within a reasonable time—within a few months or a year—and asked for an extension, he would have been quite within his rights, and the House would be acting reasonably and fairly in allowing that extension. When we look at the practice in Great Britain, we find that the term of a patent is limited to seventeen years. On no account will that term be extended, unless the parties go before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and show that they have been developing the patent and have not received any great benefit during that term of years or that the article has not come into universal use. If they show that to the satisfaction of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the life of the patent is sometimes extended a very short time, but the tendency is not to extend it any length of time so as not to create a monopoly for any further period than is deemed advisable. Can that be said in this case ? The Dunlop tire has been in universal use during the whole term of this patent. The patentee has made a large amount of money out of it, and what he is now asking is that the monopoly he has enjoyed for years should be extended a further term. I do not think that request should be granted. I think that the opportunity should be given other manufacturers of making this tire and giving the public the benefit of the competition. The amendment I have offered is a reasonable one. If the Canadian Rubber Company, in good faith, acting upon the law as it stands, finding that the patentee did not desire to have his patent renewed, finding that a year had elapsed after the shareholders of the tire company had met, when they must have known that the patent had not been renewed—if the Canadian Rubber Company then went ahead and spent a large amount of money in good faith for the purpose of manufacturing this article, they should now be protected, at least to this extent, that they should be permitted to manufacture this tire. A monopoly would then still exist to a certain extent, but there would be competition between the Dunlop Tire Company and the Canadian Rubber Company, both of which concerns are, I understand, strong companies. In fact, I understand that at one time the Canadian Rubber company did manufacture this Dunlop tire for that company itself. I would therefore ask the House to consider this amendment, which I think is a fair and reasonable one :

I move that section 2 of the Bill be amended by inserting after the word 'Act' in the twenty-ninth line the words 'made substantial proof of preparations to manufacture' and that after the word 'Act' in the thirtieth line the word 'manufacture' be inserted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has any notice been given ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not suppose that any Bill which has come before the House has received more careful consideration than this did before the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. STOCKTON. Was all this discussed in that committee ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, and it was a large committee, composed of about seventy members. In that committee all the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) were given, and with great effect, not only by himself but by solicitors for the company as well ; and after that committee had considered the matter fully, it decided, by 16 to 42, that the Bill should pass. I do not think that the House will, under these circumstances, carry this amendment, which practically nullifies the whole Bill. The point has been made that this patent was not renewed.

Mr. PRINGLE. My hon. friend was not present in that committee when the statement of its solicitor regarding the expenditure of money by the Canadian Rubber Company was questioned. I now have an affidavit from the general manager as to the

amount which was expended in connection with the plant for the manufacture of this tire.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that they bought a piece of property, but not a brick or a stone has been put on that property, and they have bought it as an investment which they intend to utilize for their own business.

Mr. BENNETT. And which adjoins their other premises.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, so there is nothing in that fact at all. As to the fact that the patent was not renewed, unfortunately that is a case which frequently happens. I have the sworn declaration of the manager that instructions were given to have the patent renewed and to pay the fee of $20, but through the oversight of the officers of the company, it was not renewed, and the shareholders and directors were ignorant of that fact until nearly a year later. Then when it came to their knowledge, they immediately took steps to have it renewed, and they gave notice of their intention early last year to apply for this Bill, so that the Canadian Rubber Company had ample notice. After the very thorough discussion on the merits of the case, after everything had been said that could be said against the Bill, by a vote of 16 to 42 the committee passed the Bill without any amendment. It seems to me that this would justify the House in passing it now. The clause that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) proposes to amend is the usual clause inserted in these patent Bills. And it is a very wise provision. The clause reads :

> Any person who has, without infringing any other letter patent, within the period between the eleventh day of October, one thousand nine hundred and four——

That is the time when the fee should have been paid.

> —and the passing of this Act, commenced to manufacture, use and sell in Canada the inventions covered by the said letters patent, may continue to manufacture, use and sell such inventions in as full and ample a manner as if the preceding section had not been passed.

As I say, that is the usual clause in these cases. If, owing to the lapse of the patent by non-renewal, any person has commenced to manufacture or sell the patented article, he can go on doing so. But the amendment proposed goes further and will enable even those who have not commenced to manufacture and sell—that is it nullifies the patent altogether. I hope the House will reject the amendment.

Mr. GALLIHER. As a member of the private Bills committee, I was present when the discussion arose on this Bill, and I was one of the minority who opposed the passing of the Bill. Now, in the first place, we have a law which regulates the issuing and continuance of the patent. That Act is in effect, or it is not in effect. As a matter of fact, it is in effect. That Act provides that upon failure of those interested to comply with certain conditions, the patent shall lapse. It has been the practice in such a case, for the parties to come before the committee, and afterwards before this House and ask for relief, where through inadvertence a patent has been allowed to elapse. Now, each case has to be judged on its own merits, I can quite understand that, if, through inadvertence, a man fails to renew his patent, or pay the sum necessary to keep it alive, and if he comes before this House within a reasonsable time afterwards, he will be regarded as entitled to some consideration, and probably will place him in the position which, through his inadvertence he has lost. But what are the facts in this case ? The committee was asked to believe, and this House is now asked to believe, that it was through inadvertence that the paltry sum of $20 or $25 necessary to keep this patent alive, was not paid at the proper time ; and not only that, but that these men, business men engaged in the manufacture of this article, did not know for the period of nearly two years that the money had not been paid. That requires a stretch of credulity, which, I confess, is too great for me. We find that, not only one session, but two sessions of this parliament went by without application being made to cure this defect. Their explanation is that their agent at Ottawa failed to pay the money. It is a handy thing to have an agent to blame in such a case. The course we are asked to take in the matter is virtually to disregard completely the statute on this subject. That statute is there for a useful purpose. If we are to allow these parties a monopoly of this particular article notwithstanding that, for two years, they failed to take any steps in the matter, it seems to me there would be no reason why we should not allow the same to one who had allowed three years or even four years to pass before asking us to do anything. Were we to pass this Bill we should establish a precedent which simply sets at nought the statute regulating patents. It is time we should pause and consider whether there is to be no limit to the indulgence that we shall give. The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) read a section in the Bill protecting those who have actually commenced the manufacture of this patented article. Now that will not protect the interests that the parties opposing this application have. A man or corporation may not have actually commenced the manufacture of the patented article, but may have expended large sums of money in preparation for that manufacture. And I contend that one should be guarded just as much as the other. These applicants come before this parliament in default, and I say it is for this parliament, if it grants their request, to do so upon condi-

tions which will protect not only those who have commenced the manufacture which was thrown open by the negligence of these parties, but those who have expended money in preparing for the manufacture. When a patent has expired and a period of two years is allowed to elapse before the patentee signifies his intention of asking to have his patent renewed, everybody is justified in believing that the manufacture of the article may be freely engaged in by anybody. Had these people claimed the consideration of this parliament within any reasonable time, I for one, would not oppose their application. But I say again,—and I wish to be emphatic upon the point—that the time has come when we should make it clear that, if we pass special legislation for the benefit of parties who have been two years in default, we will do so on terms that will protect the rights of other parties. It was proved in committee that large sums had been expended in preparation for the manufacture of this article. The statement is not exactly fair which has been made by the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell)—who was not present, but, I presume, speaks on information—that the parties who have expended were going to do this work in connection with their enterprise even had they not contemplated the manufacture of this patented article. What are the circumstances as explained by the solicitor and manager? The explanation of these gentlemen was that had it not been for their intending to go on and manufacture this article they would not have made the arrangements and they would not have purchased the extra property that they did purchase. They would not have incurred the liabilities that they have incurred had they not believed that the patent was dead and that this parliament would not renew that patent after such a lapse of time. If this were a case of hardship there might be something in what was urged by gentlemen who are supporting the Bill. But, it is not a case of hardship. It is a case in regard to a certain patent in the manufacture of rubber tires formerly used in connection with bicycles and now, I believe, to be used in connection with automobiles. Anybody who knows anything about bicycles and automobiles knows that by reason of the monopoly created by certain patents that have been granted in connection with the manufacture of these articles they charge three or four times their fair price and value. If anybody can work up sympathy in his heart for any institution of that kind he has a softer and more tender heart than I have. That is the position of affairs and it is for this House to say whether they will follow the recommendation of the majority of the committee. I am not assailing any single member of that committee for taking a view opposite to that which I take myself because we are all entitled to our own opinions in matters of this kind. But, I say that this House, independently of the opinion of the committee, ought to consider whether they wish to place themselves on record as being willing to renew any patent that may have expired no matter what the lapse of time may be or no matter how little excuse for allowing the patent to lapse there is. There is absolutely, to my mind, no reason, no excuse given why this patent was not renewed. Why a company like the Dunlop Tire Company, or whatever the name of the company may be, operating in the city of Toronto, could not expend the sum of $25 when the payment was due to renew the patent, and why they should not only not expend it then, but leave it for two years before making application to parliament, is something that it is difficult to understand. Then, they come down with a flimsy excuse that the poor, unfortunate agent at Ottawa, on whose shoulders all this blame is put and put in more cases than this—he is a very convenient man—forgot to renew the patent To my mind it is absurd to say that a business man, running a business of that kind, manufacturing and selling goods of that description, would not know within two years whether the agent had renewed that patent or whether he had not. It is to my mind, absurd to take that stand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What about your Bill for the same purpose ?

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend asks : What about my Bill ? There was a Bill on the paper in my name. That has been passed.

Mr. TALBOT. It did not make it any better.

Mr. GALLIHER. It did not make it any better nor did I claim that it made it any better.

Mr. CALVERT. Nor any worse.

Mr. GALLIHER. I had no interest in the Bill other than that I was asked to introduce it, which I did. But what was the question involved in that Bill ? Was it a matter of two years ? No. There was a lapse there as there is here, but it was a lapse of only a few months. At the very first opportunity they had to apply to parliament their application came in and that was during the present session. But, there is this difference between these two Bills. The parties interested in the Bill which I introduced seized the first opportunity after they were in default, but did the corporation for which my hon. friend fathers this Bill do that ? No, they let it pass not one session but two sessions and they come before us at the third session and tell us that they did not know that the renewal fee had not been paid. But, I say that even granting that they thought that, it is not the case of a poor man receiving his little royality out

of a patent or something of that kind. These people have enjoyed the benefits of that patent for fifteen years and surely the benefits of a patent connected with the manufacture of such goods as that patent is used for are the equivalent of a monopoly for a period of fifteen years. They have enjoyed it. What will the result be ? The result will be that having enjoyed that for fifteen years they can still go on and manufacture these articles. So can these men in Montreal who have laid their plans, expended their money, purchased their land and arranged to proceed with the manufacture of these articles. In other words, we will have two Canadian concerns manufacturing these articles and the public will get the benefit of it, instead of having the monopoly extended for three or six years.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not belong to the committee. I understand that there are two patents, one that expired in October, 1904, and another which will expire in February, 1907. Does my hon. friend know what the difference is between the two patents ?

Mr. GALLIHER. My argument in the committee was this : In regard to the 1907 patent if they had made a further application to extend that from a period of fifteen years when it was first granted to a period of eighteen years it might have been another matter, but they apply for a renewal of this lapsed patent after two years which practically covers the same thing.

Mr. STOCKTON. Was the 1907 patent a continuation of the previous one ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I believe they overlapped.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then the delay is not as great as you have said ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The 1904 patent expired in 1904 and that is the patent that I am attacking the renewal of. I am not attacking the 1907 patent, but it is the 1904 patent that I am attacking the renewal of. When the committee decided that the 1904 patent should be renewed and my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) made the amendment, what were we met with ? Why, they said that the amendment would not only affect the patent which has lapsed but that it would also affect the patent which is in existence. That is what I say. If they had based their application merely upon an extension of time from fifteen to eighteen years in regard to the patent which will expire next month there could probably not have been the same objection urged, but certainly when they asked for a renewal of the 1904 patent and ask also for this patent we are entitled to relief. We claim that we can get no relief. We claim that we have expended moneys in connection with the manufacture of this article. But, above, beyond and outside of all this there is this principle that the House should consider and that the committee should have considered, to my mind, begging their pardon for differing from the majority, and it is that we have to observe the statutes on our books. If it can be clearly shown that through inadvertence a patent has been allowed to lapse and that they have come with all due diligence before parliament at the first moment they could come, we should possibly aid them and put them back in a proper position. But, when they have dilly-dallied as they have done in this case; when they give no excuse, when it is not on the face of it a matter of inadvertence, then, I say that in my opinion at least we did wrong in the committee in granting a renewal of the 1904 patent. I take that same position in this House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have not the honour of being a member of the committee which had this Bill under consideration, but I have listened with some interest to the discussion to-night, and it seems to me that this assumption, that because some person has conceived some invention, and obtained a patent for it, he should have an inalienable right to control the exclusive manufacture of that article for all time, may well be considered; it does not seem to me to be a proper principle, although I cannot say I am speaking with a great amount of deliberation on it. The question has occurred to me whether or not the true idea in Canada would not be to have a greater degree of freedom in regard to the manufacture of industrial designs of any kind that may be invented in Canada or any other country. It has been the avowed policy practically of both parties that in Canada we want manufacturing industries, and to say that because 20 years ago somebody had invented something the people of Canada should be obliged to pay tribute to him for all time is a departure from the policy of Canada in regard to the encouragement of manufactures. We should rather take the opposite view, and have a little bit of free trade in this. When a man has had the exclusive control of manufacture for 15 years, should not any man be allowed to then engage in the manufacture of the patented article? I submit that as a sound principle. There must be some limit to the term of exclusive control, and surely in 15 years the patentee should have had a sufficient reward for his invention. Other countries are beginning to recognize that there should be a limit to the period of the right of the patentee. It has been a matter of consideration in England, whether this long period of exclusive control is a right principle. I know nothing about this particular case, but I see in the recital in the preamble that the patentee had taken out patents in 1892 and 1884. Those dates are a long time in the past and it seems to me that that gentleman has had all the advantage he should have in the interest of the country. Why

should not the same principle be applied if application were made to a court for relief from a judgment obtained by default? Under the patent law a judgment practically was obtained at the time the parties were in default that the exclusive right was to cease.

Mr. STOCKTON. That would be a different principle.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I do not see why the same principle should not apply. Parliament has as good a right to insist on some good ground being shown for relief from the effects of this default, as a court has in regard to the opening up of a judgment. It may be that there are proper grounds here, but it seems to me that the next question is the same question as would be considered by a court in determining whether a default should be opened up, namely, what term should be imposed on the party who committed the default, if any other person has rights which have accrued in the slightest degree in the meantime. The proposition put forward by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) is that when these gentlemen come in and say: We were in default two or three years ago, and although we have not explained very clearly or distinctly why we did not apply to be relieved from that default sooner, we do so apply now, they should be informed that some term must be imposed on them, especially because a bona fide industrial concern in this country, if the evidence of my hon. friend is to be believed, has come forward and by declaration proven that they have taken steps in the interim, while the patentees were in default, to engage in the manufacture of this article. I submit that it is a fair term to impose on the party in default to say that these people who are a bona fide industrial concern in this country and who were about to engage in the manufacture of this article should receive some consideration. I submit that is a fair proposition. Is it not in the interest of the country that we should have another industrial enterprise engage in manufacturing? Why is it that for the sake of this gentleman, who has had fifteen years' advantage of the patent law, we should have heartburning as to how we should help him now that he can enjoy the fruits of his ingenuity from which he has already had fair compensation? I believe that instead of encouraging the extension of patents it would be in the interests of the country to adopt an entirely different policy.

Mr. PRINGLE. Certain statements were made by the hon. gentleman from Centre York which I can hardly allow to go unchallenged. He said there has been no money expended by the Canadian Rubber Company in preparing for the manufacture of these tires, but we have the affidavit of the general manager of that company who swears: that the company has extended its selling force throughout the country; has apportioned off a certain part of its factory to be used as a work room for these goods until the new factory is built; has engaged the service of skilled workmen in this particular line; has ordered the moulds requisite for the manufacturer of these goods, and has expended from $8,000 to $10,000 in preparation for the said manufacture. In view of that affidavit the statement of the hon. gentleman from York falls to the ground. In Canada we have extended the time of patents to eighteen years which is the longest term given by any country in the world. In Great Britain, where they have gone through sad experience in this matter, and where in the 18th and in the beginning of the 19th century through the extension of these patents creating monopolies in the hands of favoured individuals, the country suffered greatly, they amended their law so as to make the term of a patent fourteen years, and to get it extended beyond that the patentee has to go to the individual committee of the Privy Council to establish a case on its merits. The term of a patent in France is fifteen years, in Germany fifteen years, in Austria fifteen years, and in the United States seventeen years. The United States started out by granting a twenty years' term but they found it was so destructive of the inventive genius of that country and so created monopolies in the hands of individuals that they reduced the term, and now after seventeen years the patent becomes public property and may be freely manufactured by any one. With the exception of Austro-Hungary, Russia and Canada, all countries having patent laws have joined in the international union for the protection of industrial property and in these countries there can be no extension of the patent beyond the time fixed by statute.

(The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed on the motion of Mr. Fielding that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.)

CANADIAN FISHERIES—LICENSES TO AMERICAN FISHERMEN.

Mr. A. J. S. COPP (Digby). Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I had just finished reading a petition from the fishermen of Charlotte county in favour of the recommendations made by the Fishery Commission to which I have referred. I wish also to read a quotation from the report of John H. Pratt, inspector of fisheries for the county of Charlotte, to the Fisheries Department for the year 1903. This is what he says:

> Fifty-two sardine factories were in operation in the state of Maine, during the past season, and placed on the market an aggregate pack of 1,173,000 cases. Fully 100,000 of these cases were packed in Washington county alone. The factory owners receive for their pack during the season an average price of $3 per

case which gave the state of Maine the handsome sum of $3,351,900 for this year's work. This is very gratifying for the above named state, but when we consider that over three quarters of the raw material for this large output was furnished from the Canadian fisheries, it is not by any means pleasant reading for the Canadian who considers what a loss it is to our country that all this raw material is manufactured in a foreign country, instead of our own.

I wish to read also from the report of Fishery Overseer Frazer, of the county of Charlotte, for the same year :

Overseer Frazer, who has charge of the fisheries on the island of Grand Manan, states that he is sorry to report that there is another decrease in the fisheries this season amounting to $60,000, this decrease being principally in the shortage of the herring catch. This enormous falling off naturally makes one inquire as to the cause of it. It was believed by some that the scarcity of herring was on account of the decrease of other fish, as all kinds of fish pursue the herring, but I do not credit this theory. In my opinion, the most reasonable cause is on account of such immense quantities of sardines and britt being taken for lobster bait for several years past. Those small herring are not allowed to mature, and unless some measures are adopted to prohibit the killing of britt in such large quantities, there will be no herring left of any size in the near future.

During the year 1904 the catch of bank cod by the Nova Scotia fleet was only 135,000 quintals, a decline of 105,000 quintals from the average. Now, I contend that the same conditions as to scarcity of bait and the depletion of the herring industry that exist in Charlotte county exist to as great an extent throughout the whole province of Nova Scotia as well as throughout the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I would ask, in view of the scarcity of herring, is it wise or prudent for our government under the modus vivendi to license foreigners to procure and catch bait, the supply of which is insufficient for the needs of our own fishermen ? Would it not be wiser and more prudent and provident, as was intended by the Treaty of 1818, to protect, preserve and cultivate our bait in order that we might have sufficient to enable our own fishermen to prosecute the fishing industry ? I contend that it would, and I would strongly advise the government to return to the strict enforcement of the Treaty of 1818 and to carry out the recommendations made by the North Atlantic Fishery Commission in regard to this awful slaughter of these small, immature herring in Passamaquoddy bay—prohibit the export of herring for bait, prohibit the taking of small herring, and encourage the taking and curing of large herring, thus retaining the Canadian fishing industry for Canadian fishermen.

In conclusion, I wish to say one word more. I have made no reference to a speech made in this House by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong), for the simple reason that that hon. gentleman is not in his seat. A few sessions ago he took advantage of my absence and the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to spend an hour in a tirade of abuse of this very commission of which I have spoken. I may some day, when the hon. gentleman is in his seat, refer to the speech he made on that occasion, when he spoke on a subject which he absolutely knows nothing whatever about. But I will not treat him in the same manner as he treated me. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honour as well as a pleasure to stand here and speak a word on behalf of the fishermen of the maritime provinces. I represent a county composed largely of fishermen, and a more noble, law-abiding, courageous and loyal class of citizens do not exist anywhere. I cannot express my own feelings better than in the language used by John Adams in speaking of the fishermen of Gloucester :

Of these ten thousand men, and of their wives and children, the cod fisheries, if I may be allowed the expression, were the daily bread—their property—their subsistence. To how many thousands more were the labours and the dangers of their lives subservient ? Their game was not only food and raiment to themselves but to millions of other human beings. There is something in the very occupation of fishermen, not only beneficent in itself but noble and exalted in the qualities of which it requires the habitual exercise. In common with the cultivators of the soil, their labours contribute to the subsistence of mankind, and they have the merit of continual exposure to danger, superadded to that of unceasing, toil. Industry, frugality, patience perseverance, fortitude, intrepidity, souls inured to perpetual conflict with the elements, and bodies steeled with unremitting action, ever grappling with danger, and familiar with death ; these are the properties to which the fisherman of the ocean is formed by the daily labours of his life.

Mr. Speaker, what John Adams said of the fishermen of Gloucester, sixty-five per cent of whom are native born Canadians, I can repeat with regard to the fishermen of the maritime provinces.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I will not trouble the House more than a few minutes. This question has been pretty well discussed since it was introduced last night by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean). We have had the secondly and thirdly and up to the sixthly, and now I would like to put in a little by way of application. We have heard something from the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) about the value of the fisheries of the different provinces. I would like to direct attention to the revenue produced by the different provinces. He mentioned it this afternoon, but did not dwell upon it as much as I would have liked. The province of British Columbia, besides having produced the largest value

of fish, has returned the greatest part of the revenue derived from the fisheries of the whole Dominion. That province has returned nearly $20,000 more than all the rest of the Dominion put together from the fisheries. Therefore, when the estimates are brought forward, I hope that no member of this House will object to any expenditure that may be proposed for the protection of our fisheries in the way of steamers or steam launches. We have heard to-day of the necessity for more steamers in the outside salt waters. I have very little to do with the salt water; it does not touch my constituency except for a short distance; but the larger part of this revenue is derived from the salmon of my constituency, and we require more protection in that way. A great many Americans fish along the boundary line in the Gulf of Georgia, and frequently cross into our waters, and we have not a steamer there fit to cope with them, or to follow and catch up with a good sail-boat when there is a lively breeze. Not only that, but some of the fishery guardians are obliged to use sail-boats or ordinary row boats, and I think they should be supplied with gasoline launches or some craft that could go around fast and overhaul any law breaker they find at work along the line. I hope that when the estimates are brought forward, hon. members will consider that British Columbia is certainly entitled, from the amount of revenue derived from her fisheries, to a pretty liberal appropriation.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Let me first congratulate my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) for having brought this important question of the fisheries to our attention. I need hardly say that I attach great importance to all matters connected with our fisheries. We have realized, especially of late years, the importance and the value of that natural wealth. We have seen an enormous increase in the development of our fisheries. The government and the department of which I have the honour to be the head have, especially during these last years made every possible effort to increase the development of our fisheries, and we are glad to see that to a certain extent our efforts have been crowned with success. We realize however that there is much more to do, that many more improvements have to be made, and that greater expenditure will be required, and I am glad to see that parliament is well disposed to favour an increased expenditure in that connection. It is not necessary for me to go at any length into statistics to show the extent of our fishery development. I may however point out that since 1870, when our fisheries yielded the sum of $6,577,000, there has been a steady increase, until last year our fish production reached the extraordinary amount of $30,000,000 in round figures, or five times the amount we realized in 1870.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the production?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. In some years there may have been a small decrease in some parts of the country, but generally speaking there has been an increase, and we are glad to see that, after what has been done for the development of those resources the production has reached the magnificent sum of nearly $30,000,000. We are sometimes told that the fisheries of the maritime provinces are being depleted or at any rate are decreasing. Well, when I look at the figures which I have in my hand, I find that in 1870 the amount of production in the maritime provinces, including Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—Prince Edward Island was not then in the Union—and including also the province of Quebec, because the fisheries of that province are mostly in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and the Baie des Chaleurs, and consequently may be said to be included in that section of country which we might call the maritime provinces—when I take these figures I find that whereas in 1870 the production in the maritime provinces was $6,200,000, there has been every succeeding five years a considerable increase. In 1875 the production amounted to $9,000,000; in 1880, $13,000,000; in 1885, $15,000,000; in 1890 there was a small decrease to $11,000,000; in 1895, $13,000,000; in 1900, $14,000,000; and in 1905, $16,160,813. So that in the maritime provinces, instead of our fishery resources showing a depletion, they have shown an increase from $6,000,000 to $16,000,000.

Mr. DANIEL. That would include the fresh as well as the salt water fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mostly salt water fish, because it covers the maritime provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the province of Quebec, the most important of whose fisheries are in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. But the province which shows the largest increase is assuredly our fine province of British Columbia. British Columbia came into confederation in 1876, and in 1880—the first year for which we have a return—its fish production was only $104,697, whereas last year it reached the extraordinary sum of $9,850,216, chiefly in salmon. That shows that the province which has made the greatest increase in fish production is the magnificent province on our Pacific coast. But at the same time I regret that in Ontario, instead of an increase, there has been a decrease, because in 1890 there was a production of $2,000,000, in 1892 a production of the like sum, whereas now that production has decreased to $1,708,963. That decrease, I believe, is due in great part to the division of power in that province. I am strongly of the opinion that it would be very much better if not only the legislation with regard to fisheries were under our control, but also the executive authority regarding their administration. As hon. gentle-

men are aware, the Privy Council in 1898 decided that the fisheries, so far as the granting of licenses was concerned, are under the control of the provinces, but that they are, so far as legislative authority is concerned, under control of the federal parliament. The result is that one authority legislates but another authority administers; and it often happens that one government may think it the fault of the other that the fisheries are depleted. I think it would be most desirable if both legislation and administration of the fisheries were under the same authority.

Coming to the question which has been raised by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) it is certainly one of the most important questions that have been brought before this House. It involves not only questions affecting our local affairs, but also international relations; and it is always difficult to deal with these questions, especially when the questions may be the subject of negotiation between the countries affected. As to the question of the modus vivendi, I may say that it has engaged the attention of the government in a most serious way—and not only of this government but of the different governments that have administered the affairs of this country since 1888 when we adopted the policy of the modus vivendi.

However, before discussing this question I may be permitted, I suppose, to say a few words about the history of our Atlantic fisheries and of the relations between Canada and the United States, and between Great Britain and the United States, with regard to these fisheries. The situation which exists with regard to these fisheries is not new; it is a situation which has been in existence for years, and I may say, for centuries. The question of these fisheries first came up on the occasion of the Treaty of Utrecht, when Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, were ceded to Great Britain by France. It was stipulated on that occasion, that the French people should have certain rights in the fisheries of Newfoundland. At that time, a part of the territory now known as the United States was inhabited by British colonists, and the fishermen of that territory, as British subjects, were free to fish in the shore waters of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. That situation of affairs existed until 1783, when the Treaty of Versailles was made between Great Britain and the United States after the cession of American independence. The Treaty of 1783, if we may rely upon what has been said by historians who have written on the subject, was about to be signed without any agreement on the question of fisheries. It is asserted that the British plenipotentiaries, as well as the United States plenipotentiaries, with the exception of John Adams, were all disposed not to speak of the question of fisheries. But these historians tell us that John Adams insisted so strongly upon the point that not only his colleagues in the convention, but even the British representatives agreed to embody an article in the treaty. That article—Article 3—provides as follows:

> It is agreed that the people of the United States shall continue to enjoy unmolested the right to take fish of every kind on the Grand Bank and on all the other banks of Newfoundland, also in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and at all other places in the sea where the inhabitants of both countries used at any time heretofore to fish. And also that the inhabitants of the United States shall have liberty to take fish of every kind on such part of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen shall use (but not to dry or cure the same on that island) and also on the coasts, bays and creeks of all other of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America.

So, under this treaty, the situation remained practically unchanged so far as the Americans were concerned, and they continued to enjoy on our coast, almost the same privileges that they had enjoyed since 1713. But, when the declaration of war was made in 1812, the situation, of course, was changed. That declaration of war, put an end—at least that was the contention of the British authorities—to the Treaty of 1783, and, as a consequence, the rights and privileges the Americans had enjoyed under that treaty ceased to exist. It is true that the Americans contended that the rights granted to them by the Treaty of 1783 should continue to exist. Controversy continued for a time on that point, but at last the American authorities had to yield and to accept a new treaty, which is the treaty ruling these affairs as between Canada, Great Britain and the United States—the Treaty of 1818. The article of this treaty relating to the fisheries has been already quoted by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and it is not necessary for me to read it here again. So far as Canada is concerned, there were special privileges given on the coast of Magdalen islands, but, as to other parts of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, it was stipulated that the only rights that the American fishermen had on our coast were the rights to come to our harbours for shelter, for wood, for water, and for repairs to their vessels. Only for these four causes were American fishermen allowed to enter our Atlantic harbours. Some doubts have been expressed whether that treaty applied not only to the Atlantic coast but also to the Pacific coast. A great deal of controversy took place in regard to that, but it seems now to be accepted, not only by the British authorities, but also by the American authorities, that this Treaty of 1818 applied not only to the Atlantic coast but also to the Pacific coast. I do not think it is necessary for me to quote anything in regard to that. I may say, how-

ever, that some years ago, I think in 1880 the question was brought before the American authorities in connection with some boat which was fishing on the Pacific coast. The then Secretary of State, Mr. Evarts, in a letter written on May 25, 1880, said that:

> The privilege of fishing cannot be claimed by citizens of the United States under the treaties between the United States and Great Britain.

In the correspondence which ensued between the British and American authorities on the question it was admitted that the Pacific coast came under the treaty of 1818 in the same way as did the Atlantic coast. I might perhaps quote in this respect one article of the treaty which determines, I think, in the most formal manner that the Pacific coast comes under the treaty of 1818. In Article 1 of the treaty it is said:

> And the United States hereby renounce forever any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbours of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America.

That would not only cover the Atlantic coast, but it is very clear that the Pacific coast is also recognized as being under the treaty of 1818.

Mr. STOCKTON. If it were not under the treaty of 1818 then there would be no treaty at all, and it would be under the general principle of international law, which would amount to the same thing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, if there were no treaty or the treaty did not apply, of course, it would fall under the ordinary rules of international law. We had, later on, in 1854, the reciprocity treaty by which all the products of the United States and of Canada could be exchanged without any difficulty. I do not think it is necessary for me to refer to the treaty of 1830 which was passed between the two countries concerning navigation or the coasting trade. We must confine ourselves for the moment to the treaties which affect Canada and the United States concerning the fisheries. After the reciprocity treaty was abolished in 1866 the Canadian government decided to issues licenses to American vessels almost in the same way as we are issuing them to-day, with the exception, however, that instead of charging $1.50 per ton, as we are charging to-day, the Canadian government then charged only 50 cents and later on it was increased to $1. In 1869 the Canadian government decided to abolish what we call the modus vivendi and determined not to issue any more licenses. It seems as if that policy had been injurious to a certain extent to the American fishermen because we see that immediately the American authorities took steps to procure the negotiation of a treaty with Canada in order to have the benefit of our fisheries. As every hon. member of this House is aware, negotiations were entered into and as a result of these negotiations we had the treaty of Washington which was concluded in 1871 and which came in force in 1873. It has been stated that this treaty lapsed by the efflux of time. That is a mistaken idea because the treaty did not die of itself, but it was cancelled at the request of the American authorities. It seems that there was in the American Senate, or among the American authorities, some power just as strong as that which existed in 1783 when John Adams forced his colleagues and forced the British authorities to adopt a policy by which the Canadians would have to submit to their will. It is certainly difficult for me to understand or to find out why it is that the American authorities in 1885 decided to put an end to the Treaty of Washington in so far, especially, as the fisheries are concerned, because it appears to me that this treaty conferred a special benefit upon the American fishermen. It is true that we had some special advantages in regard to the export of our fish by that treaty, but at the same time it seems that the advantage was mostly in favour of the American fishermen. The House will remember that in 1877 an investigation was made as to whether the advantages in regard to the fisheries were greater to the American fisherman than to the Canadian fisherman, and it was decided by the Halifax award that the American fishermen had certainly more advantages than the Canadian fishermen and a certain sum of money was paid to the Canadian authorities as a result of that investigation. So that shows, Mr. Speaker, that the American fishermen seem to have had the best of these negotiations and as I said, it is a surprise to me that they put an end to the treaty in 1885. There were, I understand, some very powerful influences exerted upon the American authorities in order to induce them to adopt that policy. The treaty was certainly more favourable to the United States than to Canada, although there were some advantages which were certainly of great benefit in the development of our Canadian fisheries. When the treaty was denounced negotiations were entered into with the view of making a new treaty. At last, after some efforts on the part of the countries interested, a new treaty was arranged in 1888, which unfortunately was not accepted by the Senate of the United States, although that treaty was adopted by the British authorities and by the Canadian parliament. It was provided that pending the acceptance of that treaty by the American Senate and by the other authorities, there should be a modus vivendi by which we should permit the American fishermen to purchase bait, ice, seines, lines and all other supplies and outfits; and to tranship their catches and ship their crews. This modus vivendi was accepted by the Canadian government, a law was passed to

that effect and since 1888 we have been issuing licenses to the American vessels applying therefor, in consideration of a license fee of $1.50 per ton. This system has been in vogue since 1888 and the question is raised by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) whether it should continue to exist or not.

I would not like to express any definite opinion as to whether this modus vivendi should be abolished, or whether, if it should be abolished, that abolition should take place at the present moment or later on. It seems to me that this question affects a great many interests in the maritime provinces, and we may ask ourselves whether the time is opportune and whether we are ready to take advantage of the situation which might be created if to-day a change was made from the policy adopted in 1888. We have seen that there is a divergence of opinion on this question : we have heard during the discussion to-day and yesterday that some members of this House claim that this modus vivendi should be abolished. Others claim that it would be better to stay as we are because by continuing the modus vivendi very material advantages are given to a large number of people in the maritime provinces. On the other hand it is represented that there is no compensation for the advantages given under the modus vivendi. As I have said I would not like to offer any definite opinion on this question. The modus vivendi was adopted, why ? Because negotiations were then going on between the American and Canadian authorities. It was represented in 1887 or 1888 when the modus vivendi was first brought before parliament that during those negotiations or pending the approval of the treaty this modus vivendi should be continued. That treaty, however, was not ratified, as I have just stated but in 1892, the Canadian parliament passed a law by which, instead of having an Act passed every year for the purpose of granting to American vessels and American fishermen the privileges involved, the Governor in Council was empowered to grant every year the licenses if he should see fit. Negotations, as I have said, were going on in 1888, perhaps they were not very active in 1892 but there were, I suppose, some pourparlers between the two countries. However, we find that later on, in 1898, the Joint High Commission was instructed specially to discuss the question of the fisheries. The Joint High Commission, it is true, has not sat during the last few years, but it is supposed that for the moment it would be probably better not to put an end to that modus vivendi for the reason that negotiations might be going on between the two countries on that same question ; that the abolition of the modus vivendi would probably raise some difficulties and would prevent those negotiations from going on. And at the same time, I think that we are not

absolutely ready to take charge of the new situation which would be presented to our fishermen if a change was made to-morrow.

What is to be done however ? We should not stand still, we should not remain quiet, but we should make all efforts possible in order to create new avenues of commerce for our fisheries, in case some day we should be under the necessity of putting an end to the modus vivendi. How are we going to create those avenues of commerce and what have we done in connection with this ? If we look at the expenditures which have been made for some years it will be found that no expense has been spared in order to put our fisheries on a better footing. We have done a great deal not only to improve the situation of our fishermen but also to place our fisheries on a commercial basis, if I may so put it. We have the best fishermen probably to be found on the face of the earth. They are brave men. They are men who daily expose their lives for the purpose of catching fish. We must provide for more than that, these fishermen are not men of business, they are hardy fishermen, they are men of bravery but they are not business men, we must maintain and open avenues for the disposal of the fish caught by these men, and we must create those avenues not only for the export trade but also for our Canadian trade. I am sorry and I was sorry to find out last year when I was on the Tariff Commission that a large quantity of our fish caught in Canadian waters, fish which belonged properly to this country, was exported to the United States and returned later into Canada and that our Canadian people had to pay the Canadian duty on it. It is well known that in the maritime provinces a great quantity of fish which is exported from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Boston or Gloucester or Portland comes back to Canada and on it Canadians have to pay Canadian duty. The same state of affairs exists with regard to the fisheries of British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What kind of fish are those ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Lobsters, cod and herring, and an hon. gentleman tells me also, mackerel, but I am not sure of that. At the same time, we find that the fish which is consumed in cities like Montreal, Toronto and perhaps Ottawa sometimes, has come back to us through the United States, and that on it we have to pay duty. In my opinion we should take the necessary means to modify such a condition of things if not to put an end to it altogether. My colleagues in the ministry have cheerfully adopted my suggestion to place in the estimates a sum of money to provide for transportation of fish in a cold storage from the maritime provinces and from the Pacific coast to the central parts of Canada. I was induced to adopt this policy because I

found that large quantities of our fish were going to the United States, and because I believe that this fish could find a market through Canadian channels, in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, and other cities. The cold storage warehouses which the government has provided for will be useful not only for agricultural products but for the cold storage of fish as well. Another difficulty that met us in the development of our fisheries was the want of bait at certain seasons of the year, and in order to remedy this defect we some years ago subsidized the establishment of bait freezers. This policy has been most acceptable to the people of the maritime provinces, and especially the people of Nova Scotia. The small bait freezers which were at first erected were found so useful that we have established at Canso and Halifax large bait freezers which supply the deep sea fishermen not only in certain seasons but during the entire year. It was also found that large quantities of herring instead of being used for food were absolutely wasted or spread on the fields as a fertilizer, because proper facilities were not at hand to cure the fish. We consequently brought out here Mr. Cowie, who is a most excellent official, so that he might instruct our fishermen in the Scotch curing system, which is far superior to that which had previously been in vogue in Canada. Mr. Cowie has given great satisfaction everywhere and I have now before me many applications not only from the maritime provinces but from the Pacific coast, asking that Mr. Cowie be sent to give instruction in the Scotch process of curing herring. This will be of great benefit to the fishermen, not only because all the herring caught can be cured, but because also better prices for the fish will be obtained. I may also mention that the government has established a fish dryer which I was fortunate enough to see in operation last summer. We have at the head of that establishment a very competent man, and I am pleased to be able to announce that the revenue obtained from that fish dryer covers the expenditure, so that it now costs the country nothing, except the interest on the money invested. All these things tend towards enabling us to meet the situation which will arise when a change comes to be made, if ever that time comes.

Perhaps it might be well for me to say here that it is apparent to me as it is to others, that our Canadian capitalists and financial institutions are not assisting the Canadian fishing industry as they should. I have been told that those who control capital, at all events on the Atlantic coast, are not particularly eager to lend money for fishery ventures, although on the Pacific coast that statement would hardly be so applicable. Nothing or almost nothing has been done on the Atlantic coast in this respect. Let us adopt a true Canadian policy; let us improve our fisheries in all respects; let us give our fishermen all the encouragement possible; let us create new avenues for the marketing of Canadian fish in Canada; let us endeavour to induce our capitalists to have the same faith in the fishing industry as they have in other industries and when all this is done I shall have no fear but that the fishing industry of Canada will be as successful as our other commercial enterprises. It is my hope that the appeal which I am now making to our financiers may induce them to be less timid in the future than they have been in the past in reference to the fishing industry.

There is not much more to be said on the modus vivendi, but with regard to the question raised by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) I may say a word or two. It is true that we have adopted with regard to the Pacific coast fisheries, practically the same policy which under the modus vivendi we have adopted in regard to the Atlantic coast fisheries; namely, that fish caught in American bottoms can be landed at Canadian ports and shipped in bond to the United States. There is, I think, a very good reason for the adoption of that policy. There may be some difference of opinion as to the necessity of that policy; but there is one thing that is very sure, that is, that as a result of that policy not only is $200,000 or $300,000 a year expended on our Canadian railroads for the transportation of that fish, but also that there is being spent a large sum of money in Vancouver and other places in British Columbia in connection with the operation of these fisheries. If we had not adopted that policy, these American vessels would have come just the same and fished in our waters or in the waters adjoining Canadian territory, and instead of shipping the product through Canadian ports, they would have gone a few miles below and have shipped it through Seattle or Tacoma, and the business would have been lost to this country. It may be interesting to know the amount of money which comes to this country as a result of this policy. It is estimated that this policy in 1902-3 yielded to this country $406,531. The freight paid on the Canadian Pacific Railway amounted to $215,106; the wages of crews amounted to $24,448; the wages of fishermen on steamers, $79,946; coal, $30,797; repairs, $19,415; provisions, $10,172; ice, $14,687; gear, $7,994; boxes, $9,324; and miscellaneous, $11,637. It is estimated that this policy yielded to us in 1903-4, $612,278, and in 1904-5 $422,732. I have not the figures for 1905-6, but I have reason to believe that they are larger than the sum spent in 1904-5. If we had not adopted this policy, under which not only the New England Fish Company, but any company catching fish in American bottoms land at Canadian ports, all this money, instead of being spent in this country on our coal mines, our fishermen and our railways, would have been spent for the benefit of American fishermen,

American coal mines and American railways; because, as I have said, the fisheries, instead of being exploited by Canadian citizens, and instead of the fish being transported by our own railways, would have been exploited by American fishermen and transported by American railways. This policy commended itself to the government also because it was to a certain extent the same policy which was as that adopted on the Atlantic coast in connection with the modus vivendi.

Some other questions have been raised by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) especially with regard to the Dixon entrance and the Hecate strait. I feel very diffident to express any views on such a large question, especially as it is not a question affecting my department specially. It is of international law, with which my colleague the Minister of Justice would be more apt to deal, especially in view of the fact that he was connected with the Alaskan Boundary Commission, which is somewhat related to this question. I do not, however, fail to realize the importance of the point raised by my hon. friend as to the situation that has been created with regard to the Dixon entrance by the decision of the Alaskan Boundary Commission, showing that we may claim a very good reason the right of exclusive fishing not only in the Dixon entrance but also in the Hecate strait. The Dixon entrance may be to a certain extent considered as a bay. It may be claimed that the entrance to this bay is wider than six miles and that therefore it is a neutral water and should be considered as a part of the open sea, and not as territory belonging to one country. With regard to that, I may say that the three-mile limit might have been at one time the extreme limit of national territory. If we read carefully the authorities on international law in connection with that question, we find that the territorial limit of a country at a certain period was much less than three miles. It was so because it was considered that the limit should be at the point which could be reached by a gun or an arm such as was then in use.

Mr. STOCKTON. First by spear and then by cannon.

Mr. BRODEUR. By which passing vessels could be reached. In the last century the three-mile limit was generally accepted; but should it continue to be accepted after the improvements of the last few years? This is a question for the authorities on international law to discuss, and I must admit that my limited knowledge of these great questions prevents me expressing any opinion with reference to that. At the same time, if the argument was good at one time by which the limit was to be fixed at a few yards from the shore, and it was afterwards extended and extended and extended, I do not see why the same argument should not apply to-day. Now, the decision of the Alaskan Boundary Commission fixed a certain limit, though inside of that limit there were canals and bays very much wider than six miles. I think there were some inlets as wide as eighteen or twenty miles. I am not sure of these figures, but I think the Lynn canal is more than six miles wide. However, it was decided by the Commission that those waters should not be considered as neutral waters, but should be considered as American territory. Then, who is to be the owner of the territory below that line? Is this going to be neutral water? If a line is to be drawn which the Canadians could not pass without trespassing on American territory, could it not be argued, with a certain degree of force—as my hon. friend argued this afternoon—that the territories or waters below that line should be Canadian territory. He has stated the case of Juan de Fuca strait, which is almost a similar case, because when the two countries agreed that a certain dividing line should pass through that strait, without regard to the three mile limit or the six mile limit, the one side of which should be American territory and the other Canadian territory. In that case it was declared by the commission that the line was to be put at a certain place; and then, if we look at the map which has been laid on the table, we find that in tracing the line we reach the western coast of Vancouver and the Queen Charlotte Islands are part of Canada. The strait runs between Charlotte Islands and the Canadian territory. If, therefore, we have the right to draw the line as my hon. friend has contended—and contended with a great deal of force—this strait would be Canadian territory. The result would be that the fishing carried on in that strait—and it is there that most of the fishing, and especially the halibut fishing is carried on—would be carried on in Canadian waters. That was admitted by American authority. Mr. Alexander, a United States fishery expert on the steamer 'Albatross,' published a report in 1897 dealing with the Pacific halibut fishing, in which he stated that the halibut fishery was conducted mainly by United States vessels up to 1895 and admitted that the best banks were those in Canadian waters? Where are those best banks? They are the following: The grounds off Banks island; off Goschen island; off Graham island, in Hecate strait; and the grounds off Graham island, in Dixon entrance.

So we see that the American expert—who may not have been a legal gentleman, but who no doubt was an expert, and, I presume, gave the matter serious consideration—admitted that the fisheries carried on by American fishermen were carried on in Canadian waters, and these waters included Hecate strait. This question deserves a great deal of consideration—the question of ascertain-

ing whether Dixon's entrance and Hecate strait should not be considered part of our Canadian territory.

I do not want to delay the House any longer upon this point. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) has called to my attention the fact that some new boats are needed in his section of country. That necessity was also referred to by others in this debate, and I may say that in studying the different reports which have reached the department, I have found that there is a great deal of poaching done, especially on the western coast of Vancouver and within the three mile limit. If, however, we have not the right to go outside the three mile limit in Hecate strait and Dixon entrance, I think we should adopt the policy of protecting our Canadian fisheries. We are very glad to see the American fishermen taking so much interest in our fisheries, but at the same time it is the duty of the government to protect those fisheries and keep them for our Canadian citizens. As they belong to us, they should be exploited by us; and if American fishermen go there, they should at least—as has been done in the case of a New Washington Company—give us as much benefit as possible. But we must do on the Pacific coast what I have said should be done with regard to the Atlantic coast. I am free to admit, however, that there seems to be more business activity shown by Canadians on the British Columbia coast. Our financial institutions have been investing large sums there, which is a condition of affairs I am glad to see. For my part I am ready to take all the necessary steps to protect our fisheries along that coast. I have asked my colleagues to put at the disposal of my department another boat, a cruiser, which should be devoted almost exclusively to the protection of our fisheries. A sum is in the estimates for that purpose, on which the House will be asked to vote; but I am sure, from the tenor of this discussion, that all the hon. members will be glad to co-operate with the government in that respect, and give us the means of protecting our fisheries in the west as we are doing in the east. I can assure my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) that no effort will be spared by my department to give oru fisheries in the west the same protection that we are giving them in other parts of the country.

Hon. Geo. E. FOSTER, (North Toronto). The question which we have been discussing since last evening is a very interesting and important one. It is especially gratifying to see the younger members of the House go outside the general line of attack and defence in party warfare in order to study and master what are really important questions in the political life and development of Canada. I congratulate the two gentlemen who moved and seconded this resolution on having prepared this question so well for discussion by this House. My only regret is that the debate should have taken place before so many empty benches. It is rather a reflection upon us, as a House of Commons, that while a scrap will speedily fill all the empty benches, the discussion of one of the most important questions we can consider should have the effect of as quickly emptying the benches as the other will have in filling them. However, possibly we will grow more thoughtful as we grow older.

I have been listening to the recital of the events of 1886 and 1888 and afterwards, with a good deal of interest and they have aroused many reminiscences. The speech of my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean) brought up many things in which I had a deeper and more direct interest at the time, and refreshed my memory regarding scenes and events of a good many years ago. Coming first to the modus vivendi—because that was the main point of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean)—I could scarcely see the gist of the minister's remarks or the relevancy of his suggestion that before the modus vivendi was allowed to drop we must fit ourselves for the eventualities. What does the modus vivendi give us that an aching void will be left when it passes away which we must first fit ourselves to fill.

If, in connection with the modus vivendi or the privileges given by it, we had the privilege of disposing of our fish in the markets of the United States under such conditions that, if one were done away with the other one would follow, I could see why, before we provoked that state of affairs or allowed it to come to pass, it would be wisdom for us to open other avenues into which would flow the trade which would be stopped by the refusal of continued free entry into the United States for our fish. But let the modus vivendi stop to-morrow and we have just as many markets as we had before. In saying that, I am not finding fault with the minister for declaring that all the avenues possible should be open for the disposing of the products of our fisheries. I entirely agree with him there. Let us, however, guard against being too optimistic in one respect. It does not end the whole matter to say that in 1870 our fisheries production was a certain comparatively small amount and that last year it was $30,000,000. That does not prove that our fisheries are better or more enduring than they were. We must remember that we have more fishing than we used to have and more call and higher prices for fish than we used to have; that we are taking smaller fish than we used to take and are more eager in the pursuit of the smaller fish than we used to be. The fact that the fishery products have risen to $30,000,000 may be a proof of coming exhaustion of the fisheries, instead of a proof of prosperity. I know, as an administrator of that department, and so does my hon. friend who now administers it, that there are a great many difficulties

in managing the fisheries of this country. I am sorry indeed, and shall never cease to be sorry, that the judges high in authority seem to feel it incumbent upon them to shear the federal power, from time to time, of its jurisdiction and authority in such a great branch of the public service as our fisheries administration. With my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) and equally with him, I deplore that there is a divided authority in our fisheries administration. It always seemed plain to me that the further away you could put the executive authority from the interest of the individual fisherman the better control you could have. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the Department of Fisheries should hold itself aloof or divorce itself from all the information, it can best get from the parties on the ground. I mean that, in fixing the times and seasons of fishing, the qualities to be taken, the size of fish to be taken and so on, it is infinitely more difficult for the near neighbour of the person interested to carry out a salutary law than it is for the authority that is further away and stronger. Therefore, I deplore the fact, and shall not cease to deplore it, that the fisheries in our country, are being administered under divided authority and, I fear, with not the same vigour and comprehensiveness that would characterize the administration by a central authority. Now, as to conveniences for fishing, and so on, it seems to me that the minister is on the right track. This country has in its fishery an asset which should command just as lively an interest and evoke just as great enterprise and skill and inventive genius as any of the other great industries of our country. The making of dairy products is considered to be an immense part of the interests of our country, and enthusiasm has gone out in that direction. But how much is there in the vast area of our fishing grounds, unexplored and unutilized—or worse, being wasted and destroyed—which would make for the future wealth and prosperity of this country if these resources were husbanded and, in harvesting our crop, proper appliances were used. But, first of all, no richness of resource, no extent of waters can take away from the governing authority, whatever it may be, the duty of protecting our own. Whatever is our own on the water, is just as precious and our duty of protecting it is just as great, as if it were on land. Suppose that it could be possible for our Canadian fishermen to go far south along the American coast line and engage in fishing there. That would bring the point directly before the people of the United States. On the open sea we would have as good a right to set our fishing vessels at work as the fishermen of the United States. But even on the open sea, for the hundreds of miles before the American coast, the American fisherman would have the advantage over the people of the north. But, should we say to them: Open your harbours to us on even terms with yourselves, the people of the United States would at once urge the argument of propinquity in their own favour. They would say: We have the advantage of contiguity in this business, and we have a right to preserve that advantage for ourselves; and we are not wanting in proper or brotherly feeling if we guard our own. But when the fishermen of the United States come to the Grand Banks opposite Canadian territory, they seem to forget this argument of preserving the advantage of contiguity and make the demand plump and square—and have done it over and over again in corespondence for the last twenty-five or thirty years—that they shall have not only the privilege of fishing upon the main, but also the advantage of nearness to the shore as well. But these are advantages which, in our own interest, and in the interest of our children, and in the interest of our nationality, we have a perfect right—nay, more, we have a bounden duty—to preserve. But we do not keep those advantages to-day. Under the modus vivendi we are making an actual gift of them. What is the little charge of so much per ton on American vessels? It means nothing. But we are not obliged to make this gift—there are no rights which can be claimed. We have given them—if we have given them at all—out of neighbourly feeling, and with a view to getting certain questions settled which both countries are anxious to have settled. But there must come a time when that will stop. In 1888 we gave them up for the time, because we did not wish to have the least friction on our coast, whilst there was a possibility of the Cleveland or the Bayard treaty being received and passed in the United States Senate. In 1889, in 1890, in 1891 and in 1892, negotiations with the United States were still on over great questions, and we did not wish to have anything pending in relation to the fisheries which would tend to retard the amicable settlement of these questions.

To-day there may be some question still, and will the time ever come between Canada and the United States when there will not be some outstanding question? How long is it to be that we shall give our rights away and get nothing in return when the right to take advantage of our neighbourhood to the fisheries is our natural right as well as it is our national and our legal right? If you take the despatches and diplomatic correspondence between the United States and Great Britain in reference to the fishery matter from first to last it will puzzle you to find one, fair generous acknowledgement that in any of these things Canada has played the part of a good neighbour and a generous friend. It is difficult to find that, I am not making it as a reproach, but we cannot expect, judging from the past, to get much in the way of gratitude or generous

feeling and thought from the people of the United States because of the privileges which we allow them to use when, by the rights of treaty and by our own national rights, they are our own and enure to our own advantage.

So I would impress upon the minister and upon this House that there must sooner or later come a time when we should resume our privileges, and these privileges are just as important to us upon the British Columbia coast as they are upon the Atlantic coast. The minister has stated that there has been great progress in the development of our fisheries on the British Columbia coast. Strangely enough he put it in close juxtaposition to the fact that in Ontario, one of our oldest provinces, there has been a decrease and a falling off in the fisheries. Over yonder is virgin soil, so to speak and if we properly appreciate that and properly protect it from the first it will be more economical for us and much wiser than it will be to allow it first to be depleted and then to endeavour to replenish it. I know that we must carry on the policy of replenishing our fisheries which has been carried on for many years and we must also carry out the idea of protecting our fisheries in our own waters and for our own people laying down the proper times, meshes and sizes of fish which are to be taken and prescribing the lines upon which the fishing industry is to be carried on. I approve entirely of what the minister said in reference to better methods of preparing fish. I mentioned once before in the House this session that Canada especially should endeavour, with her wealth of intelligence and enterprise, to make her manufactures, of whatever kind they are, excellent so that they will have a higher value and command a higher price. The experiment of bringing to this country fishermen from the old country who understand methods to teach our own people who do not understand these peculiar methods how to put up the very same fish which under one method of preparation would bring an indifferent sum of money, and has an indifferent value, in such a shape and form that when it is presented to the market its value is largely increased and it becomes more profitable to the fishermen, more wholesome and more nutritious to the consumer, is one which promises well for the future of the fishing industry. Canada, as its population increases, will become one of the largest fish-eating countries of the world. Six millions to-day do not exercise their normal appetites on the fisheries of this country because the fish are not put before them in appetizing form, in sufficient quantities or with sufficient readiness and cheapness. That appetite will increase but when your population doubles and trebles there will come the drain upon the fishery resources of Canada and so we will be wise if, to-day, before the population is too large, we make those provisions which will become settled and permanent, so that an application from an interested politician will not swerve the head of the department from what he knows to be the proper line of preservation and prosecution of these fisheries so that no little attempt in one corner to get a few votes for your man who is going to run in your interest will have the least influence in swerving the department from what it knows to be its plain line of duty in reference to the better preservation of fish and the fisheries. We have said here that one department—the Militia Department ought to be above politics, and I wish we could say soon as well that another department—the Department of Fisheries—should be above politics, because it is touched by political influences in every corner. It has been difficult to avoid this being so but with a straight policy and a firm adherence to it I believe that evil can be very much diminished and that within the course of a few years our people can come to believe in the wisdom of that policy and in the wisdom of pursuing that policy without going back to those practices and inconsistencies which have been the bane of the administration of the Fisheries Department ever since we have had fishery laws. I am not saying that in criticism of my hon. friend's administration to-day. It is a general criticism which would have been good at any time and I hope will be less of a force in the future than it has been in the past.

I do not wish to continue this debate any longer except to reiterate the pleasure I have had in listening to this discussion and my belief that it will turn out to be a very profitable and very useful discussion to the members of this House and to the minister who has this matter strictly in charge. One last word, and it is this: Whilst we desire to live in the greatest amity and peace with our neighbours, whilst we do recognize that Great Britain bears the burden of the empire, that it is a staggering burden at times, that the outside British possessions must realize that and assist the mother country in the burdens which she has to bear; yet, I think it ought to be pretty well understood in Canada from this time forward that we have given up about all that we propose to give up unless we get the quid pro quo of a compensation or an advantage, that our resources, great though they are, are none too great for our own people, that they are not great enough to allow us to give advantages in the way of gratuities and favours to even our good neighbour the United States to the south of us and that what we have we believe to be ours. We live largely under the sense that we have had taken from us, for one reason and another, what should have properly belonged to this Dominion to-day and we do not want—I am certain that is the feeling of this country from one end to the other—to be forced to to be asked to give up what are our rights or a part of our resources that we need

for our own development in the future even to insistent neighbours, and I think we must also come to the conclusion that our neighbours themselves will have just as much respect for us if they see us fairly and strongly, but at the same time reasonably, insist upon those rights which we have, and maintain them against all comers.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). I have been struck during the course of this debate with the necessity for a standing committee of this House to consider questions relating to the fisheries. It is extraordinary that while we have committees for a great many other subjects there is no standing committee to consider questions relating to marine and fisheries. We have committees on such subjects as Public Accounts, Banking and Commerce, Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Privileges and Elections, Miscellaneous Private Bills, Standing Orders, Debates of the House and Agriculture and Colonization; most of those subjects are of great importance to the House and to the country, but I submit that this great question of the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada is one that calls for a standing committee of this House. There is no question in which so many difficulties arise and in which it is necessary that members from distant parts of this Dominion should be able to express their views to one another and arrive at some sort of common idea as to the things that ought to be done in relation to it as this great industry—and when I speak of the fisheries, I wish to include matters relating to marine, because questions of that kind are constantly coming before the House. We have now before us questions of that kind and we are compelled to appoint special committees to deal with them, whereas they ought to be referred to a regular standing committee of this House, who would constantly take charge of matters of that kind. For example we have a question relating to masters and mates, which has been before the House for the last two years. We have also a question relating to steamboat inspection which is a very important question indeed; I do not know how that will be dealt with as the Bill has not been read a second time. There ought to be a standing committee to deal with these important questions. I need not state, as has been stated so often in this debate, that the fisheries are of great importance to this country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has shown us the great progress that has been made during the last 30 years in this industry. He has pointed out that in 1870 the whole production of the fisheries of Canada amounted to only $6,577,391, and if he had gone on over each decade since he would have found that there has been a steady progress, that each ten years it has advanced materially. This will be seen by the following table, of the total production of the fisheries, by decades :

Year.	Value of Fisheries.
1880	$14,400,979
1890	17,714,902
1900	21,557,639
1905 (half decade)	29,479,562

It will be seen that for 1905, the last year for which we have complete returns, the value of the fisheries amounted to the splendid sum of $29,479,562, more than twice the value of the fisheries in 1880. You see therefore that the industry has made steady progress from 1870 up to the present time, as far as the value of the production is concerned. I am quite well aware that we must take into account the fact that the prices of fish are now much greater than they were a few years ago. For example the price paid for dried codfish to-day is about twice as much as it was a few years ago, and that must be taken into account in estimating the quantity of fish we have caught. While we may swell up the figures because the prices are high, it may not show a corresponding increase in the quantity, but all the same the industry has made good progress from 1870 to the present time and it is bound to increase. As the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, it is only in its infancy. As the population of this country increases and as the people in the west begin to realize the delicious kind of fish we have in the east—and I think what was said by the hon. member for Halifax, is true that our fish in the east has a better flavour than that caught on the Pacific coast—I do not think that the salmon caught on the Pacific can compare at all with the salmon caught in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I think every gentleman who has tasted this fish from both places will agree with me that that is true and we all know that salmon is about the best fish they have on the Pacific. I am not saying anything derogatory to British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Has the hon. gentleman ever been on the Pacific coast?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Certainly I have.

Mr. MACPHERSON. And eaten fresh salmon?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes, and relished it very much, but I felt it was not nearly as good as the salmon we catch in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. That is prejudice.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Pure prejudice.

Mr. SLOAN. Like the pies that mother used to make.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think the future of this industry is very largely a question of transportation. The reason we have not been able to expand our fisheries in Nova

Scotia, the province from which I come, is largely the lack of rapid and cheap transportation. I could give you examples of what has taken place in that province to show that as transportation improves, the trade increases in proportion. For example in the little town of Canso, 10 or 12 years ago, there was no fresh fish business at all, there was no way of sending fresh fish to the market. A daily boat was established which connected that point with the Intercolonial Railway at Mulgrave. The rates on fresh fish at that time between Canso and Montreal by express were $2.50 a hundred, which was almost a prohibitive rate, and the people of Montreal were using fish that were caught in Gloucester. They could not use our fish because they could not afford to pay $2.50 for each hundred pounds to the express company. When we say 100 pounds, we must remember that that includes the boxes and the ice which are heavy, so that it would in no case be 100 pounds of fish. The rate was therefore so high that we could scarcely afford to send this fish to Montreal at all. When the daily boat connected Canso with Mulgrave we began to send the fish and shortly after the express rates were reduced to $1.50, and then the industry began to spring up and it has grown enormously since that period. Another advantage which we must credit to the present administration was the fast freight train that was put on a few years ago, between Mulgrave and Montreal. This train which carries refrigerator cars starts from Mulgrave every day, connects with another fast train at Truro, and reaches Montreal in about fifty-one hours from Mulgrave. This gives us a fast freight service which carries the fish at a very much reduced rate. A few years ago we had to pay $2.50 for sending 100 pounds of fish by express whereas we can now forward it in car load lots by this fast train at the rate of thirty-eight cents per 100 pounds, and this has done a great deal to enable us to send our fish to the Montreal market.

I was glad to hear the minister state that the government had taken means to assist the transportation of fish from the east to the west and possibly from the west to the east. I do not know how it is proposed to work out the scheme, but I have a suggestion to make: We have now a pretty good arrangement for shipping car load lots at the rate of thirty-eight cents per 100 pounds, but our difficulty is to ship in small lots. The small dealer on the coast who has probably only 5,000 pounds of fish to send forward is compelled to pay $1.50 per 100 pounds express rate. There is no system, that I know of, under which a number of these smaller dealers can unite to ship a car load lot, and if the minister could devise a scheme by which small lots would be forwarded at about the same rate as large shipments he would confer a great benefit on the industry. In the Department of Agriculture there is a scheme by which refrigerator cars are run on certain lines of railway certain days of the week, picking up small lots of butter and cheese and other perishable products by the way, and if these cars do not get enough freight to pay the haul the government subsidizes the railway to the extent of meeting any loss that may be incurred. A system of that kind applied to the fish trade would help the smaller dealers along the coast to send their fish to Montreal. In the province of Nova Scotia, and especially in my county, there are very few fish dealers who can send a car load shipment but there are many who could send 4,000 pounds or 5,000 pounds, or 10,000 pounds, and I trust the minister, with the view of helping this class of dealers, will give some consideration to the suggestion which I have made.

Let me point out that there is a large amount of Canadian capital invested in the Canadian fishing industry. The statistics tell us that $12,000,000 of Canadian money is invested in fishing vessels and the necessary gear. There is no other industry in Canada that has a production equal to more than double its capital in a single year, and that is true of the fishing industry. I do not believe there is any manufacturing industry which shows such a return on the capital invested, and consequently hon. gentlemen will see the importance of this industry. With improved transportation facilities there is no limit to what might be accomplished in the future. I suppose there is no limit to the fish in the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, and we may assume that with proper protection the industry can continue as long as our country lasts. Three hundred years ago the fishermen of France were fishing off Canso in my county. The haddock fishing was good at that time, according to the old reports and it is good yet; just as good as far as I am able to learn as it was then. There is a mine of haddock there that will outlast the coal of British Columbia or the coal of Nova Scotia, and there is no reason why, with proper protection, this great asset of our fisheries should not be increased enormously in the future. All this brings me back to the suggestion I made at the beginning of my remarks, that there should be a standing committee of this House which would deal with all these questions relating to our fisheries and which would endeavour to arrive at the wisest policy concerning them. For instance the preservation of the lobster industry is a question of great moment to the people of eastern Canada. There is a great difference of opinion, and a great variety of views are held as to how the lobster industry can be protected, and had we a standing committee of the House those interested would have a better opportunity than ever they have had to present their views to parliament.

It is a significant fact that Canada has practically the only great lobster industry in the world to-day. A good many years ago the industry was thriving in the United States; lobsters were caught as far south as Cape Hatteras, but at the present time none are caught even so far south as the coast of New York, few are taken on the Massachusetts' coast and some yet remain on the coast of Maine. But, on the 5,600 miles of the east coast of Canada we have the one great lobster industry remaining in the world. Not many years ago there were lobsters caught on the coast of Norway and on the coast of Scotland, but to-day they are practically extinct there. Hence it is most important that we should take means to preserve this industry, and hence it is that the questions as to whether more licenses should be granted to lobster factories, and whether the propagation of lobsters as now carried on is a success, become questions of deep concern to us and in my opinion call for the appointment of a standing committee of the House to deal with it.

I do not intend to take up the time of the House in referring at any great length to the question raised by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean). It is a question of great importance to us all and it is a question of great interest to the constituency I have the honour to represent. I must say, however, it is not a question on which our people are at all unanimous. I heard some time ago that it was coming before the House, and I took the precaution to write a circular letter to about thirty of the leading men along the coast of my constituency, merchants, fishermen and others, who have been thinking on this question, and I have their views. I am not going to weary the House by reading them all. I may say, however, that of the thirty about fifteen thought that the modus vivendi had better be continued, while about fifteen thought that it ought to be abolished. The local merchant who was trading with the American fisherman, selling him bait and making money out of him as a rule, said it was a good thing and should be kept going. The fisherman who had a vessel of his own and was competing with the American fisherman said it was a bad thing, and that it ought to be abolished. Now, I find it very difficult to form an opinion on this question. It is not such an easy question as some of our hon. friends think. My hon. friend from Lunenburg seemed to have no difficulty. I must say I have some difficulty. I will of course always stand for Canadian interests as I understand them. I believe in protecting our fisheries. I will stand for prosecuting any man who poaches on the preserves of our people. I do not believe in allowing any country to take away the heritage that has been given to the Canadian people. I do not know whether it would be of special interest to hon. members to hear any of these answers, but suppose I read two or three:

We are of the opinion that the modus vivendi licenses should be continued, that the privilege should be granted free of charge. The visits of the vessels to our ports greatly benefit the ports and enable our fishermen to sell bait and other supplies that would otherwise be of no value. Especially is this true of the ports west of Lunenburg.

To withdraw the privileges altogether would not cripple them seriously nor compel them to give us free access to their markets. All people resent being coerced and we believe we will secure concessions from the United States more readily by treating them generously than by attempting to coerce them as Newfoundland is doing. Perhaps the safest thing is to leave it as it is. A few years may bring light on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Fisherman or trader?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is a trader. Here is a fisherman:

In answer to your favour of the 1st instant in regard to action being taken by parliament the coming session to cancel the existing fishery arrangement with the United States. In my opinion no good result would follow such a step for the following reasons: It would destroy a profitable business that a number of our people at present have in selling ice to the fresh fishermen. I mean the halibut fishermen, also to the salt fishermen, but in limited quantities for iceing bait. Then again there is quite a trade with these people in outfits, &c. We sell them bait in the months of April and July. It is said by some that the bait would be bought by our own bankers. In times of plenty there is enough for all. When bait is scarce they do not stop on our coast. If we could prohibit them from getting bait at all, the argument might have effect, but under the treaty we cannot prohibit them from getting it at the Magdalen islands and parts of Newfoundland and Labrador. Last season there were United States vessels on the north coast of Newfoundland that made a business of catching bait to supply their own bankers. If we cannot keep them from getting bait somewhere why not sell it to them when we have it.

Another argument. If the modus vivendi was of very great benefit to the American fishermen, there would be more licenses taken out by them than there are. There are not many men shipped by the cod fishermen. The majority of our men who go in the American vessels at present go for a part of the fishery business that our people do not follow. Also the halibut fishery which is also another branch of the fisheries that we have not one vessel engaged in. It is all folly to think that by shutting them out of our ports we can stop them from catching fish.

Here is another:

Sir,—Your favour to hand and contents carefully noted. In reply would say, that I am pleased to hear that the federal government intends taking action in regard to the present modus vivendi, with the United States, in regard to the fisheries. You have asked me to give you my views on this matter. First, the Americans have about the same privileges as Canadians outside of the small amount they pay for a license. Second, they debar us from the markets of the United States by imposing such a high duty on our

fish that we cannot ship them there, which leaves them in such a position that their fishermen can realize a far greater amount for their fish than we can. Third, and they come down to Nova Scotia and ship most of our best fishermen, on account of the above reason, and thus place our fishing captains in a position where they have to take their crews from the material left by the Americans. Fourth, there has been a great scarcity of bait on our shores for three or four years. In fact, at times most of our fishing fleet were laying idle for want of bait. Then, when some bait was caught, the Americans, as a general thing, would or can pay a larger price for it on account of reasons aforementioned, thus taking the bait from our own fishmen, and consequently they would be still enforced to lie idle. Now, as you know, we get no concession whatever from the Americans in regard to our fish, and they have had great privileges from us for so long, and still will not unbend the least to us. I think it is about time the Canadian government should give them a dose of their own medicine. The Newfoundland government is enforcing her rights, and I think it the proper time for our government to protect her fishermen in unison with Newfoundland. I believe it will be the only way to bring the fishing interest of Massachusetts to their senses, and allow us a little fair-play.

It is held by some of our people that the Americans would find bait for themselves in some way if we should stop selling them bait. It is quite true that they do carry bait to our coast from Gloucester, keeping it in cold storage. I am informed by one correspondent that any one can stand on the hills at Liscomb, in my county, and see an American fishing fleet fishing at a distance of perhaps ten miles from the coast almost any winter day in December and January. They do not come into the harbours at all. They stay a few days until they can fill their vessels, and then go home. There is no doubt that they would be able in some measure to find bait, even if we shut them off. As I said before there are a number of our people who think it would not be an advantage to the country to stop the modus vivendi. At the same time, I think the government should consider the interests of the whole country, and not merely the interests of any particular class. If it be true that we can build up our own fisheries by refusing concessions to these people, I think we ought to do it. That is a question for investigation. I am not prepared at present to give the government any advice on this question. In fact, I find it difficult to make up my own mind as to when the step ought to be taken or that whether it ought to be taken. I think it will be taken at some time in the future. The time may not be far away when we may find it advisable to assert our rights in this respect, and treat the American people as they are treating us. I think that would be a popular move with a great many of our people. But I would not like to see any rash step taken or this step taken without fair and due consideration. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the discussion of the question relating to the western coast of Canada. I rose chiefly for the purpose of drawing the attention of the minister to the importance, the next time the committees of this House are arranged, of appointing a standing committee to deal with questions relating to the fisheries. I trust that we shall have a committee of that description at the next session of parliament, if not at an earlier date.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). At this late hour, it is not my purpose to detain the House at any length, but rather than have the matter disposed of now I propose to make a few observations. The question brought up by my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean) is one of paramount importance, and the thanks and congratulations of this House and country are due to the hon. member for Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean), who moved the resolution and the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) who seconded it, for the great care and research they displayed and the admirable presentation they made of the question. I am glad also to be able for once to agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the remarks he made regarding the conditions which have prevailed in this House since the question under discussion was brought up last evening by my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean), he did not speak in the slightest degree too strongly. He said that when a scrap was on every member rushed to his seat, but when a really important question was up, those seats were just as quickly vacated. The very same criticism I made myself last night to an hon. gentleman who was sitting alongside me. Early last evening, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Hon. Mr. Foster) himself was addressing certain observations to the House, which were of absolutely no interest to the House or country, but which had a personal flavour, nearly every member supporting him was in his seat. But a few minutes later when my hon. friend from Lunenberg (Mr. Maclean) rose to bring to our notice what is, to my mind, the most important question brought up this session, these benches were rapidly emptied. And it was a rather sad commentary on the conditions that obtain in this House that during the delivery of the speech which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) made to-night—which was much more important than the remarks he made last night—there were only about a dozen of his supporters in their seats. I do not wish to be considered as implying that the situation in that respect on that side is any better or worse than it is on this, but I join with the hon. member for north Toronto (Mr. Foster) in the regret he expressed that such a condition should exist.

I shall not attempt, particularly at this late hour, to discuss at any length the merits of the question under discussion. Like my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who has just taken his seat, I am not altogether clear myself in my views on the matter, because I am not sufficiently well posted on it as to have a very decided opinion on what the duty of Canada is in the premises. But if I were to express my personal opinion, it would necessarily be in line with the conclusion reached by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean). As far as I have been able to arrive at any conclusion, it is that the time has come when we should take some steps to bring about some better arrangement with the United States regarding this important question of the fisheries. All the attention I have been able to give this matter has convinced me that the fishermen of Canada have not, since 1888 down to the present, received any privilege from the United States at all commensurate with the privileges we have given them. I have had opportunities during the past ten or twelve years of knowing how important these privileges are to the American fishermen. I am not going to assert that they have not been of some benefit to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I am aware, just as my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is, that there is a vast difference of opinion with regard to this matter among our people engaged in the fishing industry. Two years ago I was so interested in the matter, that, in connection with a newspaper which at times I take a hand in conducting. I addressed a circular letter to nearly all those engaged in the fishing industry in Nova Scotia. In that letter I invited their expressions of opinion respecting the continuance or non-continuance of the modus vivendi. From many I received replies which I published. I am sorry that I have not those replies at hand just now, but I propose to have them before this debate is through, and I think they will form an interesting contribution to it. Men quite competent to express an opinion said that the time has come when some change should be made in the arrangement which has prevailed since 1888. Our people are beginning to be dissatisfied with their lot, and for that reason I incline to the view—though perhaps with no very great conviction—that the time has come when we should have some better arrangement with our American neighbours. In this connection, I wish to support my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) in the suggestion he made that there should be in this House a committee entrusted with the consideration of all matters pertaining to the fisheries of this country. The question is certainly of far greater importance than many others which are referred to special committees, and like my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) I am astonished that such a committee was not appointed by this parliament long ago. I would urge upon the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) and the government that it is neither necessary nor expedient that we should wait until next year to appoint this committee, but that, on the contrary, the government should at once name a select standing committee of this House for that special purpose. Those of us who live along the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast and the Great Lakes know well the importance of these matters. Therefore, I join my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) in urging the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) to consider at the very earliest opportunity the desirability of forthwith appointing this committee.

There are various other matters which I would like to bring to the attention of the House in this connection, but as the hour is very late and members are tired I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LAND GRANT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I desire to ask several questions about a matter which I had intended to bring up on going into Committee of Supply, not understanding that this particular debate was to be adjourned. I wish to refer to the grant of certain lands in the province of British Columbia for the purpose of the Grand Trunk Pacific terminals. I observe that by a grant under order in council of the province of British Columbia bearing date March 10, 1905, a tract of 10,000 acres of land near or at the proposed terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was granted to that company by the province of British Columbia for $10,000, or at the rate of $1 per acre. That grant contains certain reservations which are to be found in the sessional papers of the province of British Columbia for the year 1906. These reservations, briefly stated, are as follows :—1. A reservation of such portion of the land granted, not exceeding one-twentieth thereof, as might be deemed necessary for making roads, culverts, bridges, towing paths or other works of public utility ; 2. Reservation of the right of all minerals in the land ; 3. Reservation of water privileges upon the land and the right of carrying water for the purpose of mining or agricultural purposes ; 4. Reservation of the right to take without compensation, gravel, sand, stone, lime, timber and other similar materials required for bridges and public works ; 5. Reservation of one-fourth of all town lots which may be laid out. 6. Reservation of the frontage of sea or waterway, with the provision that such frontage upon a waterway shall be divided into lots of not less than 1,000 feet frontage;

7. Reservation to the Crown of the right of reconveyance of one-fourth of all such land embraced in the grant as should not be divided into town lots or water front lots; 8. Provision that any reconveyance of any portion of the land should include all the foreshore and riparian rights including the land above and below the water mark.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was good enough to bring down an order in council by this government bearing date April 2, 1906. He brought it down to-day, at my request, as I had not been able to find that it had been published. This order in council is as follows:

On a report dated March 28, 1906, from the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs stating that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has applied to the Department of Indian Affairs for the purchase of certain land on Kaien Island, Digby Island and part of the Tsimpsean Peninsula, in the neighbourhood of Port Simpson, B.C., comprising in all about 13,519 acres, as shown on the accompanying plan, the land to be used in connection with the company's terminals on the Pacific coast.

The minister submits that the land applied for forms part of the lands reserved for the Metlakatla Indians and before the same can be disposed of to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company it will be necessary to obtain from the Indians a surrender in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act, but before submitting the question of surrender to the Indians it is considered advisable to ask the British Columbia government to waive its claim to any reversionary interest it may have in the land under the agreement come to between the province of British Columbia and the Dominion in 1876, as regards the setting aside of reserves for the Indians in that province.

The minister further submits that if the Indians are asked to surrender this land to be sold for their benefit to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the province will not be asked to give them land in lieu thereof, and it is further considered that as it will be in the public interest of the Dominion, as well as of the province that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should be allowed to acquire this land for terminal purposes, thereby affording a great benefit both to the Dominion and the province generally, as well as enhancing the value of the lands adjacent thereto and in the vicinity thereof, and of the remaining portion of the reserve (comprising an area of about 16,000 acres) to such an extent as to realize a sum equal to or greater than the present value of the reserve as now constituted, the province should be willing to waive any interest it may claim in the land applied for.

The minister therefore recommends that a copy of this minute be communicated through the Secretary of State to the government of British Columbia, with a view of obtaining at the earliest possible date the consent of that government to its waiving any reversionary interest the province may claim to have in the land of which it is proposed to obtain a surrender.

The committee submits the same for approval.

(Sgd.) JOHN J. McGEE.
Clerk of the Privy Council.

I would like to ask in respect of this order in council three questions:—1. Is the land referred to in this order in council immediately adjacent to the land comprised in the grant by the province of British Columbia? 2. Has the consent of the Indians to this surrender been given? 3. What is the actual position of the negotiations at the present time?

I do not know whether the Minister of the Interior is prepared to answer the questions at this time. If not, perhaps he will be good enough to answer them at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) an answer on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, January 21, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Burrard, Westminster and Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 73) respecting a patent of the International Paper Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—MORTGAGES.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill has two sections. The first section provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners may, in any matter which, in their judgment, involves the public interest, make application to the Minister of Justice for the assistance of counsel in the safeguarding of that interest, and authorizes the Minister of Justice, thereupon, to appoint counsel to advocate the interest so assigned. The practical benefit of such an enactment will be seen at once, when one considers the nature of the interests committed to the board. At the present time, under the statute passed last session, the express companies and the telephone companies have to submit to the approval

of the board their new tariffs of rates. In a matter of that kind it is of course, that these companies have carefully prepared their schedules of rates and will be equally carefully prepared to support them to the full with evidence, not merely, it may be, of their own transactions, but of the affairs of other companies as well; and, in the general public interest, as opposed to the interests of the companies in the fixing of such rates, it has been felt to be practically a necessity by the Board of Commissioners, that they should have the assistance of counsel who would make investigation beforehand into the facts involved in the inquiry, and would occupy the position of counsel for the public as against counsel for the company. That necessity appearing in a very pronounced way in the interests which I have referred to, the board were of opinion that it would be a most useful thing that there should be a general power, subject to the approval of the Department of Justice, that they might, where occasion seemed to require it, have the assistance of counsel in the public interest.

The other provision of the statute is to correct what, possibly, might be a difficulty arising out of an amendment which was made to the Railway Act three years ago. It was then provided that, in the case of mortgages, given by railway companies upon their real property to secure bonded indebtedness, the instrument might be filed with the Secretary of State, and then, adding to what had theretofore been the law, provision was made that such a filing should be all that was requisite and that no filing in other places should be necessary to give the security validity.

Mr. STOCKTON. Without registering in any of the counties ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Without registering in any county, according to the provision of many provincial laws. That provision, however, did not come into force until the statute was proclaimed on February 1, following its passing in the summer of 1903. In the meantime, one important security in which the government of the country is interested had been executed —the mortgage to secure the obligations of the Canadian Northern Railway Company— and, technically, the provisions of this enactment waiving necessity for the filing of that mortgage in any other office than that of the Secretary of State would not apply to that particular transaction, because the amendment of the Railway Act in 1903 did not come into force until some months after the mortgage in question had been executed and so filed. It has been the practice among counsel for railway companies, for many years, to file such securities only with the Secretary of State. It is all but impossible to file such securities in every county through which the railway passes and to register with respect to every piece of property of the railway company. In order to remove any possible question as to the validity, not only of the particular mortgage to which I refer but of any other mortgage which may be under similar circumstances, this second clause of the Bill has been introduced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Northwest Territories Act. He said : This measure is intended to confer upon the commissioner of the Northwest Territories certain powers which the late governor of the Northwest Territories had, but which have not been, by the statute of 1905, vested in the commissioner. The power to appoint issuers of marriage licenses, the power to appoint commissioners for taking affidavits, and other executive powers of that character were conferred upon the Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest Territories by the ordinances of the Northwest Territories themselves ; but the statute which substituted the commissioner for the governor vested in the commissioner of the Territories the powers which the governor had had under Dominion legislation, but did not include those given under the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, so that it is doubtful, as to some of these important powers, whether the commissioner possesses them or not. There are two other provisions in the Bill. One gives to the commissioner of the Northwest Mounted Police, while in the territories, the powers of a stipendiary magistrate. The present incumbent of the office is well qualified to exercise such powers and it is thought that he should possess them ; the other provision gives to the commissioner and to every member of the council and stipendiary magistrate and commissioned officer of the Northwest Mounted Police, ex-officio, the power of a justice of the peace within the territories when they are so acting.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SOLICITOR GENERALSHIP : MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS : MEMBER FOR LONDON.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would desire to ask the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a question as to when we may expect the office of Solicitor General—which has show-

ed a yawning vacancy for some months now—to be filled. I think that the Prime Minister on two or three previous occasions, has used the soft answer that turneth away wrath, but without giving us very much information definitely on the point. Also, I would ask whether or not he is in a position to state what has been done in the case of the London vacancy and the vacancy made by the resignation of the former Minister of Public Works. I think my right hon. friend will admit that we have not unduly pressed this matter upon him. At the same time there must come an end to all things, and we ought now to be given some definite information as to what he proposes to do.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With regard to the most important matter to which my hon. friend has referred, this is the position in which the resignation of my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hyman) now stands. I think that the request made by my hon. friend is very reasonable, and I am certainly gratified by the manner in which he and his friends have dealt with this matter. They have shown nothing but a kindly disposition towards the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), and that is a disposition which we on this side most gratefully appreciate. It is quite natural that my hon. friend should want to know something more definite. I can assure him that if very shortly—within a couple of weeks for instance—we do not receive favourable news from Mr. Hyman, we shall have to press him for a definite answer as to his intention. His intention was to resign, but unfortunately he omitted a formality which has prevented the Speaker from issuing his warrant. We have sent communications to Mr. Hyman, but unfortunately they were not able to reach him. At present we have reason to believe they can reach him and we expect to have an answer at an early day. I did press on him my view that he should not resign his cabinet position, and I did so because of the reasons which induced his resignation as a member of parliament. It may, however, happen that for reasons of ill health, we may have to accept his resignation. In making this statement, I wish to express to my hon. friend and his colleagues, my gratification at the very fair manner in which the opposition have acted in this matter.

With regard to the Solicitor-Generalship, I have said—and have no reason to change my view—that as soon as the tariff can be disposed of, I shall be able to make an announcement to the House.

With regard to the Australian papers, I am glad to be able to gratify my hon. friend's legitimate curiosity. These will be brought down at the end of this week, or, at the latest, the beginning of next week.

Mr. FOSTER. That is more definite.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 9) respecting a patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 10) respecting a patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—Mr. Grant.

PATENT OF WILLIAM A. DAMEN.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 8) respecting patent of William A. Damen.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. BERGERON. I have been asked by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) to state that when this Bill would be called he would ask leave to withdraw the amendment of which he gave notice the other day. I beg, therefore, to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn. Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

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

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Annuity Company of Canada.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec, Oriental Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGE 'W. S. FIELDING."

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. How many days did the dredge 'W. S. Fielding' work at Pictou, Nova Scotia, in 1906 ?

2. When did the dredge commence to work, and what was the last day she worked ?

3. What was the nature of the work performed ?

4. Who had the contract for tug service in connection with said dredge at Pictou ?

5. What were the terms of the contract for said tug service ?

6. How many tugs were employed ?

7. How much was paid for tug service at Pictou up to 31st December, 1906 ?

8. What was the total expenditure at Pictou for dredge and tug service in 1906 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Seventy-four days.
2. Commenced on September 6, and discontinued on December 1.
3. Dredged outer bar, making a channel about 200 feet wide, 1,500 feet long and 25 feet deep, removing 60,100 cubic yards of material.
4. Captain Joseph Foster.
5. $30 per day.
6. Two tugs were employed, but on different days.
7. $2,100.
8. $7,786.34.

SITE OF NEW MILITARY SCHOOL AT MONTREAL.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Has the Department of Militia yet determined upon a site for the new military school at Montreal?
2. If so, what is the location and area of the property selected, from whom was it purchased, and what was the price paid?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). No, the settlement of this question is contingent upon the taking over by the city of Montreal of St. Helen's island under an agreement by which the sum of $200,000 is to be paid to the Dominion government.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

When was the Ottawa post office built, and what was the contract price?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Acting for Minister of Public Works). The Ottawa Post Office was commenced in 1872, completed in 1876. Contract price, $220,965.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. TISDALE asked:

1. What is the estimated total yardage of earth and yardage of rock to be removed between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction of the National Transcontinental Railway?
2. What amount of each has been removed to date in yards, and at the present rate of progress, when should work be completed?
3. What is the estimated yardage of earth and yardage of rock to be removed between Quebec and La Tuque?
4. What amount of each has been removed to date in yards, and at the present rate of progress when should the work be completed?
5. When is it expected the line will be completed and connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific branch to Fort William?
6. What is the government policy as to importing labour to assist in the railway building now going on, which cannot be conducted satisfactorily under present conditions?
7. What is the object of letting contracts for additional work under such circumstances, and what benefit will accrue from building pieces of line in the lower provinces until there is some probability of the railway reaching Quebec?
8. When will the Quebec bridge be ready for traffic, and until it is, what physical connection can be made between the north and south of the river should portions of the Grand Trunk Pacific be placed under construction east of the proposed bridge?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

	Cubic yards.
1. Approximately common excavation	11,233,247
Approximately solid rock	3,696,336
2. Common excavation	2,282,009
Solid rock	179,920
(Note). Contract calls for completion of works, September 1, 1907.	
3. Approximately common excavation	6,303,682
Solid rock	1,169,150
4. Common excavation	664,955
Solid rock	322,367
(Note). Contract calls for completion of works, September 1, 1907.	

5. Answered by number two.
6. As to questions 6, 7 and 8, question No. 6 clearly is objectionable and exception will be taken to giving an answer to that question, it being argumentative and certainly the policy of the government must be assumed to be governed by the provisions of the Acts of parliament relating to the matter.

CLAIMS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Did the delegates from Prince Edward Island, at the conference between the members of the government of Canada and the provincial governments, held at Ottawa in October, 1906, submit to the government of Canada any memorandum in writing concerning any claims of Prince Edward Island to larger sums than that set out in the resolutions adopted by the conference of representatives held in Quebec in 1902?
2. If so, what were the amounts, and the nature of such claims?
3. Has the government of Canada received any communications from the government of Prince Edward Island since the date of the Ottawa conference, with reference to such further claims?
4. If so, when were they received, and what is the nature of such claims?

Rt. hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). All the claims of the province of Prince Edward Island presented at the conference which took place in October last are fully set forth in the report of the con-

ference which has been laid on the table of the House. As to the second and third questions I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) that the government of Prince Edward Island have not since presented any further claims.

IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

Will the government at this session introduce legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes, as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903 ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government, Mr. Speaker, have not come to the conclusion that they should introduce any legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903, but I need not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that it is quite open to him to introduce such legislation if he sees fit.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA, 1906.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What are the names of the persons, firms and corporations to whom copies of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, advance or otherwise, have been supplied, up to January 15, 1907 ?

2. What are the dates on which the revised statutes were supplied to such persons, firms and corporations ?

3. When will the general distribution be made, and on what basis will copies be distributed ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I answer for the Secretary of State in saying that no copies have been supplied up to this date. The following is a list of the persons, firms and corporations to whom it is intended to distribute the statutes, such distribution to be made as soon as the statutes are brought into force :

Persons to receive copies of the English edition free—

(a) Those marked (a) to receive one of their copies in full calf binding.

(b) Those marked (b) to receive one of their copies in half calf binding.

(a) His Excellency the Governor General, 3 copies. (a) Honourable cabinet ministers, 2 copies ; (a) Honourable senators, 3 copies ; (b) members of the House of Commons, 3 copies; (a) the judges of the Supreme Court, 2 copies ; (a) the judges of the Exchequer Court, 2 copies ; (a) the registrar of the Supreme Court, 2 copies ; (a) The registrar of the Exchequer Court, 2 copies ; (a) The Speaker, Senate, 2 copies ; (a) the Speaker, House of Commons, 2 copies ; (a) clerk of the Senate, 2 copies ; (a) clerk of the House of Commons, 2 copies ; (a) law clerk of the Senate, 2 copies ; (a) law clerk of the House of Commons, 2 copies ; librarians of parliament; clerk of the Crown in Chancery ; deputy ministers; (a) commissioners for revision, each 6 copies ; officers of the Senate, 6 copies in all; officers of the House of Commons, 9 copies in all ; (a) clerk of the Privy Council, 2 copies ; keeper of the records, Department of Secretary of State ; the archivist, Department of Agriculture ; judges' chambers, Supreme Court, 3 copies ; library of parliament, 40 copies ; the library, Supreme Court, 6 copies ; Department of Justice for agents, 75 copies ; Commissioner of Dominion Police, 6 copies ; Royal Northwest Mounted Police (the comptroller to state how many copies he will require).

Ontario—

The Lieutenant Governor, heads of department, deputy heads, library of the legislature, honourable judges, registrars of the courts, judges, county courts, local judge and registrar in Admiralty or Exchequer Court, stipendiary magistrates, police magistrates, sheriffs, county attorneys (if not otherwise entitled), master in ordinary, Superior Court, clerks of the peace, libraries and colleges, law associations, city, town and county corporations, clerks of county courts.

Quebec—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, honourable judges of the King's Bench, honourable judges of the Superior Court, local judge and registrar in Admiralty of Exchequer Court, judges circuit courts, advocates' libraries, judges and clerks, sessions of the peace, police magistrates, stipendiary magistrates, recorders, sheriffs, prothonotaries, clerks of the peace, universities and colleges, city, town and county corporations, boards of harbour commissioners, clerks of circuit courts, Le Conseil d'Hygiène, Quebec.

Nova Scotia—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, barristers' library, judges Supreme Court, judges county courts, judges Probate Court, local judge and registrar in Admiralty of Exchequer Court, sheriffs, prothonotaries, clerks of county courts, city, town and county corporations, universities and colleges, boards of harbour commissioners, police and stipendiary magistrates.

New Brunswick—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, judges Supreme Court, clerk of the Supreme Court, registrar in Admiralty of Exchequer Court, judges county courts, city, town and county corporations, sheriffs, clerks of the county courts (if not otherwise entitled), clerks of circuit courts (if not otherwise entitled) stipendiary magistrates, police magistrates, universities and colleges, law associations.

Prince Edward Island—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, judges Supreme Court, judges' county courts, police and stipendiary magistrates, prothonotaries, sheriffs, clerks of the county courts, city, town and county corporations, law society.

Manitoba—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, judges

King's Bench, judges county courts, sheriffs, police and stipendiary magistrates, clerks of the county courts, prothonotary, judges' library, city and town corporations, universities and colleges.

British Columbia—

Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of the legislature, judges Supreme Court, judges county court, clerk Supreme Court, clerks county courts, city and town corporations, sheriffs, stipendiary and police magistrates, libraries and colleges.

Alberta—

The Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of legislature, honourable judges, clerk Supreme Court, sheriffs, police and stipendiary magistrates, city and town corporations.

Saskatchewan—

The Lieutenant Governor, heads of departments, deputy heads, library of legislature, honourable judges, clerk Supreme Court, sheriffs, police and stipendiary magistrates, city and town corporations.

Yukon Territory—

The commissioner and officers, 1 copy each, judges Territorial Court, clerk Territorial Court, sheriff, police magistrate.

Miscellaneous—

British Museum, High Commissioner for Canada, 3 copies ; Canadian Agency, Paris ; Canadian Law Library, London ; United States' Secretary of State, United States Attorney General, United States' Library of Congress ; Prefect, Propaganda, Rome ; Canadian College, Rome ; Colonial Government Libraries ; foreign consuls general in Canada ; British Legation in Washington ; Privy Councillors (not otherwise entitled); Colonial Secretary, England ; Inns of Court Libraries ; Library of the Law Society ; clerk of the Imperial Privy Council ; libraries of Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

EXTENSION OF MANITOBA BOUNDARY.

Mr. GREENWAY asked :

Is it the intention of the government to deal with the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba at an early date ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the year 1905 the Dominion government received from the provincial government of Manitoba a memorandum praying for an extension of the boundary of that province to include a portion of the districts of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan and northward to Hudson's bay. On the 21st March, 1905, a minute of council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, was adopted as follows :

The committee are likewise of the opinion that the desire of the province of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries to the shores of Hudson bay is not an unreasonable one, and they suggest that when the measures now before parliament for the formation of the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are disposed of, the subject of such an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba might profitably be considered. It is possible that, in this connection, questions may arise which concern other provinces, inasmuch as the territories lying to the north of other provinces may be made the subject of requests of a character similar to that of the province of Manitoba in the present case.

The committee, therefore recommend that at a convenient date after the formation of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the request of the province of Manitoba for an extension northward be taken up, with the object of coming to a speedy conclusion, and trust that this suggestion may be acceptable to the government of the province of Manitoba, whose welfare and development the present ministry desired to promote in every way compatible with their obligations towards the other provinces of the Dominion.

In accordance with the suggestion made in this minute of council a conference took place on the 12th of November last between representatives of the Dominion government, of the province of Manitoba, the province of Ontario and the province of Saskatchewan. At this conference the views of the province of Manitoba as to the extension which should be made of its territory were presented. Similar views were presented by the delegates of the province of Ontario and those of the province of Saskatchewan. The report of the conference has been placed upon the table of the House, and it will be found that the pretensions of the different provinces were not at all in harmony. The pretensions of Manitoba for an extension of its boundary northward clashed considerably with the view advanced by Saskatchewan, and the pretensions of Manitoba for the extension of its boundary north and east clashed considerably with the views advanced by the province of Ontario. Under such circumstances, it becomes the duty of the Dominion of Canada to endeavour to find a solution to this problem, so as to gratify the legitimate aspirations of the province of Manitoba without doing an injustice to the other provinces. This is a task of some delicacy and of a good deal of importance. It is now engaging the attention of the government, and it is hoped that a solution will be found and given to the House at an early date, but it is impossible at the present time to specify exactly at what date.

EMPLOYEES OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. LAKE asked:

Are the following gentlemen in the employ of the Department of the Interior, or other departments of the government ? If so, what office does each hold, and what salaries does he receive; J. A. Potvin, A. F. Leanglet, Robert H. Cook, Charles H. Bailey, Donald McLeod, D. S. McGregor, J. M. Dubois, Paul Wood, J. Hallonquist, Robert McIntosh, J. Wolff, W. H. Fynn, P. J. Hamilton, Philip Wagner ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). In so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned, the answer is as follows:

J. A. Potvin, agent on trains, North Portal to Moosejaw, Sask., $75 per month.

A. F. Leanglet—No such person, but there is an A. M. Lenglet, caretaker and guide, Duck Lake, Sask., $30 per month.

R. H. Cook, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Arcola, Sask., $25 per month.

Chas. H. Bailey is not employed by the Department of the Interior.

Donald McLeod, fire ranger, Macdowell, Sask., paid by account at $4 per day when employed.

D. S. McGregor, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Rosthern, Sask., $50 per month.

J. M. Dubois—No such person employed, but there is an M. J. Dubois, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Duck Lake, Sask., $25 per month.

Paul Wood is not employed by the Department of the Interior.

J. Hallonquist—No such person employed, but there is an A. Hallonquist, clerk, Winnipeg, $100 per month.

Robert McIntosh, sub-agent of Dominion lands, Saskatoon, Sask., $75 per month.

John Wolff, interpreter, Winnipeg, Man., $100 per month.

W. H. Fynn, land guide, Cupar, Sask., paid $2 per day when employed.

P. J. Hamilton, officer in charge Kinistino's reserve, $800 per annum.

Philip Wagner, asst. immigration agent, Edmonton, $25 per month, also interpreter, Edmonton, $75 per month.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN BELGIUM.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many immigration agents has the Canadian government in Belgium ?
2. What are their names and how long have they fulfilled the duties of such office ?
3. What are their salaries ?
4. How many immigrants from Belgium have come into Canada since 1896 ?
5. How much money has the Canadian government spent each year, since 1896, for immigration from Belgium ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. One.
2. D. Treau de Coeli. Since 1st July, 1898.
3. $1,200 per annum.
4.

Calendar year	1896	380
"	1897	369
"	1898	265
"	1899	76
1st 6 months of	1900	76
Fiscal year	1900-1901	132
"	1901-1902	223
"	1902-1903	303
"	1903-1904	858
"	1904-1905	796
"	1905-1906	1,106
Five months of	1906-1907	398
Total		4,982

5. The approximate cost of the work in Belgium since the present agency was established has been as follows:

1898-99	$2,937 50
1899-1900	2,609 00
1900-01	2,895 00
1901-02	2,513 00
1902-03	3,133 00
1903-04	3,736 00
1904-05	6,433 00
1905-06	3,762 25

GRAZING LEASE TO J. R. CRAIG.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Was a grazing lease granted, on or about August 2, 1905, to John R. Craig?
2. What was the post office address of the said John R. Craig ?
3. Has the said lease been transferred ? If so, when and to whom?
4. Who is the present owner of the privilege?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Meadow Creek, Alberta.
3. Not within the knowledge of the department.
4. According to the department's records, Mr. John R. Craig.

ASSIGNMENTS OF IRRIGATION APPLICATIONS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Since the 1st of January, 1905, how many assignments of irrigation applications have been examined and recorded by the Department of the Interior ?
2. In each case where an assignment has taken place, what was the name and address of the party to whom the original authorization was issued ?
3. What was the name of the assignee and the date of each of the several transfers ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Thirteen.
2 and 3. Answered by the following table:

Parties to whom Original authorization was issued.	Address.	Assignor.	Assignee.	Date of Transfer.
Jas. McDonough	High River, Alta.	Henry Smith & Ernest Tee.	Henry Smith	June 3, '05
Geo. Thos. Young	Priddis, Alta.	G. T. Young & Mrs. M. A. Reilly.	Henry Ford & Cora E. Ford.	Oct. 5, '05
E. H. Botterell	Montreal, P.Q.	A. C. Sparrow &. J. L. Johnston.	H. E. G. Cooke	Feb. 23, '05
Jos. C. Farr	Maple Creek, Sask.	Jos. G. Farr	David Bertram & C. McCarthy.	Nov. 15, '05
Messrs. Heber S. Allen, A. L. Allen, M. Leonard & E. Harker, trading under the name of H. S. Allen & Co.	Cardston, Alta.	H. S. Allen & Co	The Cardston Milling Co.	June 21, '05
A. L. T. d'Eyncourt	Calgary, Alta.	A. L. T. d'Eyncourt.	Wm. M. Parslow & Jno. Hamilton.	Feb. 4, '05
H. W. Carpenter	Nanton, Alta.	H. W. Carpenter	Malcolm Kane	Jan. 23, '06
S. W. Gebo	Blairmore, Alta.	S. W. Gebo	The Canadian-American Coal & Coke Co., Ltd.	Sept. 24, '06
"	"	"	" "	" 25, '06
"	"	"	" "	" 25, '06
Jno. L. Sexsmith	High River, Alta.	J. L. Sexsmith	Thos. A. Henry	June 19, '0
Wm. Edgar	Priddis, Alta.	Wm. Edgar	F. K. Paige	Sept. 5, '06
Robbins Irrigation Co.	London, Eng.	Robbins Irrigation Co.	Southern Alberta Land Co.	Jan. 14, '07

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY MATTERS.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Is it true that Superintendent Sharp, of the Prince Edward Island Railway, is to be replaced by another person ? If so, by whom ?

2. Is it true that a delegation from Prince Edward Island waited on the government relative to the conduct of Prince Edward Island Railway, and also relative to the winter time-table for said railway, and other matters, also protesting against the present management ?

3. Were any protests sent to the department re winter time-table, and is it the intention of the department to remedy the grievance ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No such decision has been reached.

2. No such delegation has waited upon the government.

3. Protests were made at a public meeting held in Charlottetown, and telegrams were received from individuals, prior to any experience with the time table in question. Should it be demonstrated that it does not meet the reasonable requirements of the situation changes will be made. So far, from reports in the department, it seems to be the best time table that can be put in force consistent with the necessary reduction in train service.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Is it the intention of the department to pay the claims of Widow James Wiggins and Charles Malley, whose properties were burned at Albert, on Prince Edward Island, by a fire started from a spark on the railway engine ?

2. Has any new evidence been received relative to these claims ? If so, who made the affidavit, and what allegations did they contain ?

3. Who conducted the first inquiry, and what was the report ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The claims of Widow James Wiggins and Charles Malley are not entertained by the department.

2. None.

3. G. A. Sharpe and A. B. Warburton, K.C. Not sufficient evidence adduced to establish liability against the railway.

PICTOU HARBOUR DUES.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked:

1. How often are harbour dues due on a vessel for a year, and how are they paid ? May one portion of said dues be paid in one port and one portion in another ?

2. Is it true that Pictou harbour dues are collected from one vessel three times per year ? If so, why ?

3. Can Pictou harbour lawfully collect more than other ports, and is it the intention of the government to put a stop to such a condition, if it exists ? If not, why not ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. In harbours to which the Harbour Masters' Act applies harbour dues are payable not more than twice in each calendar year whatever is the number of ports entered or the number of times of the vessel's arrival. The dues are payable on arrival at first and second ports. Such fees cannot be apportioned between several ports, they must be paid as required by the Act.

2. Yes. To meet the expenditure in connection with the care and maintenance of the harbour.

3. The Harbour Masters' Act does not apply to the port of Pictou. The fees payable at Pictou are collected under a special statute relating to that harbour (Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1873) and they can legally be collected three times, under Chapter 18 of the Statutes of 1890, even if a vessel has paid harbour dues twice previously in other ports during that year. It is not the intention of the government to put a stop to such condition as the reasons for granting this privilege still exists.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Has the government been notified by the Anglo-American Telegraph Company that telegraph communication has ceased between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, owing to a break in the cable?

2. If so, what is the date of such notice, and its purport?

3. Have negotiations taken place between the government and the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, with reference to the use by the company of the Marconi wireless, controlled by the government?

4. If so, what is the nature of such negotiations, and has any definite arrangement been concluded?

5. Does the government admit that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company has a monopoly in the telegraph business between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?

6. Is it the intention of the government to erect a Marconi wireless station at or near Pictou, N.S.?

7. What was the cost of the construction and equipment of the wireless station at Cape Bear, and what is the annual cost of maintenance?

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

1. and 2. Yes. January 10, simply conveying information from their agent in Prince Edward Island.

3. and 4. Yes, the government has offered the company to facilitate the transmission of messages by means of the government Marconi station, on the island, and apparatus on boats employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

5. The government is not prepared to admit, without further consideration, the monopoly referred to.

6. Matter under consideration.

7. Construction, $5,000; annual maintenance, $2,500.

NORTHWEST GOVERNMENT LANDS.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. Is there any government land in section 14, township 24, range 1, west of the 5th meridian, or in township 24, range 29, west of the 4th meridian, still undisposed of?

2. If so, have any applications been received for the transfer of the same? If so, from whom, on what date, and for what portions?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. There are undisposed villa lots in section 14, township 24, range 1, west of the 5th meridian. There is no undisposed of government land in township 24, range 29, west of the 4th meridian.

2. The following applications have been made: 30th August, 1900, William Pitman, Calgary, villa lots 12, 13, 14 and 15; 23rd May, 1902, A. M. Terrill, Calgary, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15; 7th October, 1902, John Hamilton, Calgary, lot 13; 17th October, 1904, L. F. Fowler, Calgary, lot not described; 25th May, 1905, W. L. Heath, Carbon, villa lots 11 and 12; 10th January, 1906, R. H. McPhee, Calgary, all the undisposed of lots; 15th January, 1906, J. W. Little, London, Ontario, on behalf of some person not named, part of this property, containing about 48 acres; 17th January, 1906, J. S. G. Van Wart, Calgary, blocks 9 and 10, lots 1, 2, 13 and 14, block 11, lots 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 in block 14, the whole of blocks 12 and 16; 27th January, 1906, William Pitman, Calgary, villa lots 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, and 15; 30th January, 1906, Howard Douglas, Banff, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, block 9; 6th February, 1906, W. L. Waines, Calgary, on behalf of a client, the whole of Park (villa) lots 1-15; 7th March, 1906, H. E. Gillis, Calgary, certain lands not described in the subdivision of section 14. Applications not entertained.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—COAL.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Have there been any reports by locomotive engineers on the Intercolonial Railway complaining of the quality of any coal used on that railway, or attributing delays thereto?

2. How many such reports have been received?

3. What is the nature of each such report?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON, (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Seven.

3. That the coal furnished was not of good quality.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.) moved for :

A copy of all reports, papers, surveys, estimates, correspondence and other documents, with reference to the proposed branch line from the Prince Edward Island Railway at or near O'Leary to a point at or near West Cape.

He said : I simply want to call the attention of the government to the fact that the question of this branch line has been before the government for a number of years. As far back as the time of the last Dominion elections and before that, I had this matter before the government, and amounts were put in the estimates for surveys and other work on the line, and a promise was practically given by the government that as soon as the surveys could be made and the necessary information collected, the work would be gone on with. But we have failed for a number of years to get any satisfaction. It is the same with this piece of work as with nearly everything pertaining to Prince Edward Island ; one has to keep dinging at the ministers, and one can get no satisfaction from them. This branch line is very much needed, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways or some other member of the government will now give us a definite assurance that the work will be gone on with, or will give us a statement as to what is the purpose of the government in regard to it. The general question of branch lines in Prince Edward Island will come up at another stage, and I need not say any more with regard to this particular one at the present time, but I should like to hear from the Minister of Railways as to what the attitude of the government is with regard to it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no objection to this motion passing or to the papers being brought down. The facts simply are that the attention of the department was called to a proposed branch line from a point at or near O'Leary station to a point at or near West Cape on the southern side of the island. Of course, it will be borne in mind that the southern portion of Prince Edward Island is dotted with harbours from one end of it to the other, and that the water communication along the straits is very excellent, and is availed of by the people of the island to a very general extent. The attention of the department was called to this proposed branch. It would be a very short one, connecting the western portion of Prince Edward Island with West Cape, which is on the southern portion. I forget the mileage but I think it is some ten or twelve miles. It was proposed to have a survey, and an amount for that purpose was placed in the Estimates. The difficulty was to secure engineers to do the necessary surveying during that particular season. I think that as soon as some data has been procured by the department and the department are more familiar with the conditions prevailing, we shall be able to arrive at a decision. I am not aware of any promise ever having been made to construct this particular line. I did promise that a survey should be made and the matter inquired into ; but so far as any reports indicate which have come to me, the circumstances and conditions do not at present justify the government in entering upon the necessary expenditure. That portion of the island is not very wide. There is hardly any portion of Prince Edward Island which is twelve miles away from the railway. At certain parts of the island, you can look across, and if you had a David, he could throw a stone from one water to the other.

Mr. LENNOX. He would want a sling.

Mr. EMMERSON. With the necessary sling of course. The problem of building any additional branch lines on the island is a very serious one. The northern portion is certainly entitled to a great deal of consideration. They have no harbours, or such as they are, they are not available. The coast is a bleak one. It is however populated by a very splendid class of people, who are entirely cut off from all railway facilities and from shipping facilities as well during certain seasons. Many of them are engaged in the perilous occupation of fishing and their means of securing supplies are, to say the least, expensive or hazardous, if attempted by boats or sailing vessels. I have thought that the whole question of proposed branch lines on Prince Edward Island might very readily be solved by the introduction of motor cars. If these branch lines, already established there, can be operated by these cars much more inexpensively than the present system of railway trains, that will go very far to solve the difficulty. The Prince Edward Island Railway has to be operated under very great difficulties. In the summer season it is subjected to water competition at all points, and in the winter season there is scarcely any freight traffic. In the autumn, before the close of navigation, the people rush their products to market. They load up vessels and steamers and send everything they can across to the mainland, so that when the winter sets in, the island railway has to be operated at considerable expense to meet its passenger traffic and has very little freight offering to make the running of trains profitable. These are conditions, however, which have to be met, and I am not complaining of them, They were understood from the first, but perhaps not so well understood at the time the railway was constructed by the people of Prince Edward Island. They are, however, better understood to-day, and I think it is generally recognized that the operation of a railway on the island will never be a

very profitable undertaking. But of course the people are entitled to consideration and they are receiving consideration in every direction. My hon. friend complains that these matters do not receive our attention. Well, this has been receiving our attention, In no other part of the Dominion would such a proposition be considered ; but, having regard to the isolated situation of Prince Edward Island and the conditions prevailing, the matter is one which, I am bound to admit, should be considered and it is being considered, and I trust that the experiment being tried with respect to branch lines on Prince Edward Island and the operation of suburban trains on the Intercolonial Railway by the use of motor cars, will demonstrate that these railways can be operated at a minimum of expense by the use of motor cars. In this connection I may say that for the Intercolonial Railway some three motor cars are being manufactured at Moncton, and instructions have been given for the construction of two motor cars in the railway shops at Charlottetown, which are to be used on the branch lines of the main Prince Edward Island Railway. And I think that the cost of operating these branches will be thus so decreased that it will be very possible to get more frequent service in the future and demonstrate to the country perhaps the feasibility of furnishing the northern portion of the island with additional railway facilities.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. minister supposes there are lots of harbours. We have some fairly good harbours, but in the particular section around West Cape, however, there is no place for a harbour and no opportunity to build one without great expense. The railway to West Cape would run through a level country with easy grades, so that it could be built very cheaply, and it is a country, east and west of which, for twenty or thirty miles there is no railway accommodation at all. So that while apparently there are only fourteen miles from coast to main line there is a large territory that this railway would serve. There would be an area of twelve or fifteen miles on either side of this branch line down to the cape, the residents of which are at a great disadvantage in getting their coal and other necessities from Summerside to the west shore, having to draw it this long distance of ten or fifteen miles. They are also at a great disadvantage in getting their produce to the market. The hon. minister knows that a haul of twelve or fifteen miles to market is a great hardship on the farmers. There is every reason to suppose that a branch line through this section—through which I have travelled much and which I know to be one of the most fertile parts of the island—would well repay the expenditure. I trust he will carry out these surveys to some conclusion ; and if the motor cars prove a success, I have every reason to hope that the government will carry out their promise to build this branch line.

He says that there was no definite promise. It seems to be about the same kind of thing as we have been getting from the government with regard to winter communication, telegraph communication and nearly every important matter affecting the people of Prince Edward Island. Probably he or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will say there was no definite promise for a new boat for the winter service two years ago, and that that promise was not made again last year. The people of Prince Edward Island are getting tired and sick of promises from the government benches, and we must and will demand some activity on the part of the ministers. Speaking for the northern side of the island, I admit that there are several places on that side that need a branch line, but they are in no greater need than this thickly populated district for which I ask this branch line from West Cape to O'Leary station. The minister says that the government line on Prince Edward Island does not pay. There are good reasons for that. One is that the powers that be have not carried out the terms of union. There is every reason to believe that the line would pay if it were put into physical connection with the other railway systems of the Dominion. If the minister and his colleagues would take up the question of a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland and figure out what all the freight carried over the railway—which is practically everything that the island grows—would yield for hauling by tunnel to connection with the Intercolonial Railway, I think he would find that it would afford the means not only of wiping out the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway, which was $50,000 last year, but a good deal more besides. Moreover, it would increase the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway by possibly $150,000 a year. But not only would it benefit the government railways, it would benefit every producer in Prince Edward Island by enhancing the value of his products. The minister spoke truly when he said that the products of Prince Edward Island had to be rushed forward to the markets at certain seasons, and meeting a glutted market the farmers must take perhaps one-quarter or perhaps one-half what the people of the neighbouring provinces receive. Take, for instance, potatoes, of which about 2,000,000 bushels are ready to be marketed each year. These have to be rushed forward either early in the spring or late in the fall, with the result that we get only an average of perhaps 25 cents per bushel, while the producers of the neighbouring provinces get from 45 cents to 60 cents per bushel. The same applies in greater or less degree to every product of Prince Edward Island. Another and special

difficulty under which the Prince Edward Island people suffer is the fact that under the present system they have to pay for three short hauls on their product. The consequence is that on many of their products they have to pay three times as much as do those producers who are served by the Intercolonial Railway. It will be evident to anybody who considers these facts that if the Prince Edward Island Railway were put in proper relation to the general transportation system of the country it would pay, and pay handsomely. It is up to this government and this country to give us this physical contract and carry out the terms of confederation. As I have said, if we cannot get satisfaction now, if we cannot get reasonable answers from the government, we are not going to sit down and be quiet. The members from Prince Edward Island, on this side of the House at least, are going to keep at the government, and, if necessary, hold up the situation until we do get satisfaction.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). I am somewhat surprised at the very strong appeal of my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) when he asks for the construction of a certain branch railway in Prince Edward Island. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's memory is rather short. He has only to go back two or three years to recall the fact that he offered strong opposition to the construction of the Transcontinental Railway from Chaudière through territory of the province of Quebec to New Brunswick. He tells us that it is a great hardship that farmers have to travel fifteen miles to reach a harbour or a railway station. On the occasion to which I have referred we told him that in the province of Quebec, in several counties which are just as populous as the whole province of Prince Edward Island, farmers had to travel sixty and seventy miles to reach a railway station. And yet, in spite of that fact, in spite of the appeal made, he voted against the proposition. And now he comes and tells us that because some farmers have to travel twelve or fifteen miles to reach a railway station he must have a branch line constructed and that he will never cease his complaints until this line is provided. He should remember that what is good for Prince Edward Island now was at that time very good for the province of Quebec, and that, is spite of that fact, he voted, and voted repeatedly against the construction of the transcontinental line.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I deny that imputation. I never voted against railway construction in any part of the Dominion. Quite possibly I voted against the proposition put forward by friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. O. E. Talbot). And I think that the view expressed by the opposition at that time will be fully justified before many years. I never voted against any reasonable demand for railway construction in this country, though I did object to the method by which the government proposed to carry on the work.

Motion agreed to.

PRICES OF LUMBER IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta) moved :

That it is important to the success of rapid and prosperous settlement in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, that lumber should be supplied to the settlers at as low a price as possible consistent with a reasonable profit to the manufacturers of lumber. That the prices charged for lumber in the said provinces are regarded by settlers as unreasonable and excessive. That it is charged and claimed on behalf of the said settlers that an unlawful combination exists among and between the manufacturers of and dealers in lumber for the purpose of unduly enhancing the price to the consumer. That a select committee composed of nine be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the matters aforesaid, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath.

He said : In presenting this resolution to the House I believe I voice the wishes and opinions of at least ninety-five per cent of the people of the three great prairie provinces. I believe that no proposal could come before this House the adoption of which would give greater satisfaction to the people of the west than this resolution in favour of an investigation of the conditions which to-day surround the lumber trade of that country. Now, I suppose we all agree that nothing could occur that would be more likely to facilitate the rapid and successful settlement of that country than the securing of an adequate lumber supply at reasonable prices. Many hon. members know, and all can easily understand, the difficulties with which the settler has to contend when he locates on a ranch. It is obvious that lumber is one of the first things he requires—he must buy lumber to build a house to protect himself and his family. We in that country believe that lumber at present is unreasonably high in price. It is easy to imagine the difficulty the farmer is under when he has to pay $30 for lumber which he ought to get for $20. This unduly high price of lumber not only prevents the rapid settlement of the plains, but it retards the growth of towns and villages in that prairie country. The people of that country believe that a combination exists between the manufacturers of lumber of such a nature that it comes under the Criminal Code of 1892, of which section 516 reads as follows :

A conspiracy in restraint of trade is an agreement between two or more persons to do or procure to be done any unlawful act in restraint of trade.

520. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding

$4,000 and not less than $200, or to two years imprisonment, and if a corporation, is liable to a penalty not exceeding $10,000 and not less than $1,000, who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, unlawfully——

(a) To unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be subject of trade or commerce

(b) To restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or commodity; or

(c) To unduly prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any such article or commodity, or to unreasonably enchance the price thereof ; or

(d) To unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon person or property.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the lumber business to-day is in the hands of a combination of such a character as to bring it under the provisions of the law I have just read. Of course it may be said that it is more easy to allege the existence of a combination than to prove it. But I allege to-day upon the floor of this House that a combination of this nature does exist. I will read a short extract from an article in the Calgary 'Albertan,' a paper supporting this government. The date of the paper is December 27, 1906:

The question of the lumber combine and the methods which that combine are adopting, is becoming one of the most serious which this country has to face. The price of lumber has reached that artificial price which is far beyond that which gives the lumberman a fair profit, and beyond what we can afford to pay. This is not the first time that a situation of this kind has occurred. About two years ago an attempt was made to corner lumber by precisely the same firms who are responsible for the price of lumber to-day.

The lay mind, by which is meant the mind of the average man who has not given the subject any prolonged consideration, is apt to think that the purveyors of lumber hold the situation in the hollow of their hands. This is not so by any means, and before long measures will be taken which will adjust the price of lumber in no uncertain manner. Lumber is a necessity of a young and growing country, and it is no more justifiable for persons to make the price of lumber comparatively prohibitive and at the same time to limit and restrict the supply, than it would be for the bakers of Alberta to raise the price of bread to $1 a loaf. It is time that the government should curb the greed of these grasping persons by admitting lumber free of duty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can produce articles of this same nature from dozens of papers in the Northwest; I can produce letters which I am not going to take up the time of this House to read, letters by the score, making the same insinuations that I have just read. You will understand that it is hard for me to stand here and say positively that there is a combination; of course I am not able to do that, but I do make the assertion that I believe there is a combination, and I believe that if the government will accept this resolution and undertake to investigate the matter thoroughly, it will be proved that there is a combination. I am told on the very best authority that the lumber dealers of British Columbia meet at certain intervals, they have a regular organization and employ a secretary-treasurer. This organization is not confined to that province, but it has places of business in the three prairie provinces in which they find a market for the bulk of their lumber; and that after these meetings of the association it is a recognized fact that the price of lumber takes a rise of about $2 a thousand. I am told on good authority that this association undertakes to discipline its members in this manner, that if they infringe upon the rules laid down at these meetings and sell lumber below the fixed price, they are fined for the first offence $50 for every carload of lumber so sold; for the second offence the fine is $100 per car, and probably for the third offence they are dismissed from the organization. I have been told on what I consider the very best authority, that this organization does expel many manufacturers. Then they are not content with regulating the price among themselves, but they go further, and set a price for the retail merchants in the three prairie provinces. If a retail merchant sells lumber at a lower price than that fixed by the association, he also is fined for the first offence, similarly for the second offence, and finally is expelled from the association. If the government accepts my resolution and orders the investigation I ask for, I think I can produce men that will be able to prove that this association, embracing the millowners, has dealt in the way I have indicated with men handling lumber.

Now, Sir, if what I say is correct, or is anywhere near correct, it surely must be a very serious question, and must seriously militate against the development of that country. The people there have difficulties enough to contend with without being obliged to pay unreasonable prices for one of the leading commodities required to start a home on the prairie. I will not go into any further details on this question, but I will close by asking the government to accept my resolution. I take the responsibility of stating here that if the government will accept the resolution, I believe that I will be able to give names of individuals who can prove the statements I have made.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I am not going to object at all to the appointment of any such committee as that, but at the same time there are two sides to that question. I do not know whether the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) includes all the British Columbia lumbermen in his charge or not, but he spoke as if

he did. I know that the coast mills are not charging any more for their lumber than the business of the country warrants. When a lumberman has to pay from $8 to $12 per thousand for his logs together with the cost of towing them, with the risk of loss, the manufacturing of the lumber and the handling of it, he has not a great deal left when he charges the price that is being charged now for ordinary rough lumber to the consumers in the Northwest. If the hon. member for Alberta will look closely into that matter he will find that the freight charges on the lumber are responsible for the high charges because the railway companies are making more out of the lumber than the lumbermen are making. It is all very well to say that lumber is a prime commodity, that it is one of the first things that is required for the settler. It is, but there are many other things that are required about the same time. There are hardware, tools, implements and harness for his horses, all of which things are dutiable. But there is no duty on lumber and a few years ago, when lumber was being sold by American dealers in Manitoba, when it was being laid down in Winnipeg for less than the logs cost the British Columbia lumbermen, these lumbermen could not get any protection while the farmers were willing to take all they could get at that time. I do not blame them at all for that, but if you consider that all that the lumberman has to use in his business is subject to duty, that his supplies in the way of feed have to be procured from the Northwest farmers—and he is willing that he should procure from the Northwest farmers in preference to getting them where he could get them cheaper—I am sure that hon. members will appreciate the disadvantage under which he labours. Yet, the moment anything is said about a duty on lumber the western farmers are up in arms. I suppose it is every man for himself in this world, as seemed to be the case when the commissioners appointed to inquire into the tariff during the past year found that every business was looking after its own interests. People in one line of business do not care for their neighbours in any shape or form. I suppose my hon. friend looks at it in that light to-day, but in so far as the coast men are concerned—I am not speaking for what are known as the mountain men—they are not getting one cent too much for their lumber, considering what their logs and other supplies cost them.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker there is no possibility of exaggerating the importance of the question of lumber to the settlement of the prairie country, and I suppose there is no possibility of exaggerating the importance of the settlement of the country to the success of this Dominion. Therefore, when a statement is made that a condition exists tending in any degree against the success of that settlement that statement requires every consideration and I am sure the government is quite as ready as the hon. member (Mr. Herron) can wish to give all facilities for or to take part in all investigations that may be required in order to reach a satisfactory conclusion in regard to this very important matter. There is possibly something to be said on both sides. It has been urged by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) that the conditions are such as to enhance the value of lumber, that they are in accordance with the conditions which have enhanced the value of almost all commodities. I do not think that anybody will find fault with those conditions. They are desirable conditions and we are very glad to have them prevail. At the same time it must be admitted that with a very active demand for lumber, such as exists at the present time, there is the possibility of combination amongst lumber dealers and manufacturers for the enhancement of prices which necessarily makes every consumer of lumber look with a very sharp eye to their transactions. Whether there is ground for that suspicion or not there is no doubt that the suspicion does exist that there is a combine contrary to law and therefore entitled to be dealt with by this parliament under that law. As far as the government is concerned the government is prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's motion and to take such measures as follow upon it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has seen his way clear to take the attitude that he has on this occasion. Being always an alleged champion of the settler I can assure him that there is nothing that the settler in Alberta is more interested in than the price of lumber. I desire for a moment to reply to one or two of the remarks that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) made and let me say that I hope that when this investigation is started, if the motion is adopted, it will be a full, free and thorough investigation, not similar to some of the investigations that took place in this House or in this building last session where inquiry was burked at every possible point. The hon. member from New Westminster has stated that the increase in the cost of lumber is due to the increase in the cost of logs. If he takes the price list of the British Columbia Lumberman's Association and compare the prices with the prices that were being paid for logs at that time he will find that the increase in the prices of the loggers will not account for the increase in the price of lumber. There is no doubt that there exists in that country to-day a combine, or combination, or association of gentlemen who have got their heads together in that business to keep prices up and keep competition down. There is no

doubt about that and if I may be permitted to refer to some of the things that we hope to be able to establish in bringing this resolution before the House or in having this investigation, I may say that we expect to be able to show that there exists in the province of British Columbia, three, or at least two, associations, one is known as the Mountain Lumber Manufacturing Association, and the other as the British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Manufacturing Association. There is also the Pacific Coast Lumberman's Association and I am informed that they act in unison and co-operate with one another. There are also local associations established throughout the different provinces and what I want to point out is that we are living alongside of a province which probably is the best lumber country in the world where they have all the machinery necessary, where they have an inexhaustible supply of timber and where they are born and brought up to the business and yet we have to pay increased prices. Prices are increasing all the time and the situation there to-day is that it costs the settler about two good acres of land to get a thousand feet of rough lumber.

If this government are anxious to assist the settlers in overcoming the hardships they should leave no stone unturned, it is their first duty, when all inducements are hung out to bring people to that country to investigate this matter and see that no question of expense stands in the way of the fullest and most complete investigation. I have said that in British Columbia there are these two or three main associations; there exist throughout the provinces, local associations, or sellers' associations. There is in Alberta an association known as the Retail Lumber Dealers' Association. They had their general meeting as I understand on February 6, 1906. The officers of that association, if it will assist the government in bringing evidence before this committee of investigation to know them, are: P. A. Prince, Calgary, president; A. M. Grogan, Calgary secretary treasurer. There are a number of other officers whose names it will not be necessary for me to read at the present time. The declaration of purpose of this association is set forth on page 1 of their constitution as follows:

We recognize the absolute right and necessity of every person, partnership or corporation to fix and establish such a price as may enable him or them to realize a fair and honest profit on all lumber and lumber products sold by him or them and to enter into such agreements or arrangements with that object in view, as may be deemed advisable or expedient without in any way unreasonably enhancing the price thereof, or unduly preventing or lessening competition in the same or in the supply thereof.

This little book is the constitution of the local association, which exists in Alberta, and I find that in the month of August this association sent a delegate to the meeting of the Mountain Lumber Manufacturers' Association. This delegate reported to the local association and I have in my hand what purports to be a copy of his report. He says:

I brought up all the different complaints that our association wanted to make, and I will enumerate them as follows:—

The Elk Lumber Company have been practically the only offenders in shipping lumber direct to consumers, contractors, and also a shipment has been made to the Innisfail town. town.

The outcome of our discussion in reference to this firm was that a committee of the following four gentlemen, namely, P. Lund, A. Leitch, Mr. Dulmage and G. P. Wells, were sent to Fernie to wait on Mr. Boynton, who is the manager of the Elk Lumber Company.

The Elk Lumber Company have now agreed to stand by the two associations, and will in future ship lumber to none other than legitimate dealers. Their reason for shipping to the contractors in Southern Alberta was, that the association was formed very quickly, and as they had been shipping lumber to contractors for some time, it was a hard matter to break off very suddenly, and rather than have their old customers become antagonistic they concluded to ship them a few cars, and then gradually drift away from this sort of trade.

This delegate's report says that one of the few millers who were not in the combine had agreed to go in and to stand by the two associations.

It is interesting to note just what the rules further provide, and by looking at the rules I find that the directors of the local association determine who shall be eligible as members of that association. At page 3 it says:

They shall for cause determine that the party is undesirable or ineligible to membership.

That is, as I take it, they can say: There are enough of us in this business here at the present time and your membership is not desirable; therefore you cannot become a member of this association, and if you are not a member of the local association, you cannot buy one stick of lumber in British Columbia to-day.

That is the condition of affairs that exists to-day and that has existed for some time. This matter was before the public long ago. I have before me a clipping from the Vancouver 'Province.'

Mr. MACPHERSON. Of what date is that?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. It is about two years ago. It reads:

Unless a man is a member of the association it is said that it is impossible for him to purchase lumber or shingles on the coast. Numerous attempts to secure lumber in Vancouver have been made by non-members, but they have always met with refusals.

While competition is still restricted it is possible for one, two, or any number of yards to be opened in one town or centre. All owners of yards, however, are bound not to sell under regulated prices.

It being again reported yesterday in Vancouver that competition in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories was so restricted that no outsider could become a member of the Northwest Lumber Dealers' Association 'The Province' wired its Winnipeg correspondent to ascertain the facts. The above despatch explains how the matter stands at present.

Objection having been taken by the Vancouver millmen to some of the statements made by Mr. G. L. Lawrence, M.L.A., of Glenora, Manitoba, in an interview in 'The Province,' it may be reiterated that Mr. Lawrence came to this city for the purpose of purchasing between twenty-five and thirty cars of lumber and shingles, and not 'a car or two' as one millman would have it believed in an interview he gave to a morning paper.

Mr. Lawrence wishes to establish a lumber-yard at Glenora, and came to Vancouver to purchase a stock of material for it. He wished to pay cash for his requirements, but he was turned away from two mills here. They would not do business with him he says, because he was not a member of the selling association which handles British Columbia lumber in the Northwest and Manitoba.

He did not come to Vancouver to buy a small stock of lumber at wholesale rates; he came to buy a trainload, but as he was not a member of the selling associations east of the mountains, he could not do business according to his own statement.

In the opinion of a number of Vancouverites, the fact that Mr. Lawrence desires to stock a Manitoba lumber-yard with Vancouver lumber, puts an entirely different complexion on the turn down he received here at the hands of the millmen. If he were endeavouring to secure merely a private supply the stand taken against him might not be open to so severe criticism as is now the case.

That was the reception he received and other people who have applied since have received the same treatment from the different mills. As a matter of fact circulars are sent out by the British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Association. I have one list here for instance, list No. H-37, effective November 13, 1903:

FOR DEALERS ONLY.

The British Columbia Lumber and Shingle Manufacturers' Association.

Price List.

Cancelling all previous Lists and Supplements.

Subject to change without notice.

No agent or salesman has any authority to alter prices, nor in any way modify this list.

I have also here the following other price lists: J, effective April 14, 1904; M, effective, January 4, 1906; M, effective May 3, 1906; 13, effective August 8, 1906. I understand that since the last list I have here was issued the price has been raised $1.50 per thousand all around.

These lists are sent out from time to time by these two or three associations in British Columbia to the sellers in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and these sellers cannot sell under the prices quoted in the list. If they do they are liable to a fine, a penalty or expulsion from the association, and it will be noted that between February, 1906, and December, 1906, the prices in Alberta have been raised three times or more. It is quite apparent, I think, that this combine has existed for some time, as I have copies of the price lists that have been sent out during the last two years by the members of this association to what are called the sellers' association in the different provinces. Not long ago, I think not over a year ago, the Rothesay Lumber Company, of Mara, B.C., were selling lumber though not a member of the combine; and I have their price list for 1905, which shows prices much less than those in the list of the combine. I find that they assigned reasons why they would not continue to sell lumber except to local dealers; and, mark you, these local dealers have an association of their own, and if they do not wish to admit any one else into the lumber business, their directors can decline to accept an application. Why should such a state of things exist in the lumber business? If a man wants to go into the grocery business or any other business in the province of Alberta, he is not obliged to go around and see the directors of a grocers' association to ascertain whether they are making profit enough in that particular town to let him into business; but he opens his store and starts his business without asking permission of any one. But if any one wants to start the business of selling lumber in Alberta, he has first to go to this association and pay his fees and get permission to sell. I have not the slightest doubt that the same state of things exists in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. That is what I object to. I have here statements of the reasons assigned by some lumber companies who were not members of the combine for not filling orders. One, dated in August, 1906, says:

We return herewith orders, as we regret that we are unable to ship them owing to the fact that orders are not for regularly established dealers. We could ship to Messrs. ————'s mills, provided it was clearly shown that material was for their own use in the factory. Try and have these orders placed through some regularly established dealer, a list of whom is appended.

That shows that these men have sent to the lumbermen in the province of Alberta lists of certain lumber dealers through whom they are to deal. I find that in March last another well known lumber company in British Columbia gave the following as their reason for not filling an order:

We can ship this material in the time specified, provided you can have it go through any of the dealers up there. We have decided in the future not to ship to contractors direct, as we find that this is working against our business. Trusting you can secure it through a yard, and we will guarantee to give you quick despatch.

It is working against their business, because the combine practically force everybody in British Columbia handling lumber to become members of the association. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I have given the government sufficient information to enable them at any rate to start an investigation; and if there is any further information which I can give them, I shall be glad to indicate where I think inquiries should be made for evidence to establish that there exists to-day in the west an unlawful combine. The matter is one that will have to be taken up by this administration. I understand that there exists in British Columbia two or three great associations which are operating through local associations. The secretary of one of these associations is, I am told, R. H. Alexander, and his son, B. F. Alexander, of Seattle, Washington Territory, is the secretary of the Pacific Coast Association. They are also, I believe, officials of the existing local associations. Therefore, there should be no difficulty in the government undertaking the inquiry and pushing it vigorously, and having the proper evidence brought before the committee when it is formed. The situation to-day is, I think, the same as it was two years ago. I was very much amused to hear the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) say that one of the reasons why the price of lumber was so high was the excessive freight rates charged by the railway company. Now, I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway probably hauls more lumber from British Columbia than any other railway; in fact, so far as Canada is concerned, I think it is the only way by which the lumber can be brought out; and it was the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who broke the combine two years ago, when they threatened that if this combine were not discontinued they would establish yards of their own and sell lumber to the settler at cost. I have here a quotation from the Victoria 'Times,' and the hon. gentleman will know whether or not that is a supporter of the present administration. I have been told that it was once edited by the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). This paper says:

It is perfectly well known, in face of the indignation aroused in the Northwest by reason of an alleged lumber combine or trust, that no government of Canada would dare to impose a duty on lumber. The Canadian Pacific Railway was so wroth at the danger in which its vital interests were being placed by the embargo of high prices that it threatened to establish mills of its own and supply lumber at cost.

If that is a true statement of the facts, I think the hon. gentleman's answer to the motion was not a very good one when he said that the railway company was responsible for the increased price of lumber. Hon. gentlemen opposite always like to blame the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for everything. They blamed it recently for the coal scarcity in the Northwest, although I have had it from the miners of Lethbridge that not one ton of coal came out of the mines there this year, where thousands of tons came out a year ago, and this was not due to a shortage of cars. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this motion, and I congratulate the hon. Minister of the Interior on accepting it. I hope the investigation will be full and free, and, if an evil exists, as I have no doubt it does, I hope this government will do everything in their power to allay that evil and thereby alleviate the condition of the settlers in the western provinces.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House in arguing this point. If there is a combine, and it is proved to exist, no doubt the remedy will be applied. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has made an attack especially on the British Columbia lumbermen. They are no doubt willing to get as good a price as they can for their lumber.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I think I gave the names of those in the province of Alberta as well who belong to the association. I did not confine myself to British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I wish to point out that a despatch in the papers says that there are not enough logs cut to-day in the province of British Columbia or on the coast to keep the mills running at their full capacity for two weeks. Logs are worth to-day $15 a thousand at the mills in Vancouver. That is accounted for by the scarcity of labour as well as by the very large demand from the middle west for lumber. I wish to tell my hon. friend further that I question very much if he will see very much cheaper lumber in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba or British Columbia, so long as the crops in his country continue good. A gentleman from the province of Saskatchewan was in the city of Vancouver last fall desirous of buying lumber. He was taken around the different mills but they did not want to touch his order at all. As a matter of fact it was only after considerable pleading that they decided to take it up. They said they had orders for all they could cut within the year and that to take up new orders would disarrange all their arrangements. That is the condition in British Columbia to-day, so far as lumber is concerned, and that will continue to be the condition as long as the demand keeps up. But just so soon as you will see a bad crop in the

west, you will see the demand go down and the price of lumber decrease in proportion. It is purely a question of demand and supply.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I wish first to congratulate the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) on the decision of the government to allow this committee to meet and inquire into the lumber question. The matter is certainly a most important one to the people of the prairie province. It is certainly most important to them that lumber should be placed within their reach at reasonable figures. Now that we have had the decision of the government to have this inquiry, I do not see that I need say very much. But as a question has been raised regarding the existence of a lumber combination, I think it would be as well to inform the House that the tariff commission, when it met at Vancouver, inquired into that question, and I have here the evidence given before it, a portion of which I should like to read, as I think it effectually disestablishes the fact that there was a combination in British Columbia governing the price. Some of the witnesses said that the old combine which had existed two years or more previously between the lumber companies in British Columbia generally and the retailers in the prairie provinces, had ceased to exist. But a certain gentleman, Mr. R. H. Alexander, whose name has just been mentioned by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy), and who gave evidence in the interests of the British Columbia lumbermen, admitted the existence of a combine in regard to prices. I wish to read a small portion of his evidence :—

By Mr. Brodeur—

Q. It was alleged somewhere that there was a combination of the lumber industry in British Columbia ?

A. There was no more a combine than an association to regulate prices or have the prices as nearly uniform as possible.

Q. There was an agreement to that effect between the different lumber industries ?

A. There was a price list that they all worked on—a standard list.

Later on Mr. Alexander said, on being questioned by the Hon. Mr. Fielding :—

Q. Is there any combination at this moment amongst the lumbermen as to prices ?

A. There is no combination in the way you mean—that there is any penalty or anything of that kind. There is a general agreement as to the prices that we are working on. Whether we are keeping it or not, I cannot tell you. It is much the same as in belting, oils and a whole lot of things like that that are generally used all over the land.

Q. But there is an agreement among the manufacturers that they will not sell below a certain price. Is that correct ?

A. I suppose it is.

Q. Therefore, there is no competition among them, if there is an agreement to sell at a fixed price ?

A. Competition between each of them ?

Q. Certainly, that is the point.

A. Well, there is considerable competition.

Q. There may be competition in other things, but is there competition in price ?

A. Well I would not say even that.

Q. Well, we must know that. It is a very important thing. We are told that a year or two ago there was this combine but that it was broken up. I understand that combination was that those who were in it were not able to sell to a man who was not a member of the association. That was not so much a combination as to price but a combination that you would not sell to a man unless he were in the ring.

A. It was as to prices as well.

Q. Well, that is all at an end ?

A. Yes.

Q. But there is another combination to-day as to price ? We would like you to give us some idea as to what it is ?

A. Well, it just amounts to what I have told you. They have gone and prepared a list which they think is the fair relative value of the different kinds of lumber.

Q. Is it a matter of written agreement ?

A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. The members of the lumber industry had a meeting and discussed it ?

A. Yes.

Q. And came to an agreement ?

A. And came to the conclusion that prices should be so and so.

Q. And that list of prices was fixed by somebody and set down in writing and you all know what it is ?

A. Yes.

Q. And you all pledged yourselves one with another that you will not sell for anything less ?

A. Virtually that is the understanding.

Q. Could we see that resolution or agreement ?

A. There is the list. There is no actual document drawn up. The list is a published list—the same as you or any other manufacturer.

It seems to me that that surely was sufficient proof of the existence of a combine in regard to price, and I am rather surprised that the tariff commission, after getting that evidence, did not consider it their duty to lay the information before the Department of Justice or the Solicitor General. Further evidence was given, but in view of the government's decision, it will not be necessary for me to read it. A good deal of it had regard to the desire of the British Columbia lumbermen for a duty of $2 upon rough lumber.

With regard to what the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) has said I would like to say a word or two. As I understood him, he considered that because the farmers of the Northwest provinces were protected in the goods they produced and because the British Columbia people had to use those products, the Northwest people should be willing to have a duty placed upon lumber. Let me reply that as regards the great staples of production, in the Northwest, wheat and cattle, our people consider that they have no protection whatever or that the protection on these articles does

not affect them. They have to sell in the markets of the world in competition with the world, and they consider that it would be in their interests to have all the duties taken off agricultural commodities rather than have such duties used as an argument in favour of a high protective tariff.

Inquiry was made into the allegation that a lumber combine existed some two or three years ago. A commissioner was appointed but, extraordinary as it may seem, no evidence at all was tendered. It may be that at the time, the lumber manufacturers had got a scare and had ceased to operate in the way they had been doing up to that time. At any rate, I think the prices had considerably gone down, since the inquiry was asked for, and the grievance being removed temporarily, no evidence was given. But I think we may take it for granted, especially after the assurance given by hon. members who have spoken that when the inquiry here proposed is held we shall have plenty of evidence tendered, and that the government will be put in a position to size up the situation and take such action as may be found necessary in the premises. I find, from figures supplied to me by the retailers in the Northwest that there have been very considerable increases in the prices they have to pay for lumber recently. In fact, in the year 1906, I am informed there were no less than five lists issued, each averaging an increase on the prices given in the one before it—these lists being issued by the associations of which we have heard. From one set of figures that I was able to procure, I find that from March, 1905, to October, 1906, there was an increase in dimension boards and ship lap of $6 per thousand feet. Now as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) has suggested freight rates on lumber are certainly very high and form a serious charge on the consumer. But I do not think these freight rates have been increased within the last two or three years—at least that is my information. Therefore, the increase being charged to the consumer of lumber goes entirely into the pocket of the manufacturer.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) does not wish to misrepresent the case and that he would not speak as he does if he knew the condition of affairs. The logs cost to-day $15 a thousand at the mill, whereas, three years ago, they cost $6 or $7—and in some cases, as low as $5. The logger, the producer, is getting a great deal more money for his logs. That is, the increase goes not to the manufacturer, but to the workman.

Mr. LAKE. What I intended to say was that the added price goes not to the railway but to the producers of the lumber in British Columbia. The logger, I suppose, takes part in the manufacture by cutting the logs. When the amount paid to the railway company for hauling is deducted, there is an increase profit to the British Columbia producer of something like 61½ per cent—that is, making a rough estimate on weight of the lumber. This increase is calculated on these figures, covering a period from March, 1905, to October, 1906. But this is not the only class of lumber in which there has been a very large increase. All the grades in common use in the Northwest have greatly enhanced in price. Nor was October, 1906, the last time when an increase was made. I am informed that a list which came out in December, 1906, shows a still further increase in prices. When the tariff commission were in Manitoba, evidence was offered to them purporting to show that there was an increase in the price of lumber between 1895 and 1905 which amounted, on the average, to 28¾ per cent. It will be seen that if the prices had increased to that extent up to the time in which the tariff commission held their meeting, these further increases which have taken place in 1906 have most seriously added to the burdens of the people of the Northwest. The increases in one class of material during the year 1906 are as follows —and I just take this as a sample of the steady increases which have taken place in many items.

Mr. BURROWS. What class of lumber does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) refer to?

Mr. LAKE. Fir dimensions. In January this particular class was $21 per thousand. In March it was $22; in May $23; in September, $24; in December, $25—steady increases every two or three months. The weights of lumber, of course, vary, and it is impossible to make an exact calculation; but I estimate, after the freight has been deducted both from the original price and the subsequent prices, that there has been an increase of from 30 to 35 per cent in that particular class in 1906. The retailer, of course, must make his fair profit; and it is obvious that, when he charges so as to make the regular percentage, the more he has to pay the higher must be the amount of profit per thousand feet he must charge the unfortunate consumer. And, from information I have been able to get, at the present time, the retailers appear not to be in this combination, but to be charging a reasonable margin of profit. The question is where is it going to stop? As the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) pointed out just now—and as he pointed in very strong language a few years ago—the most serious aspect of the whole question is the effect upon the new settlers who are coming in. In a pamphlet issued by the Department of the Interior a short time ago—at least, it was sent to me only a few days ago—there is a series of questions and answers for the informa-

tion of intending immigrants. One of these is in regard to lumber, as follows :

56. Q. What does lumber cost ?
A. Spruce boards and dimensions, about $18 per thousand feet ; ship lap, about $20 ; board and sidings, $23 ; cedar shingles, $2 to $3 per thousand.

I think the prices given would be fair if it were true, but I am afraid the information given is not correct—at any rate, it would not be applicable to the greater part of Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta. I am very glad that the government have agreed that there should be an inquiry into this matter. I hope it will be brought on soon, and that it will be exhaustive and a large number of witnesses summoned, and that the government will be prepared to take quick action on the information obtained in that inquiry.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). I am not very conversant with the prices charged during the last year for British Columbia lumber. I am not interested in the manufacture of British Columbia lumber, but I am interested in the manufacture of lumber in the province of Manitoba. I admit that the price of lumber has increased in the Northwest to a large extent during the last two years, and there are two reasons for it. The first reason is this, that for the last twenty or thirty years in the province of British Columbia those gentlemen who put all their wealth into the lumber business did not make any interest on the money invested. Three years ago British Columbia lumber was selling at a figure at which the manufacturer could not possibly get clear and pay ordinary bank interest on the money he invested. There are gentlemen sitting on both sides of this House who I know have been interested in firms in British Columbia, and I call upon them to witness to this fact, that money invested in the manufacture of lumber in British Columbia up to two years ago has not been paying dividends. Lumber sold in British Columbia up to two years ago at a very small figure, and that is one reason of the difference between the price of two years ago and the price of to-day. Another reason for the increase of price in the Northwest is that that country is growing very rapidly, and British Columbia mills more particularly went out of the business of manufacturing as much as they could; they shortened their stock. I know of one firm in the city of Winnipeg who bought limits in British Columbia and who undertook to build a large mill plant, &c. After they had used up a million feet of lumber in the construction of that mill they left it standing idle for two years, without putting any machinery into it, in fact it never turned a wheel. Now, why was this? Because they could not manufacture lumber in British Columbia and make any money out of it at the then current prices, but since that time, the demand for lumber has increased, while the supply has decreased. Then all at once the time came when lumber did not have to be shipped from over the border as it used to be when Manitoba was a slaughter market, and we were up against a shortage of lumber, and the manufacturers in British Columbia did not have time to get a stock. When they started to get a stock they found that men were scarce owing to the great amount of railway construction; the price of labour rose very high, and consequently the price of lumber rose $4 or $5, and even some grades of lumber rose $6 per thousand feet, within the last two years. Now, the point I want to make is this, that there have been unusual conditions in that country which have tended from various reasons to increase the price of lumber. Coming down to the province of Manitoba I make this statement, and I make it as a man who knows what he is talking about, that there is no fixed price amongst the manufacturers in that province. I am glad the Minister of the Interior has consented to the appointment of this commission. I am willing that they may come and examine my books, and what they will find is this: they make the price lists of the manufacturers in my district within a radius of 200 or 300 miles and they will find that they do not agree in any particular. We have not got any general price list in Manitoba, and we have not had for years any combine of prices among the lumber manufacturers. As regards the prices quoted by my hon. friend in the pamphlet, he quoted the ordinary price of lumber at $18 a thousand. I have been selling ordinary spruce lumber this year in the beginning of the season for $17.50, and at the close of the season for $18.50, wholesale on board cars. This is manufactured lumber, not the ordinary sawn lumber, because in that country we plane everything.

Mr. STAPLES. Up to what length?

Mr. BURROWS. Up to 16 feet. Above 16 feet there is a graduated scale. But the ordinary building lumber, common lumber, from 12, 14 up to 16 feet, of which the ordinary price is $18.50 in Manitoba wholesale.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. member supply that lumber at this price to the wholesale or the retail trade?

Mr. BURROWS. I will supply at that price to the retail dealer. The way we transact our business is this: I suppose I sell to 150 retail yards all over the province of Manitoba. I do not go in for establishing retail yards ; I allow retail men to do that, and I sell to the retail yards in carload lots.

Mr. STAPLES. If a farmer wanted a carload of lumber could he go and purchase from your firm at that price?

Mr. BURROWS. I will answer the hon. gentleman as I answered him coming down from Winnipeg this last time. If he wants lumber and will send me his order I will sell it to him as cheap as any man in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES. Will that apply to all farmers?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not as a rule try to sell to everybody; the same rule prevails in our business that does in others. You cannot go to a wholesale dry goods store and buy a web of cloth as cheaply as a man who is a retail dealer can do; there is a well-defined rule regarding that in all kinds of business. We sell to the retail trade the same as any other wholesaler does, the same business rule applies. Now as to the question whether lumber will be cheaper in the future, I will give my opinion for what it is worth. I think in view of the number of mills that are being erected in Manitoba and other parts of the Northwest and in British Columbia, the time will soon come when you will have a large supply of lumber, when the supply will be larger than the demand, and according to the ordinary rule of business lumber will not be as dear. I think at present the British Columbia lumber is too high, and in Manitoba cities they are charging as high a price as they can get. With regard to the causes for the increased price of lumber, there are some phases of the trade out there that are exceptional. For instance, we have in our country what is called line yards. I presume people in eastern Canada do not know what a line yard is. It was common in the western states and the practice extended into Manitoba, where some men undertook to have what they call line yards all over the country. One firm has 125 yards. For instance, they go to the manufacturers and sometimes buy three, or four, or even five million feet at the lowest price per carload. They enter into competition against the other retail dealers and drive them out of the business. It oftens happens, particularly in the western states, that when these line yards get control at any one point they run an opponent out of business, and then of course they put up the price of lumber. In the town of Saskatoon this summer I saw a retail list. I found in some cases that the retail man charged $11.50 profit on 1,000 feet of lumber. That is too much; that is an outrage. A great many manufacturers in the Northwest are being blamed for conditions of that kind for which they are not responsible. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied, in fact I am pleased, that the government are appointing this commission, and I will be quite willing to have them examine my business, because they will find that so far as Manitoba is concerned there is no combination between the lumber manufacturers and there are no set prices. They will find—I am speaking of what I know to be a fact—that the wholesale prices of my firm and half a dozen other firms do not agree. They will find that we are not selling on any one fixed price list and they will find that there is no combine in so far as the manufacturers of lumber in the province of Manitoba are concerned. As long as times keep good we expect to have a good sale for our lumber; we expect to get a good demand for our lumber and I think that for, say another year, until a greater supply is produced, the price of lumber is not going to be less, but I think that so soon as the lumbermen have time to get a good stock on hand we will begin to see that lumber prices will not be so exorbitant as they are now said to be.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question which he may answer or not as he likes? Taking Manitoba lumber, such as my hon. friend and others manufacturing like him make, do the first and second grades of Manitoba lumber compare favourably with the first and second grades of British Columbia lumber, or does each have a field which is rather out of competition with the other?

Mr. BURROWS. I would answer the hon. gentleman's question in this way: Spruce lumber is no good for finishing lumber. For instance, there is a class of lumber you get out of pine for finishing and for fine work that you cannot get out of spruce at all. You can get a class of lumber out of fir that you cannot get out of spruce, such as flooring and lumber for making steps and upper grades. We do not come into competition with that class of lumber at all, but in ordinary building material, such as dimension timber for making houses, joisting boards, flooring, ceiling and siding, we come into competition with British Columbia. Ours is just as good as the ordinary lumber of British Columbia, but we have not the higher grades that they produce in fir and pine.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the defence which the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has made from the manufacturer's standpoint, as he is a manufacturer of lumber himself, I think the resolution of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) is a most timely one, one fraught with considerable consequences to the people of the west, and one which should demand the conscientious consideration of the members of this House. The hon. member for Dauphin has quoted some prices that he is selling lumber for in his particular portion of the province of Manitoba. Of course, it must be understood that the hon. gentleman is stating the wholesale price, and that, in addition to this price, you have to add the freight rates that have been complained so much about by the hon. gentle-

men from British Columbia who spoke to-day, and that you have to add also the retailer's profits; so that hon. members will understand that the prices submitted here in this pamphlet are considerably below the prices charged to the consumers in the west. What the hon. gentleman has said does not at all apply to the retail trade in that part of the province to my own knowledge. Lumber is an absolute necessity of life, particularly in the west; it is one that is called in such requisition as to tax the mills at the present day to their utmost capacity to supply the very great demand in that particular portion of the country, and one which our people must have, no matter what the price they must pay for it. If, therefore, there is anything that unduly enhances the price to the consumer, if by reason of the mill men taking advantage of this great demand, or by reason of an illegitimate combination in the trade, or by any other illegitimate cause, the price is increased, then it is not at all surprising that there is a very great outcry against the price charged to the consumer, and that an investigation is demanded at the hands of this parliament. I am not going to say, Mr. Speaker, that the mere fact of an increase having taken place in the price of lumber in recent years is evidence of itself that there is a combination in the lumber trade, but I, like many others who are not personally sufficiently acquainted with the conditions of the lumber trade to give a decided opinion one way or the other, am anxious to see this question set at rest, and if the people are labouring under a grievance they should have a full opportunity afforded them to have that grievance remedied. Therefore, I was delighted to hear the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) state that it was his intention to accept this resolution of my hon. friend from Alberta in order to allow both parties to be heard, and if there is a grievance to have the remedy applied, and in that way to have this agitation set at rest. When the predecessors of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the treasury benches were in power, and when their Tariff Commission visited western Canada, evidence was produced before the commission to prove that a combination had existed in the lumber trade, by means of which an undue price was paid for lumber. The result of that investigation was reported to the government, and the government took the only effective remedy in their hands at that time, namely, the placing of lumber planed on one side and lumber in the rough on the free list. Since that time there has been an agitation carried on, both inside and outside of this House, by those engaged in the lumber trade, by a certain portion of the press and by hon. gentlemen in this House, who have introduced resolutions calling for the reimposition of the duty upon lumber. I am free to admit that had the government responded to that appeal of those engaged in the lumber trade, and had the prices of lumber gone up as they have gone up in recent years, many of the people who to-day are making a great outcry against the price of lumber would have been amongst the first to have claimed that the duty was responsible for the increase in price. There is no doubt of that in my mind. Since the prices have increased and since there has been no duty placed on lumber, the people who would have claimed that duty had increased prices are deprived of that argument. But I remember having a conversation with a gentleman engaged in the lumber trade of British Columbia a few years ago, in the course of which he offered me a great many arguments, many of which are known to members of this House, as to why parliament should impose a duty on American lumber of $2 or $3 per thousand, and I must say that as a protectionist some of those arguments appealed to me with considerable force. He stated that the products of the farmers which they were compelled to buy—dairy products, butter, eggs, and so on—had a considerable duty upon them, that they were practically forced to purchase these products from the farmers of the Northwest and Manitoba, and that he thought it was only right and proper for the settlers to reciprocate in kind, and allow them to have a certain protection for the British Columbia lumber trade. The gentleman went so far as to state that neither he nor his fellow-lumbermen desired this protection for the purpose of increasing the price of lumber, but for the purpose of retaining the market for our own Canadian lumber, that they simply desired to have our Canadian market for our own Canadian lumber, and he went as far as to declare that they were willing to put up a guarantee satisfactory to this House and the country that if the government would impose a duty of $2 per thousand they would not increase the price of lumber to the consumer. If the recent increases in the prices of lumber have been legitimate, if those increases were absolutely necessary for the preservation of the lumber trade, of what value would such a guarantee have been? If the prices are absolutely demanded to meet increased wages and the increased price of logs, and if those increases in price had taken place while that guarantee was in the hands of the government, the condition of the lumbermen would have been worse than it is in the estimation of the public, for certainly they could not have avoided the charge that they were increasing the price in the face of that guarantee. I think it is very questionable if these increases are justified even by the conditions that have been described here to-day. The question of freight rates has also been referred to in connection with the increased

price of lumber. The tendency of freight rates during the last couple of years has been downward rather than upward. Certainly they have nothing to do with the increased price of lumber to the consumer. Now, in fact, as has been quoted by the hon. member for Calgary, (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) the best evidence that freight rates have not been the cause of the increased price is to be found in the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway threatened to establish lumber yards of their own if the British Columbia lumbermen did not supply lumber at a cheaper rate than the figure for which they were holding up the people at that time, and the only complaint I have heard in recent years in regard to railway facilities is that sometimes the cars were not available when they desired to carry out their large supply to the settlers. I do not think the question of freight rates enters materially at all into the increased price of lumber to-day in comparison with the prices of some two or three years ago. It may be denied that there is any combination in the trade. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has said so.

Mr. BURROWS. I said there was no combination between the manufacturers in Manitoba.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not know whether the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) is one of those unfortunate wholesale men referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, who were expelled from the association because of not keeping its rules, but I am glad to hear his assurance that he is not in a combination in the lumber trade although I am free to confess, if I am to believe the press reports, that there is apparently no part of Manitoba where there is as great a public outcry against the price of lumber as in the hon. gentleman's own constituency. This may be owing to the fact that the government have recently decided to abolish all rights to cut lumber in the Riding mountains and I think the Duck mountains. That of course is where a great many of these portable sawmills were at work on which many of the settlers depended for their lumber, and they feel that they have a grievance in being compelled now to buy from the larger lumbermen.

It may be a difficult matter to prove that there is a combination in the lumber trade, but I think sufficient evidence has been adduced here to-day to show that there is an association and has been for some time, at any rate—as far as the lumbermen are concerned in British Columbia, by means of which they not only dictate the price of lumber but also dictate as to the number of yards that there shall be in any given town. I know that not so very long ago, a case of that kind occurred in my own constituency and there have been other cases; the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) produced evidence two years ago in this House, showing that the lumberman absolutely refused to sell to an independent dealer because they did not think the town sufficiently large to justify more than one yard, and the man who had the yard there happened to be a member of the lumbermen's association. They dictated the number of yards and the price as well. I heard a gentleman in the lumber trade state a couple of weeks ago that the only change in the rules to-day from what they were two years ago, was the change of one word. He stated that in their rules they had a provision that the retailers were bound not to charge less profit than 25 per cent. I do not know whether this gentleman is correct or not, but he states that word 'less' has now been changed to 'more' and it is provided that they shall not charge more than 25 per cent. If that is the change it is a change in the right direction.

Mr. BURROWS. More than 20 per cent.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I think that change more ornamental than useful. I think it will be found that where a man has a monopoly of the lumber trade in any given town, there is nobody to enter a protest if he charges more than 20 per cent, and in fixing that 20 per cent, I think he will take into consideration the long time he has to wait in some instances for his money under the credit system, the trouble and expense of collecting, etc.,—and I am not prepared to say it is not quite legitimate to do so. But at any rate, as I stated, wherever there is a monopoly there is no person to see that such a provision is carried out and where there is a competitor it is to his advantage to have the dealer exceed the 20 per cent, as by that he is likely to have more trade fall into his own hands.

It has been stated, and with some force I will admit, that a couple of years ago the government appointed a commissioner, Judge Richards, I think, to inquire into the lumber trade, largely I think, owing to the fact that the member for Lisgar undertook to lay certain charges. In reply to those charges the government appointed Judge Richards to hold a commission and inquire into the matter and as a result of that investigation no evidence was adduced and the argument has been used that if the people were labouring under the grievances of which they complained at that time, why did they not appear and lay a case before the commissioner, why did they not appear in person or by counsel and establish their claim, and why, if this resolution is adopted, and the commission appointed, are we sure that a similar result will not follow? Now there may be two or three explanations as to the reasons for the failure in the other case. It does appear to an onlooker rather forcible at first glance, but if you take into consideration the fact that farmers, who are the principal complain-

ants, are not as well organized as people in other lines of business, you will possibly find one explanation. It involves to them considerable expense and loss of time to appear before these commissions. I think the true explanation is to be found in what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) stated, that is, that at that time, or about that time, there was a significant drop in the price, and of course that cut the ground from beneath the feet of those who were complaining about the price. But I am satisfied that if this resolution is accepted, as I know the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has declared his intention of accepting it, the people of the west who are at the present time much better organized by means of the Grain Growers' association, the Farmers' Institutes, etc., are in a better position to present their case here, and they will take the trouble and opportunity of appearing here to state their case, and setting at rest this very much vexed question. There may be some difficulty in applying a remedy. When an article is taxed a partial remedy can be applied by placing it upon the free list. At the present time, of course, lumber in the rough and planed on one side is on the free list and the only thing that could be done in that way is to place finished lumber on the free list, lumber planed on both sides. I doubt very much if that will meet the situation. Of course it is not our place over here to formulate and mould a policy on this question. Action may be taken under the Criminal Code, under the clause referred to by a previous speaker, which provides that any one engagaing in any unlawful combination in restraint of trade will be subject to penalties, and there is yet another remedy which might be applied. I believe a great many lumbermen cut their lumber under license. They have large lumber berths secured under license. If any of those holding a license enter into any combination the best remedy for the government to apply is to bring about the forfeiture of the license. I think that would be a very effectual remedy and I suggested it to the minister. I join with other members in congratulating the minister in acceding to the request for a commission and I trust that sufficient evidence will be given to convince the people that if there is a grievance, parliament is ready to remedy it, and it is only just to the lumbermen that such an agitation as this should be set at rest.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia East). I do not know whether a combination exists among the British Columbia lumbermen or not, but if there is one I am very glad that the government has acceded to the request of the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Herron) and appointed a commission. Some of our friends seem very much surprised that the minister should have done so, but I do not think there is any reason for surprise because since I have been in the House, whenever any matter of this kind has been brought to the attention of the government, they have been ready to appoint a commission or a commissioner and look into the merits of the case, and I believe that in this case they will give a thorough investigation.

I think, however, this is not an opportune time for an investigation of this kind, for the simple reason that the advance in the price of lumber, to my mind, has not been caused by a combine among the British Columbia manufacturers. The same advance in the price of lumber has taken place all over Canada, but according to the terms of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) you would think that the increase in the price of lumber had only occurred in the western provinces, while if you look into the prices of lumber ruling at the present time in Ottawa, where you have the cut of the whole Ottawa valley, you will find that the price has increased as much as on the prairies of the western provinces. It has been caused by the increase in value of the timber limits in British Columbia and the western territories. When a timber limit is sold now it is not sold at the low prices that ruled a few years ago but at a very high price. That adds largely to the cost of lumber. We have heard it stated by members from British Columbia that logs which a few years ago sold at from $5.75 to $7 a thousand are now selling at from $12 to $15. If a man has to pay $12 a thousand for logs he cannot manufacture lumber from them at a very low price. A lumber manufacturer to whom I have been talking within the last three days told me that five years ago he could get men to work in the bush at from $20 to $25 a month, whereas to-day he has to pay from $40 to $50 a month. The prices of all kinds of supplies and materials used in the lumber industry have also gone up. If we want to get cheaper lumber in the west and all through Canada there is one thing which the government could do but in which I doubt the hon. gentlemen opposite would support them, that is, to reduce the duties on machinery and everything else that goes into the manufacture of lumber. I see that in the revised tariff the duties on some materials going into the manufacture of lumber are increased. That being the case, you cannot expect that the cost of lumber is going to be materially reduced. The hon. member for Calgary referred to conditions that existed two or three years ago. There has been a very great change in conditions since that time. There is one reason why I think a commission will not find anything of particular value, that is, that to-day the British Columbia lumbermen cannot supply the demand. Half the time they cannot get cars to ship the lumber. I was told within the last month by one of the purchasing men of one of the large railway companies that they wanted several million

feet of heavy dimension timber of long lengths to build docks, and had ordered it in British Columbia last year, but could not get the lumber at any price. The Grand Trunk Pacific is short millions of feet of the lumber they ordered, because they could not get it at any price. Some of our hon. friends opposite, in a half jocular manner, have said that we on this side of the House have been putting all the blame on the freight rates, and they have referred to the threat made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to go into the manufacture of lumber themselves. They did make the threat to go into the manufacture of lumber, but they did not make the threat to reduce the freight rates. A little over two years ago, during the last general election, a lumber dealer in one of the towns in my constituency took me into his yard and showed me a large pile of lumber, and he said to me that the man who bought the timber, the logger who cut the logs, the sawmill man who sawed them, the man who hauled them to his yard, the dealer who left them in his yard to dry and the man who loaded them on the cars, all of them combined got forty-five per cent of the proceeds, while the railway company got fifty-five per cent. So that you see that the freight rates have something to do with the price of lumber. If we are going to appoint commissions for so many purposes, I would suggest to the right hon. leader of the government whether it would not be advisable to appoint one permanent commission on the lines of the Railway Commission to inquire into all such matters instead of having a separate commission for each separate matter as it comes up. In that way I think the work would be done better and certainly at no greater expense.

Mr. SCHAFFNER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the year ended June 30, 1906.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at six p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 22, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 77) to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. Gervais.

WAYS AND MEANS—INCIDENTS OF JAMAICA EARTHQUAKE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding : That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I took the opportunity of this motion to say for myself, perhaps for many of my fellow Canadians, that I regard certain incidents of the Jamaica earthquake as a distinct loss to Imperial prestige on this continent, a thing all Canadians took pride in. The British naval stations on this Atlantic coast are no more. There is a lesson in it for us. Intimations given some time ago we may have failed to apprehend, though as distinct as the fan of the east, and that was to have a care for ourselves. If we are to be continental in our own aspirations we must have the means of expressing it ourselves, even as our neighbours have. We may yet find need of a more Canadian flag on a Canadian ship, in seas that are as much ours as others.

THE SWAMP LANDS OF MANITOBA.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald, Man.). I desire for a few moments to call the attention of the House to a matter which affects the constituency I have the honour to represent, and not only the constituency, but the province in which that constituency lies. It affects it in two ways : First, financially; secondly, it impairs or affects the liberty which the sportsmen of that province have long enjoyed. I refer to the order in council which was passed on the 5th of December last, whereby some seventeen or eighteen sections of the swamp lands of Manitoba were recommended to be leased to the Hon. Senator Kirchhoffer for a period of twenty-one years, at a yearly rental of $5 per section, or in other words, for less than three-quarters of a cent per acre. No, I do not desire to enter into the details of the swamp land grievance in the province of Manitoba, for they are many; but in order to establish the fact that the lands in question are swamp lands, and should long ago have been transferred to the province to deal with as it saw fit, I think it is proper for me to cite a few facts.

Previous to the year 1885, owing to conditions which I do not propose to set forth at present, it was necessary to pass the Swamp Lands Act whereby all the swamp lands in the province of Manitoba were to be transferred to the province to deal with as it saw fit. The manner in which these lands were to be examined, transferred and classified was on the same basis as that fixed by statute in the United States whereby the swamp lands were transferred to the respective states in which they lay. At the time of the passing of this Act there was

estimated to be between seven million and ten million acres of swamp lands. The manner of selection was to have been by a commission of two duly qualified land surveyors, one of whom was to be chosen by the province and the other by the Dominion of Canada. In accordance with this understanding the province chose and recommended for appointment the late Wm. Crawford, who acted in that capacity up to the end of the year 1896, or up to the time that this government succeeded to power. When this government came in they thought that this was too important a position to be held by a person who was not of the same political faith as the government, and without consultation with, or the knowledge or consent of the government of Manitoba, Mr. Crawford was dismissed, and there was appointed in his place a Dominion land surveyor of the same political stripe as the government. From that day to the present the province of Manitoba has not had a voice in the selection of these lands, has not had anything to say as to who should act on their behalf, or what quantity of land should be considered swamp land. The season of the year in which these lands were to be examined was, according to agreement, the month of June. The month of June, as you all know is the wet month in Manitoba, and consequently the province of Manitoba would have received a greater acreage of land in the month of June owing to the fact that a greater number of acres being under water in that month. But that part of the agreement was not complied with. The commissioners naturally preferred to travel over that country dry shod and in the sunshine. But I say that this government have no right to allow those lands to be examined during the dry season of the year when a smaller percentage of swamp land is to be found.

Again, the cost of selection of these swamp lands was not to be charged up to the province until after they were transferred by order in council to the province. This has not been the case, but the government have, during their term in office, charged up the province long before these lands were transferred. The most recent figures I have been able to obtain set out the facts in this manner: Up to the present there have been examined 4,021,253 acres of swamp lands; there have been reported as swamp lands out of this number, and falling to the province, 2,051,165 acres; of that number the province of Manitoba has only received 1,282,840 acres. The cost that has been charged up to the province for this million and a quarter acres has been $143,977. Now, if you will further analyse this statement, you will find that out of this 2,051,165 acres, this government has retained and diverted to other purposes 768,324 acres, which justly belongs to the province, but are withheld, 768,324 acres of land reported as swamp lands that should have been transferred to the province. While this government have been unjust enough to retain those lands, still they have not failed to charge the little province of Manitoba with the entire cost of examining, classifying and transferring those lands. From a conservative estimate I find that the province has been charged with $53,991.13 that has been, without consultation with the government of Manitoba, deducted from the small annual subsidy which the province receives, namely, $100,000 a year. Again, I find that there has been an unjust interest charged upon the expenses connected with this examination, the amount of $11,381.91 has also been charged up to the province. These lands, according to the agreement, were to have been selected with diligence and despatch, but this has not been done. Some 22 years have elapsed, and we have only received out of that seven million or ten million acres about a million and a quarter acres.

While this has been done the province has been deprived of the great revenue that it might have received from these lands. It has been stripped of the privilege of collecting timber dues, wood dues, the fees from hay permits and grazing leases, and I might say also shooting leases as I understand that the government leased to the Oak Point Shooting Club some two years ago 4,000 acres of these lands for the purpose of a game preserve. These are some of the ways in which the little province of Manitoba has been stripped of some of its revenue, and I think it is high time that we should cry a halt and see that justice is done to that province in respect to its swamp lands. Not only that, but the taxing of these costs has been done in a very irregular and unbusinesslike manner. Instead of the government issuing a statement annually as a business man would issue a statement they have let it run; in fact, there has been no statement issued for three and a half years, but I suppose that when the statement is issued the government will not forget to tack on interest as they did on previous occasions. I also find that these lands have been examined in remote portions of the province. Instead of examining the lands which lie adjacent to settlement where they could be disposed of to good advantage we find that the commissioners go away up the country, I suppose, where it is more politically expedient for them, where they can be of greater use to their party. Notwithstanding the fact that the authorities of Manitoba have requested the government and the commissioners that these lands should be examined adjacent to settlement where those that are fit for it could be brought under cultivation, the province could get no consideration from them. In fact I have heard it stated by the premier of

Manitoba—and I have no doubt his statement is correct—that he cannot even get a civil answer from the department to his correspondence.

Now, Sir, owing to the slowness with which these lands are being examined the people of Manitoba can see gradually disappearing what would have been a very valuable asset had these lands been examined and transferred in accordance with the agreement to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks. But, I suppose there is a climax to all grievances and if there be a climax to the swamp lands grievance in Manitoba I think we have reached it at last when this government have taken power upon themselves to lease to an individual some 10,000 acres of land which did not belong to them for a period of ten years at $5 per section or less than three-quarters of a cent an acre. I say it is high time that we should cry a halt and see that justice is done to the province of Manitoba. I know these lands, because, as I stated, they are situated in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and if there are any lands in the province of Manitoba that qualify as swamp lands I can say upon my own knowledge that these are swamp lands. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of this government to cancel or rescind this order in council and further I submit that all the moneys which have been wrongfully exacted from the province of Manitoba should be forthwith returned to that province with interest thereon. Manitoba, as hon. members from that province, who sit on the opposite side of the House know, has had great difficulty in financing, it has required every available dollar to carry on the great development that is taking place there and to meet the requirements of the country. As I stated before the little province has been stripped of its entire public domain, it has been stripped of its timber, it has been stripped of its lands and it has been stripped of all other privileges which sister provinces have enjoyed. Therefore, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is now time that justice should be done to the little province of Manitoba. No later than yesterday the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stood up in the House and answered a question which had been neatly constructed by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). No doubt the hon. member for Lisgar knew full well the answer he would get. The question was asked for a purpose. As to whether the answer he got will satisfy the people of Manitoba or not is another question. I do not pretend at this moment to discuss the principle of leasing these public lands to any one person or any company. I say that I am not in favour of the principle and I venture the statement that the people of Canada—and I know from the resentment such action has received in my own province—that the people of Manitoba certainly are not in favour of any such principle of leasing lands for a game preserve or for the enjoyment of any one individual thus cutting out the rights of the sports who have enjoyed the privilege of going there to shoot on former occasions. Therefore, I hope that the government will immediately rescind this order in council and that these lands which belong to the province of Manitoba beyond doubt will be immediately handed over.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that perhaps the individual members of this House are not very well acquainted with. Nevertheless, I consider it a very important matter for two reasons. One is the very great utility of that section of the country to the class of men who use it the most. But a greater reason to my mind why this matter should be regarded as one of importance is the principle which is involved. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a question on the paper the other day in connection with this matter when I asked the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if a lease had been granted to any person or persons in connection with certain lands adjacent to Lake Manitoba, and the answer I received may have been a fair answer. It probably was the only answer that the minister was legitimately called upon to give to the question I asked. But, I claim that it was not, between members of this House and a member of the executive, the answer that the hon. gentleman should have given. I asked him if the leases had been granted and he said 'no.' True they have not been issued, but the hon. gentleman knew very well that the order in council had been passed that these leases be granted, and in so far as I understand the question, and from any information I have received from those whom I have asked and who ought to know, it practically means that these leases, in so far as the government are concerned, have been granted. The people of Manitoba profess to be and are to a very large extent a democratic people.

We should not remain silent and permit Senator Kirchhoffer and any important personages who may be associated with him to obtain this lease over that district of our province. I have always looked upon the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) as a democrat (I might say as a democrat to the hilt), and I cannot understand how he could have been induced to grant such a lease to any man or any set of men, constituting them territorial barons. So far as I am concerned I am not going to deal with the swamp land question at all to-day; I am more interested in the reason which induced this government to lease that territory to any one. It may be said of these seventeen sections south of Lake Manitoba, that they do not comprise a very great area, but they are no doubt the best breeding ground and the largest resort for wild duck on this continent of America. The good senator has

been living there for a long time; he knows the habits of the duck; he knows that Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis extend 250 miles north, or, taking into account the chain of lakes practically to Hudson bay, and he knows that countless thousands, yes millions of ducks which are bred along these lakes come down to the neighbourhood of these seventeen sections of land in the fall, that they are attracted there by the large wheat fields that surround that part of the lake, and that it is their last resting place before going south. We would be neglecting our duty as representatives from that country if we did not stand up in this parliament to enter our protest against this government granting such a lease of our great national heritage to any person whatsoever. I do not know how the members supporting the government and who represent Manitoba constituencies feel on the question, but I do know that in Manitoba this thing is denounced by persons regardless of party. I have no doubt the Minister of the Interior has had extensive correspondence from that country since it has become known that an order in council granting this lease had been issued, but let me quote from the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' an organ exceedingly dear to members of the government and a newspaper which cannot be described as a Conservative organ in any sense, the following:

If the Ottawa government has been listening to the voice of Manitoba during the past few days it will be in no doubt as to the healthiest course to follow in this matter of the proposed lease to that high and mighty potentate, Senator Kirchhoffer. But if it is still unconvinced the 'Free Press' herewith takes the responsibility of advising it to withdraw the order in council and abandon all intentions of executing the lease. The people of this province almost to a man are hostile to any such concession being given to Senator Kirchhoffer or anybody else; and they are prepared to see, too, that their wishes are not flouted.

This question has been considered of sufficient importance to have it brought to the attention of the legislature of Manitoba, and I read from the Winnipeg 'Tribune' the remarks made on the question by members of that legislature. The Hon. Mr. Mickle moved the following resolution:

That this House place on record its strong disapproval of the granting, either by the province or the Dominion, of exclusive shooting rights on public lands within the boundaries of the province to any person or persons, the same being, in the opinion of the House, an unjustifiable invasion of the rights of the individual.

Mr. Mickle in support of the motion said:

He did not know of any question that had arisen which had caused such discussion in the provinec, as the granting of exclusive privileges to private parties to shoot over certain lands on Lake Manitoba. The people of Manitoba would not stand for such treatment, and such privileges to any individual. He asked the House to place on record its strong disapproval of the granting of any such leases. The granting of preserves was all right for those who had the rights of shooting, but was not desirable from the ordinary shooter's point of view.

The people of Manitoba did not want such a condition to exist in this province, while no great harm had yet been done. The Minister of the Interior had stated yesterday that no leases had been granted for exclusive shooting rights during the past eighteen months, which applied to the province of Manitoba, and he hoped no leases had been granted by the provincial government, and if there were they would be cancelled.

The speaker continuing, said that it may be said that the parties could gain exclusive rights of shooting by purchase. This was so to a degree, but he hoped that if such lands were to be put up for sale, it would be open bidding, and with a reserve clause that the rights and privileges of the hunters should be preserved.

Dr. McInnis said:

He congratulated the leader of the opposition on his remarks, and said that notwithstanding denials there has been an effort by some individuals in the province to secure and control special shooting privileges in the province. The people of Manitoba were democratic enough not to stand for any government, whether provincial or federal, granting any such lease as was proposed. He noticed, he said, that the Minister of the Interior had yesterday stated in the House that no lease had been granted for exclusive shooting privileges to any one in Manitoba during the past eighteen months.

The speaker said there was an application made by a certain gentleman to get exclusive shooting privileges in Manitoba. There was another feature of the proposed lease, that the federal government was about to lease lands to a private individual which should have been transferred to the people of Manitoba, to whom they rightly belonged long ago.

The land belonged to the people, and the government should retain the same for the public. No individual had any right to expect any such privilege. The game should be preserved, but not for any private individual, but for the people as a whole.

Dr. McInnis, in conclusion, moved an amendment that the House was of the opinion that no exclusive privileges should be granted over any public land, to any private individual for shooting purposes.

Mr. Walker, another member of the legislature, is reported as follows:

Sampson Walker, M.P.P., for North Winnipeg, next spoke, and strongly supported Dr. McInnis' motion. He said that the country was interested in the veracity of the ministers, both of the Dominion and provincial. The Minister of the Interior had stated that no lease had been granted during the last eighteen months, while the 'Gazette' gave notice of such a lease. The people would not stand for a lack of veracity in its ministers. If a mistake had been made at Ottawa in the

granting of such a lease, the minister should have admitted such.

Dr. McInnis' motion was passed unanimously.

Now as I said before I am not going to-day to enter into the question of swamp lands. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has gone into this matter to some extent. We in that country certainly have a tremendous grievance in connection with the swamp lands that should have been handed over to our government. I simply arose to enter my protest, not particularly on account of the seventeen sections of land that may be granted, but to protest most strenuously against any such principle as is involved in the granting of a lease to a set of individuals shutting out other men who have an equal right.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I suppose it would hardly be in order to allow this somewhat unexpected and extraordinary discussion to close without some words from myself. I may say that I cannot congratulate the hon. gentlemen in their fairness in bringing up this matter. A motion was placed on the order paper for a return to be brought down; that motion was agreed to, the return is in course of preparation, and I think the hon. gentlemen would have been doing themselves and their party in the House and out of it, very much more credit if they had waited, and had not precipitated this debate until the papers were in the hands of the House and of themselves. However they have seen fit to take their own course and must be judged by their own actions. In regard to the grievance of the province of Manitoba with reference to swamp lands, I can only say that so far as I am aware the province of Manitoba has no grievance, not a shred of a grievance, in that connection. If there is any grievance in connection with the swamp lands of Manitoba it is on the part of the people of Manitoba as to the disposition by the provincial government of those lands which have come into its possession and under its control. An agreement was entered into in 1885 between the Dominion government and the then government of the province of Manitoba whereby an examination was to be made of certain lands within the province and if those lands were found to fulfil certain conditions then, under certain circumstances, they were to be handed over to the province. That agreement has been in process of being carried out ever since; the terms stand as they did then, and the conditions are being fulfilled as they were then. There was no agreement express or implied, that the Manitoba government should come immediately into possession of all the swamp lands in the province. They were to come into possession of those lands under certain conditions and according to certain circumstances and under certain requirements. If they are not coming into possession of these lands in accordance with these conditions then the province has a grievance. But if they are coming into possession of the lands according to that agreement and under those conditions they have no grievance, even although there may be millions of acres to which the province thinks it is entitled, and which it has not yet received. Examiners have been appointed; the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has complained that one of these examiners should be an appointee of the provincial government. I cannot answer the question as to whether his contention is right or not, but I can certainly say that, so far as my knowledge goes, the contention has not been raised until recently and the same men who are examining the lands to-day have been examining them for a number of years. Therefore if there is a grievance it is a grievance of long standing and might easily have been righted years ago. That it was not even alluded to, and that no attempt was made to right it years ago, is, I think, fair evidence that there was and is no grievance. The lands cannot be handed over to the province until they have been surveyed and examined and passed upon by the commission, but as fast as they are surveyed, and found to come within the conditions, they are handed over to the province. Within the last few days many thousands of acres have been handed over to the province so that the work of handing them over has been going on all the time. I do not think it can be successfully held that the province has lost anything by not coming into possession of these lands sooner. So far from having lost it has gained by these lands not having come into the possession of the province at an earlier date. To-day the province is disposing of these lands at high prices, and if these lands had come into their possession years ago and the same policy had been carried out, they would have been disposed of at low prices.

In regard to shooting leases on Lake Manitoba, and the alleged interference with the rights of the province to the swamp lands, supposedly included in those leases, I have only to say that if my hon. friends had taken the trouble to read the orders in council authorizing the issue of those leases, they would have seen that the authorization was subject to the rights of the province of Manitoba, that there was no intention, no desire, on the part of any one, to in any way derogate from the right of the province to these swamp lands. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has seen fit to suggest that he has not been treated fairly, or the House has not been treated fairly in the reply that I gave to a certain question addressed by him the other day. He asked a straight question and I gave him a straight answer, and I think if the hon. gentleman gets a straight answer to his straight question he is getting all he can fairly ask for. If he asks the members of the government to

provide him with a question as well as an answer I think he is going altogether too far. I might also suggest that if he imagines that an order in council authorizing a lease is the same thing as a lease, he is under a very serious mistake. While a minister may be authorized by order in council to do thus and so circumstances may arise which may not warrant the minister in doing thus and so and he does not, under the terms of the order in council, do thus and so. The order in council expresses the intention of the government and of the minister and to that extent the government and the minister must be held responsible, but there is all the difference in the world between an order in council authorizing the Minister of the Interior to issue a lease and the possession of that lease by the lessee. No lease has been issued in the case mentioned and no lease will be issued. Is my hon. friend satisfied that he got a fair and square answer to his fair and square question on that occasion ?

Mr. STAPLES. If there had not been protests from the people of Manitoba against the leasing of these lands to Senator Kirchhoffer, would a lease not have been issued as recommended by the order in council ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no doubt at all that had there been no protest from the people of Manitoba a lease would have been issued in accordance with the terms of the order in council, but after protests have been made I think it would be improper on the part of the minister to issue the lease and, as I have already informed the House, the lease will not be issued.

My hon. friends laid some stress on the rights of the province of Manitoba and on the impropriety of the action proposed to be taken, by granting a lease of these lands, which they describe as a trespass upon the rights of the province, and something also was said about its being an infringement upon the principles of democracy. One hon. gentleman expressed his surprise that I should have been a party to the proposed issue of this lease because, I was a democrat to the hilt. I thank my hon. friend for his good opinion, and I think I am entitled to retain it. With regard to the proposed issue of a lease to Senator Kirchhoffer, of certain swamp lands in Manitoba, that proposition rested upon the statement of the senator that he already held from the government of Manitoba a lease of adjoining and similar lands, so that the proposed lease was supposed to be in accord with the policy and principles of the government of that province regarding the administration of such lands.

Mr. STAPLES. Do you always support what the government of Manitoba does ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not always, but when that government is dealing with practically its own property, we take it for granted that it knows what it is doing and that its action is satisfactory to the people of Manitoba. It seems however that we were deceived.

Mr. STAPLES. How about the Oak Point lease ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is in precisely the same position as the lease proposed to be issued to Senator Kirchhoffer. An order was prepared granting a lease to the Oak Point shooting club. That company had already a lease of a certain area. That lease was cancelled for the purpose of enabling homestead entries to be made within its area. Then an order in council was prepared granting a new lease to the company. But, in view of the protests received from the people of Manitoba—which certainly caused a revolution in the policy of the government of that province—in deference to their protests, the Oak Point shooting club will not get its lease either, and it will be the policy of the Department of the Interior in future not to grant such leases to anybody for larger areas than they require for their buildings.

I think that a word might be said—although it is hardly relevant to the debate—on another point. It has been said that the premier of Manitoba had entered a protest against the granting of a lease to Senator Kirchhoffer and that the premier had not received even the courtesy of a reply. Well, so far as I am aware, he never did enter such a protest ? Had he done so, he would have received a reply. But he entered a protest against the granting of a lease to the Oak Point shooting club to which he did receive a reply to the effect that the lease was only issued subject to the rights of the province. But the objection to the lease was not on account of its anti-democratic character. It was simply on the ground that it was a trespass on the swamp land rights of the provinces. I was justified in presuming from the fact that the Manitoba government was aware that a lease had been issued to the Oak Point club and from the fact that the same government had issued a lease afterwards to Senator Kirchhoffer,—I was bound to assume from these facts that the principle of issuing shooting leases was an accepted policy of the Manitoba government, which government is supposed to represent the public opinion of that province. The lease to Senator Kirchhoffer was proposed to be granted therefore in accord with that policy and subject to the swamp land rights of the province.

I would like to point out that whatever allegations may have been made in the past against the administration of the Department of the Interior as to graft on the part of its political friends, in this case such a charge cannot be made because the proposed lease was to have been in favour of Senator Kirchhoffer,

who is a political friend of the government of Manitoba ; and the fact that he had been able to get a lease from that government led me to suppose that it would be in accord with their policy and wishes to extend the boundaries of that lease, such extension only to have effect while the land remained under the control of the Dominion and would cease just as soon as the swamp lands commission and the other arrangements connected with the transfer of such lands could take effect.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) had any right to characterize this discussion as a most extraordinay one, I have an equal right to find fault with that characterization after having listened to his very laboured attempt to justify himself by taking refuge behind what he described as the precedent set by the provincial government in reference to a prior lease granted Senator Kirchhoffer of some seven sections. The hon. gentleman went far afield for a precedent, and appears very anxious to follow a precedent when he finds it is a wrong one. No one in this House has attempted to defend any lease of that kind, and by the way there was no lease received from the provincial government by Senator Kirchhoffer. The hon. minister says that it is one thing to pass an order in council and quite a different thing to put it into effect. But he will not deny that it was simply and solely owing to the pressure of public opinion, as evinced by the protests from his own political friends and party organizations as well as from those interested in sport in that province, that he refused to grant the lease. He should bear in mind that even if the province of Manitoba did grant a lease of seven sections to Senator Kirchhoffer, or anybody else, it was granting a lease of lands that belonged to it, and if that government did wrong, it is answerable to the people of the province. But the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) granted a lease of seventeen sections of land which properly belongs to the province and not to his department or to the Dominion government.

If these are shooting lands, they properly come under the head of swamp lands, and all such should be handed over to the province of Manitoba in accordance with the agreement entered into in 1885. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has stated that if there is any grievance in regard to the swamp lands on the part of the people of Manitoba, it is against the provincial government for the way they have disposed of these lands. Fancy this Minister of the Interior reflecting upon any government for its disposition of public lands, considering the record of the government of which he is a member on this same subject. The authors of the Saskatchewan Valley land deal, in which 250,000 acres of land were handed over at $1 an acre, reproaching the government of Manitoba for its handling of the public lands, is rich indeed. The present Minister of the Interior may claim that he is not responsible for this deal. It is true that it was carried through by his predecessor. But consider what he himself has done since coming into office. Last June he handed over, for $3 an acre nominally, but $1 an acre really, no less than 380,000 acres of the public lands of this country to the Robbins Irrigation Company, composed of his own political friends. When the minister says that there is no grievance against this government on the part of the people of Manitoba in regard to these swamp lands, either his memory is exceedingly short or his ignorance of the details of his department most remarkable. The Provincial Treasurer of Manitoba, in his budget speech the other day, said:

> It is a cause of grievance that the province has paid for the cost of inspecting large quantities of swamp lands which have not been transferred and possibly may never be. And to make the situation still more unbearable, interest on the cost of inspection is charged from the date the same is paid until the time the same is deducted from our subsidy. This is entirely opposed to the arrangement made between the Deputy Minister of the Interior and Messrs. Larivière and Harrison in 1887, when it was agreed that half yearly payments to the province will not be charged with the cost of making the selections until the lands have been vested in Her Majesty for the purpose of the province. In other words that the cost of selection should not be charged until the lands would be transferred.

Yet in the face of that distinct provision, the Dominion government have been charging up the cost of inspection of these lands which they still withhold from the province. The province submitted a very strong statement, on September 20 last, referring very fully to these claims. And no action has been taken, so far as we know, by the Dominion government in reference to this appeal. It was in regard to this matter that Mr. Roblin complained of receiving no reply, and not in regard to protests against the Kirchhoffer lease. Nor is this the only protest in regard to swamp lands, and claim that they should be handed over to the province of Manitoba. Similar protests were handed in by the Liberal provincial government, of which my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) was the head. I have here before me the copy of the report of the Executive Council, approved by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, November 5, 1906. In the course of this paper it is stated that on January 7, 1890, the Provincial Treasurer, Daniel H. McMillen, wrote the Deputy Minister of Finance as follows:

> I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 2nd instant, in-

closing two cheques for the sum of $211,-721.76, on account of subsidies due to the province of Manitoba, on January 1, 1890. We must again——

So it would seem that they protested prior to this.

—take exception to the way in which the province is being charged with the expenses of the Swamp Lands Commission before such lands have been vested in the province, also to the interest charged on such expenditure, and also to the effect that in no way are we shown details of what is included in such expenditure.

Still, the minister states that there is no grievance on the part of the people of Manitoba with this government concerning the way they have handled the swamp lands. Again, on January 9, 1889, a similar protest was addressed to Mr. Courtney by Mr. Smart, acting Provincial Treasurer. So we see that, time and again, both Liberal and Conservative governments in Manitoba, have filed protests with this government against its disposition of these swamp lands. Now, it appears that the Dominion government passed an order in council to grant this lease. But I am pleased to hear from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) that the lease has not been issued, and that he has responded to the very strong protest from the people of the province against issuing such a lease. But it will not do for him to try to hide behind the alleged precedent of the provincial government; for, as a matter of fact, if I understand the matter correctly, the Oak Point lease was granted to the Oak Point club by the Dominion government prior to the grant of the lease to Mr. Kirchhoffer. The Manitoba 'Free Press' wired its Ottawa correspondent to find out the conditions of the Oak Point lease, and he wired back that it had been granted for one year's time; and, on inquiry, he found that it had expired and had not, up to that time, been renewed. But, having been granted a year ago last fall, it was prior to the lease granted to Senator Kirchhoffer by the provincial government.

I do not think it is necessary for me to take up more time with this matter, as the Minister of the Interior has declared his intention of granting no leases of this character in the future. I am pleased to learn that, and I am sure that the people of Manitoba will be pleased also. In the first place, the Dominion government has no jurisdiction to lock up these lands for twenty-one years in the hands of a private individual. The minister seemed to find some satisfaction in stating that this lessee was not one of his own political friends. Then what was the influence which led to the passing of this unjustifiable order in council? It was the minister's wish, at any rate, to lock up these lands in the hands of Senator Kirchhoffer for a shooting preserve, with the power to shut out all other sportsmen of the province, who are as much entitled to shoot there as any private individual. The lease was to have been given for twenty years, subject, as the minister says, to the claims the province of Manitoba might put up. The lease granted by the province of Manitoba contained a provision that at any time, on giving thirty days' notice, the lease could be cancelled if the lands were required for homesteading purposes. The provincial government did not wait to have a committee wait upon them to protest. When the committee of protest waited upon the provincial government, they got a reply even before they made their request, that steps had been taken to cancel the lease. For the Dominion government to lock up lands that properly belong to the province and that, as swamp lands, should have been handed over, is a high-handed proceeding, and one that cannot be justified by any arguments of the Minister of the Interior.

CANADIAN FISHERIES—LICENSES TO AMERICAN FISHERMEN.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means, I would ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if he would be good enough to lay upon the table of the House the order in council which was quoted by my hon. friend from Comox-Atlin (Mr. Sloan) in his speech during the fisheries debate the other day? That hon. gentleman read a part of the order in council founded upon section 78 of the Audit Act, relating to the transhipment of fish from American bottoms to Boston through Canadian territory, stating that this order was to be carried out in accordance with rules and regulations made by the Minister of Customs. If the Prime Minister will make a note of that, and bring down to the House the order in council and a copy of the rules and regulations under which it is operated, it would be very useful to the House.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before you leave the Chair, I would like to direct the attention of the government to certain returns which have been moved for, a memorandum of which has been placed in my hands. These returns I understand have not yet been brought down; if any have been brought down, it must have been within the last two or three days. This memorandum was prepared two or three days ago. On the 28th of November I moved for a return of documents relating to lands granted to other than actual settlers. It was arranged privately with the Minister of the Interior that the return in the first instance should comprise only a list and not the documents themselves, because they are very voluminous. If the Minister of the

Interior will be good enough to forward as much as possible the production of that list, I would be very much obliged. On the same day, the 28th of November, I moved for a return of all documents relating to lands acquired for the purpose of constructing a round-house at Truro. On the same day the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved for a similar return with regard to land acquired in Halifax for the purpose of constructing a round-house; on the same day he also moved for a general return of documents relating to land acquired within a certain period at Halifax for the purposes of the Intercolonial. On the 10th of December the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) moved for a return of certain documents relating to a contract between the government and Mr. W. A. D. Lees, respecting the fencing of certain lands near Fort Saskatchewan. On the 17th of December I moved for a return of documents relating to a contract for the construction of a post office at Vancouver; also for a return of documents relating to the construction of an immigration building at Winnipeg; also for a return of documents relating to certain works at St. Andrew's; also for a return of documents relating to section B of the Transcontinental Railway. On the following day, the 18th of December, I moved for a return of documents relating to section F of the Transcontinental Railway; also for a return of documents relating to a post office at Winnipeg. I think it would expedite business if these returns were brought down at an early day.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). With respect to the return for all correspondence relating to lands at Halifax, that has been laid on the table. The return relating to Truro has not been brought down, because we have not received certain information from Moncton, but we hope to have it in a few days. The information asked for with respect to sections B and F—the one through New Brunswick, the other through a portion of Quebec, as I understand—that information is being prepared by the Transcontinental Commissioners; yesterday they informed me that they hoped to have it ready within two or three days. I may say that this information is very voluminous. It involves the preparation of plans and profiles, as I am informed by the officials of the Commission. I have asked them on two or three occasions to expedite the returns as much as possible, and they have assured me that they would. With these exceptions I think most of the returns asked for from the Department of Railways and Canals, have been furnished.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince Edward Island) Before you leave the Chair I desire to ask the government if they have any statement to make with regard to re-establishing cable communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and if any arrangement has been made by the Anglo-American Company for the government with the Marconi people for carrying on this work until a cable is prepared?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform my hon. friend that the Acting Minister of Public Works is attending to this matter, and will perhaps be in a position to make a communication on the subject in a few days.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

58. Rye, per bushel, 7 cents, 9 cents, 10 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is substantially the same as it was.

59. Rye flour, per barrel, 33 cents, 45 cents, 50 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the same.

60. Wheat, per bushel, 8 cents, 10 cents, 12 cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there any changes in any of these items?

Mr. FIELDING. No material change except that the intermediate tariff comes in between. The general tariff rate is in each case the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the preferential?

Mr. FIELDING. And the preferential except where it fluctuates by a little from what it was before.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Will the hon. minister explain why rye has been reduced from 20 to 10 cents?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reduction; it is 10 cents.

62. Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, free, free, free.

63. Rice cleaned per 100 pounds 50 cents, 65 cents, 75 cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a change.

Mr. FIELDING. We made raw rice free and reduced the duty on the manufactured article.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the duty before?

Mr. FIELDING. The old tariff rate on uncleaned rice was half a cent a pound.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When this duty was put on rice we were promised that certain mills would be established in Canada to clean rice. Have these mills been established?

Mr. PATERSON. There are only two, one in Montreal and one in Victoria, I think.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will they be able to continue in business with this on the free list?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, so we think.

Mr. FIELDING. The manufactured article is not on the free list. The raw material is on the free list; the manufactured article is reduced.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. If you look at page 48 of the index or schedule that has been put on the table you will see that rye is placed at 20 cents per bushel under the old rate.

Mr. FIELDING. That is item 58?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The old rate was 10 cents and the new rate is 10 cents. Has my hon. friend a book saying that it is 20 cents?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Yes, the index or schedule that was printed and distributed places it at 20 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case there has been an error.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On page 48 of the index submitted to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Customs Act it is ten cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it must be a mistake, because the preferential rate is given at 6⅔ cents a bushel and the general tariff rate as 20 cents a bushel.

Mr. FIELDING. It must be a misprint. There is no change.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the duty on cleaned rice before?

Mr. FIELDING. $1.25 per 100 in the general tariff; it is reduced to 75 cents and the 50 cents is taken off the raw material.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was this done?

Mr. FIELDING. It is an article largely consumed and the reduction is decidedly in the interest of the consumer.

64. Sago and tapioca, 17½ per cent, 25 per cent, 27½ per cent.

Mr. GANONG. Did you raise the duty on tapioca and sago in the interest of the consumer?

Mr. FIELDING. The general tariff was formerly 25, and the preferential tariff 16⅔.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you raise the tariff on these foods?

Mr. FIELDING. The article comes in to a very considerable extent under the preferential tariff and we thought 17½ per cent was moderately low.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was the general tariff raised from 25 per cent to 27½ per cent on sago and tapioca which are used particularly by the sick; was it for the sake of revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. This would give a little larger preference. The preferential duty was formerly 16⅔, and under the unit of 2½ which we have adopted, it would be either 15 per cent or 17½ per cent, and we made it 17½. The increase in the general tariff would turn a little more towards the preferential trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And in order to give the British exporter the best possible advantage you raised the general duty and then raised the preferential duty on the British exporter.

Mr. PATERSON. In many cases the general tariff was raised with a view of giving a greater preference.

Mr. GANONG. Don't you know they do not produce tapioca or sago in Great Britain.

Mr. PATERSON. But it is produced in countries which have the benefit of the preferential tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Which country are you trying to help?

Mr. PATERSON. We are trying to help ourselves and the British empire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a large statement.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says that the duty on this article of food has been increased to help the British exporter; are we to tax unnecessarily the food of our people to help any exporter. From what countries is sago and tapioca exported?

Mr. PATERSON. The straits settlement largely.

Mr. FOSTER. Is your object in raising the taxation on articles of food to help the straits settlements? It would seem to me that our legislation should primarily be for the benefit of the people of Canada. If you had left the general duty as it was before and made a greater difference in favour of the preferential country you would have been consistent. Is it the policy of the government to tax the food of Canadians in order to help some other country? In this case you have raised both the general duty and the preferential duty; you have taxed higher than it was before, an article of food that is not made in this country.

Mr. PATERSON. In this case the preferential tariff was the governing factor. The general tariff is governed by the preference and the preference is only increased to the extent of the difference between 16⅔ and 17½ which is a very moderate duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the principle the minister goes upon is that his first duty

is to look at what countries he shall help by giving them a preferential entrance into this market. And, having made up your minds that you want to help certain countries in that respect you then go to work and place the general tax upon articles which are imported into this country from that standpoint, is that it? I should have supposed that you would first put the tariff upon the articles that come into this country with prime reference to the needs of this country. Then when you cast about you to help a country that is favourable rather than unfavourable to us commercially you would fix the amount of the preferential duty so as to help the friendly country; but surely the minister is not going to say that he and the government that he represents takes as a principle in fixing their tariff any other principle than the necessities and the circumstances and the wants of Canada itself.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes we do, we do not hesitate to say that in the framing of this tariff there are many items in the tariff in which we thought that by increasing the preference that was given to Great Britain or the British colonies that enjoy the preference, we could, by increasing that preference, turn a trade which is now perhaps in the hands of our American friends or some other country, more largely in favour of countries to which we wish to extend the preference. That was only done in cases where you might expect a considerable competition to come from the British country or the colony that enjoyed it. It would not be done in agricultural implements because you would not get any agricultural implements likely from the old country and therefore the general tariff and its bearings had to be considered, but wherever you had an article in which there is competition and large competition, take textiles, or cottons, for instance, there if it was possible by increasing the preference to turn some of that trade to Great Britain instead of the United States having regard in all cases to our own needs and conditions, we were ready to do it. In many lines of articles we do that. That is where England was a competitor with the United States in an article, while we have in some cases raised the duty on the American article, we have not raised it, we have perhaps lowered it on the article coming from Great Britain, and the foreigner who is in competition with Great Britain has to lower his price; the consumer in Canada, instead of paying the full amount of the general tariff, pays a price which is governed by the British preferential tariff, as the foreigner will have to cut his price in order to meet the British competition. So we do not hesitate to say that that is one of the underlying principles of the tariff; where we can, consistently with our own interests, turn a trade from other countries in favour of Great Britain, we do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Now the minister runs off into by and forbidden paths. All he has been saying is just old porridge warmed up.

Mr. PATERSON. You cannot change truth, it is always just the same.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is a lot of truth which it is not necessary to go into now. He might enter into a disquisition on the movements of the planets,—it might be true.

Mr. PATERSON. This has a bearing on the matter under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. On the tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The movement of the planets?

Mr. PATERSON. The movement of the planets has about as much bearing on the question as the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is arguing that he wants to give a preference to the British countries that export to us sago and tapioca. Could he not do it as well by making his preferential tariff 15 per cent and keeping his general tariff at 25 per cent. Is it necessary for him to raise the tax on an article of food not made in this country in order to give the preferential advantage? Why does he adopt the double expedient of raising first the general tariff, making the tax higher and then raising the preferential tariff, making it higher? Does he not see that the easy road to accomplish what he is arguing for, is to make the duty no higher in the general tariff and to make the difference between the general and the preferential rate greater, let him make it 15 per cent instead of 17½ per cent? What reason is there in the world to tax sago and tapioca? Is it revenue he wants? He says he does not need revenue he is able to reduce the duty on rice and paddy, because he does not need the revenue. There you have a real reduction, and you keep the preference as well, and what reason is there to put the 25 per cent up to 27½ per cent and the 16⅔ per cent up to 17½ per cent, on an article of food that is not made here?

Mr. PATERSON. I have explained—

Mr. FOSTER—and if he will come down from the planets, and just attend to sublunary things here,—

Mr. PATERSON. With the duty at 25 per cent, and the preference 33⅓ per cent, the preferential tariff was 16⅔ per cent, was it not? In changing that to a specific figure going on the principle we have laid down of working on units of 2½ per cent, we had the option of taking either the 15 per cent that the hon. gentleman suggests or 17½ per cent. 17½ per cent was a great deal nearer 16⅔ per cent than 15 per cent would be and 17½ per cent being the governing rate, that would

make the general tariff 27½ per cent as I have explained before. We did not think that 17½ per cent was any appreciable addition to the taxation of the people in this respect, and we had given them a great many thousand dollars reduction in the article preceding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister has made it perfectly plain now and that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should not ask any more questions.

Mr. PATERSON. That is about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister explains that he has made the general tariff 27½ per cent, because the preferential tariff is 17½ per cent, and he has made the preferential tariff 17½ per cent because the general tariff is 27½ per cent. I do not think anything can be more clear or more cogent than that. I would like to ask one question. He says that the preferential tariff as a whole is more favourable to the British exporter ; has the government had any computation made as to whether the revenue upon imports from Great Britain under the preferential tariff would be larger or smaller upon the basis of last year's importations under this tariff or under the tariff as it existed before ?

Mr. PATERSON. My anticipation is they will be larger.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Larger under this tariff ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. We cannot tell until we have had the practical operation, but my judgment is that by the system we have adopted there will be extra trade thrown to Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister does not understand me. I say, let us take last year's imports from Great Britain, under the preferential tariff. You know what your revenue on that was under the tariff as it existed before. Would the revenue under this tariff on those same imports be larger or smaller than the revenue of last year?

Mr. PATERSON. That would depend on the quantity that comes in, does the hon. gentleman see the points?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am taking the quantity that did come in. I am asking the minister to apply the tariff to the quantities that did come in, not to some unknown quantity but to the quantities that actually did come in last year, and I want to know if the minister is able to tell whether or not this preferential tariff would yield more or less revenue than the preferential tariff as it existed before.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we have made no close computation on the line of my hon. friend's suggestion. On the whole, the difference in the preferential tariff is more favourable to Great Britain than before, that is leaving out the middle tariff.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the general tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. The preferential tariff was formerly about 16⅔ and now it is 17½ ; the general tariff was formerly 25 and now it is 27½, so that the result would be to turn the trade still more to the preferential countries. We have no close computation made on the lines indicated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have you any general computation ? It is not customary to make extensive changes without having some regard to the revenue to be derived. If this preferential tariff now being enacted had been in force last year, would you have got more or less revenue than you did under the preferential tariff then existing.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not answer that very definitely. Many of the changes are very slight, and it is quite impossible to make a close calculation. But even if it turned out that the amount collected would have been larger that would not prove that the change in the preferential was not favourable to Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not arguing that it would. On the contrary, the preference might be greater, if you still further increased the general tariff. That is obvious to any one who would give the matter a moment's consideration. But what I wanted to know was whether if this preferential tariff had been in force last year, would you have got more or less revenue.

Mr. FIELDING. I think on the whole a shade more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The people will pay more than last year.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a fractional increase, yes.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Did any individual, firm or delegation ask the government to have the tariff increased on this item ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not recollect any in particular. We were dealing with the 17½ rate as a fair one.

Mr. SPROULE. Theoretically speaking you had either to cut the rate down to 15 or raise it to 17. Why did you make it 17 instead of 15, when it was 16⅔ in the old tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that in this case the revenue considerations were in my mind. We made reductions on some things here and there and we had to protect the revenue. I do not remember any one in particular seeking an increase.

Mr. SPROULE. If the revenue was a consideration, the hon. minister was unfortunate in putting the increase on an article of food that cannot be produced either in

Great Britain or Canada, and therefore the increased must be paid.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that this is an article which should not have been chosen for an increase. It comes into general use, especially in the case of sick people, and this increase in duty is simply an addition to the burdens of the people, and an addition which is evidently not necessary for the purposes of revenue. It is an article which is not produced in this country or even in England. Under the circumstances, the government should reconsider their decision and reduce the duty rather than increase it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister be kind enough to give us the total imports of tapioca and sugar last year and the duty received ?

Mr. FIELDING. Tapioca, the total imports were 2,079,067 pounds, value $54,318. Those were the imports for home consumption. Of that quantity there came from the United States 205,635 pounds, value $8,273. From Great Britain the imports were to the value of $14,720, and from the British East Indies, $31,192.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of duty was collected ?

Mr. FIELDING. $9,955.73. It is not a very large item. In reply to my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr), I would say that if we were increasing all along the line, he would be right. But here and there he will find these fractional differences, taking the form of a reduction in some cases and in others of an increase. And in this instance the difference will be so very slight that outside the discussion in the House no one will ever discuss it.

65. Biscuits, not sweetened, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. The general tariff rate remains the same. The preferential tariff before was 16⅔. We reduced it to 15.

Mr. BARR. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has an interest in that.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, he is a most patriotic man. He is reducing the rate of duty on a competitor.

Mr. BARR. In order to sell more.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are no biscuits imported in any large quantity.

Mr. PATERSON. There are biscuits imported.

Mr. GANONG. This must be very gratifying to our poor biscuit manufacturers. This is an instance in which the government have reduced the preference, but they have kept the general tariff up because the only country the biscuit manufacturers are afraid of is that which comes under the general tariff. Of biscuits not sweetened, only $37.000 worth are imported from Great Britain whereas from the United States we import $200,000 worth. This is an illustration of the manner in which the tariff is adjusted. Where there is no possible danger of competition, the government reduces the preference and take credit for the reduction, but where there is a possibility of a large import they keep up the old tariff against that country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What amount of biscuits sweetened and not sweetened were imported last year from the United States and Great Britain ?

Mr. FIELDING. The quantity of unsweetened biscuits imported was 271,761 pounds, of the value of $18,220. Duty, $4,190.84. The import of biscuits of all kinds sweetened was 250,245 pounds ; value, $35,551. Duty, $7,103.53.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they come from Great Britain ?

Mr. FIELDING. Of the biscuits unsweetened, $4,409 worth came from Great Britain, and something over $12,924 from the United States. Of the sweetened, $29,241 came from Great Britain, and $4,670 from the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. That bears out very well what the hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) says.

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all ; the preference on the sweetened is reduced as well as on the unsweetened.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much is it reduced ?

Mr. FIELDING. Formerly the sweetened were 18⅓ per cent, and now reduced to 17½ per cent under the preference.

Mr. HENDERSON. A reduction of about ⅙ of one per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and increases at about the same rate.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are all changes.

67. Macaroni and vermicelli, per one hundred pounds, 75 cents, $1, $1.25.

Mr. FIELDING. That has been changed foom an ad valorem to a specific duty. It was 25 per cent, with ⅓ off under the preference.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the reason for the change to the specific duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. The customs authorities found that it was very difficult to fix the value. And, I must say, that, in the case of articles of food I perfer the specific duties, as they tend to the importation of pure goods.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the uncompromising hostility to specific duties is also undergoing a change.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know about the change, but I think, that in the case of food products, there is much to be said in favour of specific duties, on the ground that I have just suggested.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) has professed himself a protectionist, and we know that specific duties are admirable, from this point of view, as against ad valorem duties. The hon. gentleman is quite consistent in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is a change.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, well, this is a world of change.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Is this an increase, or a decrease, taking last year's value ?

Mr. FIELDING. The calculation was made with a view to giving us about the same duty and we think that on the present value of the goods, the duty is about the same as before.

69. Hay and straw, per ton, $1.65, $1.75, $2.

Mr. BARR. Is this an increase or a decrease ?

Mr. FIELDING. Straw was formerly unenumerated, and therefore, came in at 20 per cent. We have now classed it with hay. That is the only change.

Mr. BARR. You have increased the preference ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not imported from Great Britain.

Mr. ELSON. The duty on hay and straw has been too low. We export 68,500 tons to the United States and they charge us $4 a ton. We import from them about 7,025 tons. It seems to me that the duties should be more equal.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How much do we import ?

Mr. FIELDING. Last year we imported $99,000 worth of hay, and we exported about $1,500,000, of which $449,549 worth went to the United States.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. At what points in Canada do we import United States hay ? In the mining sections I suppose ?

Mr. FIELDING. Largely at British Columbia points, undoubtedly, for the mines.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What ad valorem would this $2 a ton represent on the valuation of last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. On the imports of last year it would amount to about 14 per cent.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I suppose that there are farmers in the Dominion who would like to have protection in their own market. Why should not they have the benefit of a higher rate than 15 per cent ? That duty does not compare at all with other duties, whether protective or revenue duties. Take the item of sago, at 27½ per cent. That is an article of food. Why should hay have only 15 per cent ?

Mr. FIELDING. The duty is a moderate one. I fancy that the miner and the lumberman, to whom this is an important item, might not be so anxious for an increase as the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith).

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But the same would apply to sago.

Mr. FIELDING. But hay is more important to the miner than sago.

70. Flax seed, free, free, free.

71. Seeds of timothy and clover, 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent.

72. Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing over one pound each, 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent.

73. Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, hemp, canary and millet seed, when in packages weighing one pound each or less, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Items allowed to stand.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Can the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) tell us when items 72 and 73 will come up for discussion ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are passing over a number of items that will be brought up at a later stage. I can not now indicate the exact date, but there will be ample opportunity for discussion.

76. Seed peas and seed beans, from the United Kingdom, free.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the United Kingdom mentioned in this item ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is the item as it has been for years, and we have not changed it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for it ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it must have been an early suggestion of a preferential tariff.

78. Florist stock, viz.: palms, ferns, rubber plants (Ficus), gladiolus, cannas, dahlias and paeonias, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Many of these articles were not enumerated in the tariff before. Being unenumerated they fell into the 20 per cent class, and we give them in the tariff at the rate they are mentioned. So with palms, they were formerly free and we have included them in the dutiable list. Some representations were made to us on that point, regarding them more or less as an article of luxury. They are not grown in Canada.

79. Florists stock, viz.: azaleas, rhododendrons, pot grown lilacs, araucarias, bulbs

corms, tubers, rhizomes and dormant roots, n.o.p.; seedling stock for grafting, viz.: plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees, free, free, free.

Mr. FIELDING. One or two items are included. There is no change with regard to bulb, corms, tubers, rhizomes and arancarias—also seedling stock. The other items which are now made free were formerly classed as unenumerated and chargeable at 20 per cent. We now include them in a group which is made free.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. There is one article that should be included in this classification and that is rose stock. They are used in exactly the same way as plums, pears, &c. I do not suppose the whole duty would be $50 a year. I think they should be in the same list.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know offhand any objection to the hon. gentleman's suggestion. Still we would like to consider that suggestion, and we will let the item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister might also think a little about 78. Is there any reason why you should make a division between 78 and 79? They are both florists' stock. In all cases they are not indigenous to this country. You have azaleas and rhododendrons, free; but when ferns or palms come in, which are very commonly distributed, and the importation of which I think we ought to encourage because of their beauty, I do not see any reason why they should be made dutiable at 25 per cent while the others are made free. You have bulbs, tubers, corms and dormant roots of all kinds free; but when you come to gladiolus, cannas, dahlias and paeonias, you make them 25 per cent. It is desirable to cultivate a taste for flowers, and the beauty of gardens in our country, and the minister knows that these tastes are not confined to rich people, as the humbler classes develop a fondness for flowers, and the more such fondness is developed the better. Beautiful flowers are productive of good taste, good morals, they are elevating influences in every respect. I wish the minister would think that over. I do not think he could put it on the ground of their being luxuries. A poor woman in her humble cottage is just as fond of having a fern or a palm as she is of having other flowers. I do not see the reason of making a division between articles that are of the same class.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken if he thinks that none of these things are produced in Canada. Representations were made to us by an organization called, I think, the Canadian Horticultural Association, that to a considerable extent these things are produced in Canada. We endeavoured to give effect to some extent to the wishes of that association, perhaps we did not give them everything they wanted. But the division here made was to a considerable extent made upon their representations. The impression my hon. friend might have that these things are all imported and not produced in Canada, is, I think, incorrect.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I may say that generally the things mentioned in 78 are commonly grown in Canada, while those mentioned in 79 are not so commonly grown.

80. Trees, n.o.p., and teasels, free, free, free.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What do you mean by trees not otherwise provided?

Mr. FIELDING. N. O. P. would mean any trees not specifically mentioned in any other part of the tariff.

81. Trees, viz.: apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds, each, 2 cents, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister state what quantity of these articles were imported last year?

Mr. FIELDING. About $16,000.

85. Tomatoes, fresh, per 100 pounds, 50 cents, 65 cents, 75 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. The old tariff was a mixed one, 20 cents per bushel and 10 per cent, the preferential being one-third off. It was a compound duty, and we have made it a specific duty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. With the object of giving the Canadian raiser some protection?

Mr. FIELDING. For the convenience of the customs to some extent, but also for the advantage of the Canadian importer. It is somewhat higher.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I take it that this is an increase.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it is an increase.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I might say to the minister that in the raising of tomatoes a great deal of capital is engaged, both in the neighbourhood of Toronto and of Montreal, and throughout the Niagara peninsula, raising early tomatoes under glass. Canadian gardeners are doing fairly well, but the expenditure is very large, and they would like to see a reasonable measure of protection accorded to them, inasmuch as the minister has recognized the principle of protection. If we recognize the principle of protection it ought to apply to all classes. The market gardeners are a large class. They pay duty on all the things they require. I was at their meeting and heard them contend—and I believe they contended with a good argument—that they were entitled to just as much protection as any other class in the community. Up to the present time the market gardeners have been ignored and I do not think it is fair, when we have accepted the principle of protection, that it

should not be generally applied to all the industries or to most of the industries, and I certainly believe that one interest should not be ignored as has been the case largely in regard to market gardeners. I would like the hon. minister to state how far he has gone in this revision of the tariff in the way of recognizing the claims of the market gardeners to a reasonable amount of protection.

Mr. FIELDING. There are some increases.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree with my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). This is an item in which the market gardeners, particularly of the province of Ontario, are interested, and as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will remember several deputations waited upon the government with respect to this matter and made a specific request to the government. They have been awaiting with considerable patience the general revision of the tariff and I think it would be only fair if the hon. Minister of Finance would state to the committees what these increases amount to. It does seem that the increases are so very trifling that it is difficult to figure them out. It seems to be rather a task for the minister himself. I think it would be fair to the committee and to the government that he should state what increases have been made in the interest of the market gardeners.

Mr. FIELDING. A specific duty, of course, will vary in ad valorem according to the price of the article, but it is a substantial increase. I could not give the hon. gentleman the exact amount of the increase, but I do not think that the growers of tomatoes will complain. I think perhaps we gave them a larger advance than some other interests that came before us.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the average price on the importation?

Mr. FIELDING. The officials tell me that on the fair average of last year the duty was about 20 per cent and now it will run to about 30 per cent. That is a rough approximate statement.

Mr. FOSTER. About 20 per cent ?

Mr. FIELDING. Equivalent to that, and it will now be about equal to 30 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. On what price?

Mr. FIELDING. Normal prices.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN Would the hon. minister tell us what the importation of tomatoes is at this time of the year or for the next three or four months? There are importations of tomatoes from Bermuda and Florida coming into competition with the hot-house tomatoes of the gardeners of Toronto and Montreal and this rate of 75 cents per 100 pounds is a very small protection for them. This is the kind of article that they desire protection against and under these circumstances could the duty not be imposed in such a way as to vary with the season? It might be a very much larger duty at this time of the year. You would in that way be taxing a luxury and at the same time be giving encouragement and protection to an industry in which there is a very great deal of capital at present engaged.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give my hon. friend the importation at a particular season. I would have to make a special inquiry as our blue-books do not give it. The idea of imposing one duty at one season of the year and another duty at another has something in its favour, but it would involve a serious departure from the principle upon which we have heretofore dealt with these matters. I think the tomato grower has been placed in a substantially better position than that which he has hitherto occupied. I rather think he will be well content with this duty—better content than lots of interests that did not get quite all they wanted. I said that this would probably amount to 30 per cent. That figure may be somewhat high. The rate was 19 or 20 per cent and this will probably be between 25 and 30 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister is anxious, I presume, to please the producers of tomatoes in this country, but I do not think he will be well sustained in the statement he has made, because he will remember that when the market gardeners waited upon the government they made a specific request that 5 cents a pound be placed on tomatoes imported into Canada. When my hon. friend states that they will be well pleased with 75 cents per 100 pounds I do not think he is doing them justice. For myself I think the duty is not at all sufficient and I beg to assure the minister that I do not think the producers of tomatoes will be at all satisfied with this very slight increase. It will be very disappointing to them. If there is one article that the market gardeners and farmers can produce in abundance, I think it is tomatoes. I am quite sure that the minister should give this matter more specific attention. I do not think he will venture to say that any of the market gardeners, during the tour of the ministers seeking information upon the tariff, stated that this small increase would suit them or would be sufficient to comply with the demand they made one or two years ago.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the weight of a bushel of tomatoes?

Mr. BLAIN. Sixty pounds. The producers of tomatoes in this country, I am sure, are prepared to produce all the tomatoes that the Canadian people can consume and a great many more. When the

hon. gentleman is giving us protection on every hand in this tariff and when the old free trade principles are abandoned. I think he should see to it when an article can be produced in abundance and at a price which is not at all exorbitant, at a price which meets the approval of the consuming public, that this article has a protection that will guarantee a larger investment, as my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out, in this important industry. I am sure that if a specific duty of 5 cents per pound were placed on tomatoes it would enable the Canadian people to procure at a reasonable price their whole supply from the crop of tomatoes grown in our own country.

Mr. FIELDING. If I am open to the charge of being a protectionist my hon. friend will have to do me the justice of saying that I am not a protectionist to the extent of 5 cents a pound on tomatoes. Five cents a pound would be equal to $3 per bushel on an article which costs all the way from 25 cents a bushel up to $2.50. One of my officials says that it will be $5 per bushel. Five cents a pound or $3 a bushel on an article of that kind is a pretty stiff duty.

Mr. BLAIN. What about an intermediate point if that is too high?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is rather remonstrating that I have not given the tomato growers all they ask. Perhaps the tomato growers, like most other people, asked a little more than they expected to receive.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the hon. minister would adopt the principle I suggested he would have to recognize the seasons of the year and alter his tariff accordingly. The protection which the Canadian tomato growers ask to-day is against the early tomatoes from the southern states coming here in competition with the tomatoes they raise under glass in this country. If you could give a 5 cent a pound duty on that class of vegetable, say during these months and up to the 1st of June, you would give a substantial protection to something raised in Canada and something which is a luxury.

Mr. BLAIN. None would come in under that duty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. None would come in afterwards. This industry of growing tomatoes under glass in Canada ought to get more encouragement than this proposed tariff gives it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The new tariff is 75 cents per 100, which equals 45 cents per bushel. The old tariff was 20 cents per bushel and 10 cents ad valorem. What our market gardeners have to fear is the early spring competition when prices are high, and in the case of that competition the government proposes actually to give Canadian market gardeners less protection than under the old tariff. Taking tomatoes in the early spring as worth $3 a bushel, they would pay 50 cents duty under the old tariff, but only 45 cents under the new. When the Minister of Finance states that he is giving the market gardeners increased protection on tomatoes he states what is not correct, and I call on my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) to corroborate my statement.

Mr. LANCASTER. Seeing that the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) does not respond, I wish to say a word. The Minister of Finance is willing to be called a protectionist with certain mental reservations, but I think he ought to be an 'adequate' protectionist where the industries of this country are concerned. The demand of the tomato-growers was not unreasonable, and therefore to give them less than one-sixth of what they have asked is not meeting their request in such a way as to inspire them with any thankfulness to the government. Coming from the Niagara peninisula, where this industry is extensively carried on, I have a particular interest in it. Those engaged in the industry have to meet competition in the early spring market from our neighbours across the line. Then it is that they need protection and not when tomatoes are grown in the open air in abundance and are sold cheaply. It is not a simple question of planting the tomatoes and letting them grow in the sunshine; it is an industry which requires care and skill to cultivate under glass, coupled with the fact that the milder climate of the Niagara district forces the tomato to maturity earlier than in other places in Canada. Protection is therefore asked for an industry which requires skill, labour and capital. We might just as well be frank about this, and let it be known that there is no increased protection to the tomato-grower in the proposition made by the government. The tariff is practically as inadequate as it was before, and the tomato-grower of the Niagara peninsula will have nothing to thank the government for. As a consumer, I think it proper that those engaged in the industry should have greater protection than the government is now offering them.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is that when they need protection it is not given them by this change in the tariff. At $2.50 per bushel the protection under the old tariff, and the protection under the new tariff would be exactly the same. When tomatoes are more than $2.50 per bushel, the new protection would be less than under the old tariff, and when they are cheaper than $2.50 the protection would be greater. At the very time when protection counts and when tomatoes are produced at greater pains and cost by Canadian gardeners, when protection is needed by them to obtain the Canadian market, protection is not

given under this proposal of the government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. For my part, I think the duty proposed is far too small. The cultivation of tomatoes is an extensive and a growing industry; it employs a large amount of labour; it requires considerable capital, and it can be profitably prosecuted in this country. The government should consider these facts and give greater protection. Protection is needed when tomatoes are a luxury and the price high, and when Canadian grown tomatoes come into competition in the market with those grown in the United States under more favourable conditions. As I have said, this industry can be prosecuted with great advantage to our people, especially in the Niagara peninsula and in the neighbourhood of Toronto and Montreal, and if the duty were increased it would be very beneficial. In fact, I would make the duty double what it is to-day. It is an industry which should be encouraged. The placing of a larger duty upon tomatoes would not have the effect of increasing the price to the consumer except at certain seasons of the year, for at other times there is an abundance of tomatoes at a cheap price. Therefore it is, I say, that in order to encourage this industry, the duty should be at least double that which is proposed.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The proposal of the government is that the duty on tomatoes shall be 75 cents per 100 pounds, which is equal to 45 cents per bushel. Under the old tariff the duty was 20 cents per bushel and 10 per cent ad valorem. Last year 51,000 bushels were imported at a value of $116,000. That would be equivalent to 23 cents per bushel and 20 cents per bushel specific duty, making 43 cents a bushel on last year's importation, and the new tariff would make the duty 45 cents a bushel, so that the government proposes the immense increase in the duty of 2 cents per bushel. It seems to me that when the Finance Minister estimated it had increased from 20 to 30 per cent there must have been some error. Those are the figures from the Trade and Navigation returns. They indicate practically no increase, but a stationary condition. I agree with the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) that this is an industry that requires a greater protection than the small amount we have on it at the present time. The large quantities now imported can be grown in Canada as well as elsewhere, and I think the suggestion to double the duty is not out of the way.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course if you take the extremes of price, high or low, you can make a special case, but if you take the usual price of these articles I think it will be found that there is a substantial increase. For example if you take the low price, 25 cents per bushel—and I am told it is not uncommon to have tomatoes as low as 25 cents—the old duty was 22 cents, but now it will be 45 cents on that. There is a considerable increase. It is only when you get into the high price that the duty seems to be a small one. Take 50 cents—and there are great quantities of tomatoes sold in Canada at that price—the duty under the old tariff was 25 cents; under the new tariff it will be 45 cents; there is a large increase there. Then take it at $1—and there are considerable quantities of tomatoes that come in here which are worth $1—at the old rate, that was 30 cents, but now it is 45 cents; there is an increase there. Carry the price to $2. At the old rate it was 40 cents per bushel, at the new it is 45 cents; so it is only when you get to the higher priced tomatoes that the argument applies.

Mr. LANCASTER. And it is only against the very high priced tomatoes that we want protection.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend says he wants these duties only on the high priced tomatoes. The proposal is to make it 5 cents a pound or $3 a bushel. That would make it apply to the low priced too.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not if you adopt the principle of seasons. If you adopt that principle you would meet the case and meet the view of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) only I would advocate that it should be more substantial than 5 cents a pound in that case, and if that applied to the months up to the 1st of July it would give a substantial protection to a large industry, an industry that is worthy of protection and an industry that pays its portion of the taxation of this country to-day. The market gardeners pay taxes on everything they use and they are the only section of the community who have no protection in this country. Why should we discriminate against them? I have tried to argue that before, and I never could get an answer from any one. The market gardener, the farmer, the manufacturer is protected, nearly every industry is protected, there is just this one class, and there is no man in this country who works harder than the market gardener. I have hundreds of them in my constituency and I know their condition and I know the view they take, and the same thing applies to Centre York, and to some constituencies around Montreal and Hamilton. These men work hard, very hard. They pay their portion of the general taxation. They do not complain of the recognition of the principle of protection but they ask for a reason why they and their industry alone are excluded from the benefit of protection by the tariff.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The actual position according to the Trade and Navigation returns is as follows: We imported 51,475 bushels of tomatoes and the duty collected on these was $21,943. With 45 cents pro-

tection as is given at the present time the total amount collected on that same number of bushels would be $23,162.75. The difference between the old tariff and this on the same amount of goods coming into the country would amount to only $1,113.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Under last year's importations it would be only 21 per cent. That is a small duty for an article like this which is a luxury when we have so many items in the tariff that are no more entitled to protection having 30 per cent and 35 per cent in fact many of them do not require protection at all, but are articles not grown in this country. While this duty was only equal to 21 per cent and I have shown that the increase is scarcely anything, being not more than 22 per cent or 23 per cent, under the new tariff. I cannot understand the argument of the Minister of Finance in suggesting that we take certain values for tomatoes, the prices that prevail in this country at various times. I always understood that the duty was levied on the price of the article imported, and if we take the duty on the prices of the articles imported last year we get a result of only 21 per cent. I don't think the market gardeners will be at all satisfied with such a small duty.

Mr. LANCASTER. In addition to benefiting the tomato-grower, the increase in this duty will help other industries, as every tomato-grower, if protected in the growing of tomatoes under glass for the early market, will have to build hot-houses at considerable expense and this will make work for masons, carpenters, and glaziers, and call for the use of steam pipe, and other materials, in the erection of very expensive buildings, so that it will benefit all the people interested in building. All mechanics will get the benefit of this protection, in addition to the tomato-grower himself being able to compete with the Americans and build up his industry.

Mr. CLEMENTS. This question should be considered seriously before the item is passed. I come from a district where a great deal of garden stuff is grown and I realize its importance. I am glad that I can for once agree with my hon. friend for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) I think it would be a great injustice to the market gardeners if they were not given more protection than is proposed by the present schedule. I know that in my district they have complained bitterly of the small duty and I sincerely trust the government will take this into consideration, and will increase the duty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The value of the tomatoes coming into Canada was $116,934, while the actual increase on the same amount of goods only amounts to $1,113; therefore it is not 1 per cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In view of the opinions that have been expressed in reference to this duty, I would ask if the government could not see their way to let this item stand over. It is an important matter, one affecting the interest of the people of Ontario to a very large extent; it is an industry that ought to be encouraged, and if the duty was largely increased I think it would be a benefit to the people of Canada. Only for a very short time of the year, when these tomatoes are a luxury, would it increase the price to the consumer, and we all know that at that particular season of the year the quantity that is consumed by the ordinary family is so small that even twice the duty would amount to only a mere bagatelle. If we can, without increasing, in the main, the cost of these products to the consumer, at the same time largely increase the prosperity of those engaged in this industry and largely extend the industry, it certainly would be in the interest of the people to do so. I do not know of any industry more capable of development or in which greater development has taken place, or with regard to which the climate and soil are better adapted for production. As has been said, the market gardeners are a class of people who bear a large share of the burdens of taxation. They are engaged largely in cultivating small farms.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They pay $15 a year rent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; and they cultivate five, or six, or ten acres, on which they employ more labour than an ordinary farmer will on 100 or 200 acres. If we can, by largely increasing the duties on this particular article, greatly encourage its production, it surely is the duty of the government and parliament to reconsider the matter, and I hope that the hon. minister will allow the item to stand over for further consideration, and that, after hearing the views of hon. members on both sides, he will at least double the present duty.

Mr. FIELDING. Most of us were under the impression that a market gardener living close to a city was better situated and better off than a farmer who lived miles away from a railway, but that appears now to be a substantial disadvantage. When the prices are low, of course, the duty at the present rate would be very high, but when the prices run to very high figures the duty would not be out of the way. I have no objection to allow the item to stand, but would like to have a return showing the different valuations at different seasons of the year. If we could make a scale which would impose heavier duties when the prices are higher and not burden the consumer when the prices are lower, we might accomplish the object which those who advocate an increase have in view.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. When the price is low, we do not require protection.

Mr. FIELDING. If an article cost 25 to 50 cents and you have a duty of 45 cents a bushel, you have a good duty.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Company—Mr. Campbell.

EARTHQUAKE IN JAMAICA—MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :—

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the fiscal period of nine months ending March 31, 1907.

For aid to sufferers by the recent earthquake and fire in the island of Jamaica, $50,000.

And in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House, Ottawa,
21st January, 1907.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the message of His Excellency, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

On item 85,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In speaking on this item of tomatoes before six o'clock, I neglected to use a word which I have used before, and which I think applies to the case. I wish to say that in some things we ought to have a flexible tariff, and this is one of them. I hope the minister will seriously consider the proposal of adopting a flexible tariff, based either on climate or geography, in order to apply the principle of protection in connection with this special article, as well as on some others that may occur.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some of us had the impression that we had enough tariff already. We have a general tariff, an intermediate tariff, a British preferential tariff, a surtax, and several others ; and now the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) wants to introduce a flexible tariff. I am afraid that before we get through with this tariff it will be so complex that even the Minister of Finance himself will scarcely be able to understand it. However, when the question comes up again we will no doubt get a better definition of what is meant by a flexible tariff. As the time was cut short by the arrival of six o'clock when we were dealing with this question, I will express my opinion now with regard to the duty on tomatoes. I am not at all alarmed that an increased duty, even as high as suggested by the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell), or even higher, would have any material effect in unduly increasing the price of tomatoes. When tomatoes are high priced in the spring of the year, they are only purchased in small quantities, and by wealthy people. No one thinks of buying a bushel of tomatoes at that time of the year. Tomatoes are sold in larger quantities later on, but principally by the pound in the early part of the year. Now, all the difference it would make by adding another three-quarters of a cent per pound on a purchase of two or three or four pounds, would only amount to three or four cents, and would not be felt by almost any family. I think the government would be justified in putting a very high duty on tomatoes in order to warrant those who grow them putting a much larger area of land under glass, and thus be able to supply from Canadian sources the demand for tomatoes in the early season of the year. Unless the market is assured to the growers of tomatoes, it is not very likely that they will go to the expense of putting a much larger area under glass in order to produce early tomatoes. I believe a higher duty would encourage them to do so, and in that way, if not in the immediate future, in a couple of years, I am convinced that we would get tomatoes in the early season of the year just as cheaply as we get them now by importing them from the other side.

86. Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, n.o.p., the weight of the can or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, per pound, 1 cent, 1¼ cents, 1½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. I want to insert a word there for better definition, namely, 'air tight' before the word 'packages.' The duty is the same as before.

Mr. MARSHALL. There are times when we can sell tomatoes on the other side of the line. Their duty is 2 cents a pound, or 72 cents per dozen, while we only impose a duty of 48 cents. It seems to me a hardship that while they can come in here with their tomatoes by paying 48 cents, we have to pay a duty of 72 cents to get into their market. I would ask the minister if he does not think that is a hardship. That applies to all canned goods. There are times when the crop is short on the other side, and when we have a plentiful crop and can ship goods

to them. But more frequently American goods are shipped here. So far as the canners are concerned, they are well pleased with the tariff on canned goods. I merely mention this item in particular in which it seems a hardship that we cannot get into their market on more equal terms.

Mr. FIELDING. There is some force in what the hon. gentleman says, it is a hardship. But that argument might apply to other things. When Americans send wool goods into Canada they have to pay 35 per cent, and when we send wool goods into the United States we are taxed 100 per cent. Yet we should not draw from that state of facts the conclusion that we should adopt the American tariff. The argument might be used as well on other lines of goods as in regard to the line to which the hon. gentleman refers. The duty is a moderately high one as we have it now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now that the minister has raised this argument, I am not afraid to say that as regards the Americans who are our rivals in the production of many things, I am a firm believer in tariff for tariff, and if they put a high tariff on our goods we ought to meet them with a reciprocity in tariffs. We are coming to that more and more, and there is hope for the Minister of Customs; he is coming around to be a protectionist; he is glorifying at times in the fact that he is a protectionist, and in a little while I hope to see him justifying the doctrine that the best way of dealing with the Americans is to adopt a reciprocity of tariffs. When we come to that, the Canadian manufacturer will have control of his own market, and the Americans will be induced to treat us fairly. The principle of our tariff ought to be to compel fair trade on the part of other nations toward us, and if others choose to put a high tariff against our goods we ought not to be afraid to put a high tariff against theirs.

87. Vegetables n.o.p., 15 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What vegetables are not included in this item besides tomatoes?

Mr. FIELDING. There are a number of vegetables not specifically mentioned which bear separate rates of duty. Melons are provided for separately.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This is an increase of 5 per cent?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand from the minister's definition of this item that cabbage would be included under the name of vegetables. Now, in the American tariff there is a specific rate for cabbage of three cents each. To my mind 25 per cent on an article like cabbage is altogether too low a duty. In the early season of the year I have noticed in the city of Ottawa at any rate that we have to pay a very high price indeed for cabbage. I have inquired of grocers on Sparks street and I found them asking 20 or 25 cents for a single head of cabbage, and that not a very big one. Certainly the price was not raised to 20 or 25 cents by reason of the duty of 25 per cent, and I do not think it would be raised any higher even if we made them 3 cents each. At that season of the year we practically have no cabbage to offer. But if we are going to adopt the policy of the hon. member for South York, that of tariff for tariff, and if this tariff is intended to produce revenue, I think we might as well have a little more revenue out of it, and put cabbage on an equality with the American tariff. It does seem ridiculous to allow the Americans to have a tariff of three cents when we only have less than one.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister mention some of the items that would be included under this special tariff of vegetables?

Mr. FIELDING. Asparagus, cabbage, celery, cucumbers—there are a number of others not specifically mentioned in the schedule which the hon. gentleman has in his hands.

Mr. BLAIN. When the market gardeners approached the government on this question they specified all these articles, mentioning what duty they wanted imposed by the government on each article. I cannot understand why the government would select a special article such as tomatoes and put a specific duty upon them, excluding other items such as asparagus, spinach, cabbage, &c. Why not, as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) points out, make a specific tariff for these items in order to encourage their production by a new tariff. I think that would be in the interest of the people. There should be a specific duty upon all these items that we can produce in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The American tariff does not specify these things at all, it groups a number of them together. It specifies some, but on the whole it does not specify any more than we do.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What was the importation of celery from the United States last year?

Mr. FIELDING. Celery is not reported separately in the books.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is an article the competition in which our market gardeners feel keenly. There are sections in Michigan and California where they have made great progress in the growth of celery and gradually the Canadian market is being flooded with celery from these states. I agree with what has just been said that there ought to be a specific duty on this article of celery. I think the minister, in

as much as he has held over the question of tomatoes, might also hold over this item with the object of seeing whether he cannot put it along with others in a specific duty column and give more protection to the Canadian gardeners, especially on that article of celery.

Mr. FIELDING. The duty on celery in the United States, if that helps my hon. friend in forming a judgment, is 25 per cent; so that we are not only having a reciprocity of tariffs on that but we have out-Heroded Herod. I am afraid, I think the increase which has been made is one which the market gardeners will accept as not a full compliance with their request but as a reasonable effort to meet their wishes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to urge upon the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he place more duty upon celery as we have in my riding some 35 acres of celery every year. I can assure the hon. minister that the producers of celery feel that they are at a disadvantage by reason of American celery coming in and taking the market from them. I would be very glad if the minister would consider this request and give celery a little more duty.

Mr. BLAIN. The specific requests of the market gardeners in reference to these items were as follows: asparagus, 3 cents per pound, cabbage, 3 cents each, cauliflowers 3 cents each, celery 35 cents per dozen, green cucumbers 20 cents per dozen, spinach 35 cents par bushel. These, I understand the minister to say, are the items that would come under the special legislation under discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. I think so.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me that the government are too careful; they change the tariff a little here and there. When there are articles that can be produced by the Canadian farmers and market gardeners I think the government should make a high tariff so that the farmers and market gardeners would have an opportunity of investigating largely, feeling that they had secured their own market in Canada even if they do not have an opportunity of reaching the market of the United States. The policy of changing the tariff so slightly that it becomes a question of discussion whether it is an increase at all or not is in my opinion a mistake. I think the hon. minister should make a greater effort to meet the wishes of the market gardeners than he has in the very slight change he has made in these articles.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend will find—I would not like to say in every case without examination, but in most cases—that the scale of duties which he seems to approve of is higher than the highly protective duties of the United States. He does not want that. Would he have on Canadian celery a protective duty higher than the United States duty on celery? I believe that our celery is good enough to stand on its own merits and hold its own. I have more faith in our Canadian celery than the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. BLAIN. Whether the duty in the United States is less or more my idea of the tariff is that where we have an article such as celery and these other articles to which I have referred that can be grown successfully in Canada, the duty of the government is to put a high duty upon them and give the farmers and market gardeners an opportunity of entering into the general production of these articles. I have no fears about the cost to the consumer. There will always be sufficient competition in these articles to give them to the consumer at a proper price. The consumers will not be charged more than they should be paying for these articles.

Mr. FIELDING. If they are not going to give the farmer a better price what is the good of the increased duty?

Mr. BLAIN. What I say is that the increased duty will give the whole Canadian market to the Canadian farmer.

Mr. FIELDING. At a higher price.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say so. I say that there would be sufficient competition among the Canadian farmers themselves to satisfy the consumer in Canada and the consuming public would have no grievance against the farmer or against the government. On all these articles that are consumed by the Canadian people and that can be grown on Canadian farms it is the duty of the government to put such a duty as will allow the Canadian farmer to supply our own market.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a new doctrine—prohibition.

Mr. MARSHALL. We are packers of vegetables, amongst them being asparagus, but we are not packing this particular vegetable largely for the simple reason that we cannot get the farmer or gardener to grow it. Our contract with the farmers last year was ten cents a pound. We cannot pay the farmer more and compete with the Americans. We would pay them 12 or 15 cents a pound if we were protected, but as it is we cannot pay more. American asparagus is shipped in at a price with which we cannot compete even when we pay the price that we did last year. The growers claim that they cannot grow asparagus profitably at ten cents a pound. This is a vegetable that should be canned in large quantities as a large business might be done in it. It is an article that is demanded by the buyers and I hope that the hon. minister will see his way to raise the duty on asparagus.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think there is a good deal in what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in reference to the duties on vegetables. There is no doubt that we in Canada can raise all the vegetables that are required, and it is also a fact that if we did so it would be a benefit to us. It would stimulate the industry, it would give more employment to labour, it would benefit those engaged in it, and I believe that it would give the market gardeners the market without at the same time enhancing the value of the stuff to the consumers. While it is true the duty on vegetables going into the United States is only 25 per cent and that we have advanced ours to 30 per cent and while that would seem to be a reciprocal arrangement almost at the same time the American market is one that we cannot take advantage of. They have in the south the advantage of cheap negro and Chinese labour and a climate different from ours, and they can at all times supply their people with vegetables grown there. Therefore, there is no opportunity for us to send our goods over there and I will venture to say that if their duty were only 10 or 15 per cent we would not be able to send much over there. While we are labouring under certain disadvantages in Canada in having to compete with the warmer climate of the south and of California from which they ship these goods in large quantities into Canada it would seem that this is a case where we ought to have a larger duty irrespective of the duty that they place upon these goods there. I am not in favour of following the American tariff as a whole. I think it would be very foolish for us to put 50, or 60 or 100 per cent upon all goods as they do but at the same time there are certain articles that we ought to consider from the Canadian standpoint alone without any regard to the American tariff at all, and it seems to me that this is a case where we ought to increase the duty considerably beyond what it now is. I would be in favour of making this duty, if not a specific duty, at least an ad valorem duty of 40 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Fifty per cent would be better.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Fifty per cent. If you make it 50 per cent what difference would it make to the consumer ? You would never know the difference and it would give the market to our Canadian producers. I think this is a case where this government should increase the duty up to 50 per cent because it will stimulate the growing of vegetables greatly in Canada, it will build up the farmers and market gardeners all around the city of Toronto and the city of Montreal, give them a wider market and enable them to prosecute their industry with greater vigour and with more profit to themselves and to the consumer. I hope the government will see their way to amending this schedule by increasing the duty to 50 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear—protection!

88. Pickles, sauces and catsups, including soy, 25 per cent, 32½ per cent, 35 per cent.

Mr. MARSHALL. This is an item that we would like a little more protection on.

Mr. FIELDING. The preferential is slightly increased from 23⅓ to 25 per cent.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would point out to the minister that great quantities of American ketchup are coming into this country and that the rate of duty now proposed is not sufficient to give the Canadian ketchup manufacturers a fair show on the market. Some of the Detroit ketchups are sold at 80 cents a dozen, and a duty of 35 per cent would amount to about 3 cents a dozen only. If the Canadian manufacturers could get their glass bottles as cheaply as the Americans do we could compete with them, but we are not able to induce the glass men to sell us the glass at as low a rate as they sell it on the other side. For that reason the ketchup manufacturers of Canada would like the duty raised to at least 50 per cent.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I have in my constituency, an important factory, which is making a specialty of pickled vegetables, and I would like to know from the Minister of Finance on what basis he has accorded the slight increase of duty from 23⅓ to 25 per cent. I would also like to know from the minister why it is that he has not met the representations made to him by the pickle manufacturers of the Dominion, who have [illegible] much larger increase in the tariff than that which the government now proposes.

Mr. FIELDING. The increase in the preferential tariff is from 23⅓ to 25, which is the nearest unit as compared with the old item. It is not a material increase. Under the rule laid down we had to make our choice between 22½ and 25 ; we thought 25 was a reasonable rate.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. The minister has not answered my question as to why the representations made by the pickle manufacturers of the Dominion have not been taken into account when the change was made. There appeared before the tariff commission in Montreal a gentleman who was authorized by the pickle industry to state their case, and the reasons advanced by him for an increase in duty seem quite plausible. It was pointed out that the economic conditions surrounding this industry in Canada, handicapped the industry as compared with the conditions prevailing in other countries. It was demonstrated before the commission that the Norway pine of which the pickle cases are made, the German bottles in which they are put up, the Holland and French onions and cucumbers, the Spanish corks

and spices, are all packed under an English label in London and shipped to Canada under the preferential duty. This, together with the higher price for labour in Canada and the greater cost of materials, all prove that the slight advance in the duty now proposed by the government is not sufficient to protect this Canadian industry. We find from the Trade and Navigation returns that the importation of pickles from Great Britain amounted in 1896 to $75,000, and that in 1906 they had reached the handsome figure of $300,000 or an increase of 500 per cent. This increased importation of pickles has simply ousted from our own market a corresponding quantity of Canadian made pickles, and if, as we are told, the primary consideration in the framing of this tariff is to help the agricultural industry, then that idea has not been carried out with regard to this particular item, because the growing of the vegetables by the agricultural community for sale to manufacturers of pickles has not been encouraged to the slightest extent. It is greatly to be feared that the decline of the Canadian pickle industry will be more and more marked under the tariff now proposed, and that the growing of vegetables to supply the pickle manufacturers will become less and less every year. I know that an industry has been established in London for the purpose of availing of the preferential tariff on English goods, and that foreign capital was invested in that industry last year in order to increase the output, on the other hand I have in mind a certain Canadian firm which formerly bought 500 tons of vegetables a year, but which last year could only buy 50 tons, for the reason that there no longer was any profit in the manufacture of pickles. The preferential tariff has placed the pickle manufacturers of the Dominion at a great disadvantage, and the government has done nothing in its present tariff proposals to in any way help it. It was demonstrated before the tariff commission that the cost price in Canada was far higher than the cost price in England. I would impress upon the Finance Minister that the new duty should be at least an advance of 6 per cent on the old preferential tariff or 5 per cent on the preferential tariff which is now proposed to the House. This would make the preferential tariff 30 per cent, and then the intermediate, the general tariffs, could be graded on the computation which the Finance Minister follows in this respect. When we are working for the development of our national industries it is only right that we should take into consideration the lower cost prices in foreign countries as compared with Canada, and especially should that be the case in connection with protection to these articles which so much concern the farming community.

Mr. AMES. When the Minister of Finance was in Montreal the representatives of the pickle industry pointed out that the competition which was most disastrous to them came from Great Britain, and they asked for some additional protection. Their request has been granted by the government more in name than in fact. The increase in the tariff amounts only to 1⅔ per cent as against British competition, whereas the representatives of the pickle industry in Montreal asked that the duty against British goods be raised to 40 per cent, which they pointed out was the tariff in the United States. They did not get the 15 per cent advance that they wanted, but they got 1⅔ per cent, which, according to their statements which were laid before the minister in November, would not be sufficient to protect this industry, which, unfortunately seems to be a failing industry. It would appear as though that might be one of the industries which we might all agree to protect in Canada, inasmuch as the raw material is something that the farmers want to have protected, and the bottles are something which the manufacturers would desire to have protected. It does seem a pity that an industry with which both the farming and manufacturing industries are connected, an industry which would under natural conditions thrive in Canada, should be gradually driven to the wall owing to competition which, with that additional five per cent would be less dangerous. I would ask the minister if he cannot again take into consideration the representations made to him in Montreal and grant some additional protection against the British article, at least more than 1⅔ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. I feel that to a considerable extent the imports of British pickles are due to a matter of taste on the part of the consumer, and I doubt if even an increased duty would make a difference in the imports. Certain people like the British pickle on account of difference in taste, and I do not think the increased duty would in itself make the industry successful in Canada. The pickle people asked for a higher duty, but if we gave 40 per cent against Great Britain, what about the United States? That would mean not less than 50 per cent or 60 per cent against the United States, and of course we think that these are very high rates. I wish we could meet the views of every deputation which comes before us, but I will have to be frank enough to say that a good many have asked without receiving quite all they desired.

Mr. GANONG. If the figures given by my friend beside me (Mr. Robitaille) are correct, there has certainly been an unusual increase in the imports of British pickles, more than would be accounted for by the statement of the Minister of Finance. I have been rather surprised that the Minister of Customs has not said something about this. If I am correctly informed, that gentleman has been a manufacturer of pickles in this country and has had experience, and

he should give the benefit of that experience to us and state whether he could successfully compete.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the minister's argument is very strong, especially in view of the fact that his first aim should be to protect Canadian people. To say that a great many people use English pickles because they have a preference for them does not, I imagine, carry much weight, because going into the rural districts of our country, where pickles are sold from the stores in great quantities, the great bulk of the consumers pay not the slightest attention to whether the pickles are English or Canadian made, and if by raising the tariff on English pickles the Canadians have the market and secure a little better price, there are many who would go into the business who do not follow it to-day because it is not remunerative. It is not a case of any special preference for the English article, but it is because the merchant is able to sell them at a price with which the Canadian manufacturer cannot compete.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I cannot understand why the Canadian pickle manufacturer cannot make a success of making pickles in this country, when we consider that the Heinz Pickle Company of the United States buy hundreds and thousands of tons of vegetables, young cucumbers, &c., in Canada and put them in salt vats and keep them there until they are required in the United States; then they are sent to the United States, manufactured into pickles and returned to this country, paying the duty both ways. Now, why is it that our Canadian pickle manufacturers cannot compete with that company which buys its raw material here, ships it over to the United States, pays the duty and then ships it back here and pays 30 per cent duty? I should imagine that would be the limit of duty that this country could stand under the circumstances.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I would state, in answer to the last speaker, that the Heinz Company, whose establishment in Pittsburg I visited, do not buy Canadian pickles, but have their own lands, raise their own vegetables, make their own bottles and labels, and even get lumber and make their cases; and naturally, on account of the enormous capital which they possess, they are in a position to compete by making their articles at a far less cost than they can be made in Canada, owing to the small population in this country. The Canadian manufacturer in the pickle industry, as in any industry, has a population of only 5,000,000 to serve, while in the United States they have a hundred million, and on account of the wonderful tariff that has helped their development and the extreme profits that they have made, they are enabled to reduce the cost of production so that they can export to Canada or any country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said that if to-day, with a slight difference of duty, the Canadian pickle is not chosen, it is because the flavour of the English pickle is better liked. The theory is very nice, but if he had been drumming on the road for seven or eight years, as I have been, trying to sell the Canadian article, he would know that when there is a slight difference of five or ten cents a dozen on an article, not only on pickles, but on any class of goods, there is not a Canadian consumer or grocery store that will not buy the foreign article, because they say it gives an appearance of luxury to be able to say that they have a foreign label at a little difference in cost. It is not many years ago since the Canadian article was considered by the Canadian consumer an inferior one, even although it was equal to or better than the imported. On account of the organization which has been formed of late, which had for its object the encouragement of the use of articles having for motto, 'Made in Canada,' this has been to some extent changed, and through the efforts of the manufacturers in advertising and in drumming among their customers, showing that they are manufacturing their goods with the same ingredients and the same skill as are used in the production of the foreign article, this prejudice is to some extent being overcome, but I know myself I have been in several lines obliged, in order to get a proper price, to put on a certain class of goods an English label, which shows that the consumer was not in a position to decide whether it was Canadian or foreign made. There are whiskies to-day of different brands, compounded in Montreal with English, Scotch and other foreign marks, which shows the prejudice which exists in regard to many classes of goods. A new man in any industry has to combat the fact that these foreign firms are old established, and the Canadian manufacturer has to incur a large expense to introduce his products and acquire for his goods a name, which has the commercial stereotyped phrase of 'good will.' The present increase is not sufficient to foster the development of the pickle industry. I do not want 40 per cent duty, but something a little more moderate. It is not because the United States imposes a duty of 40 per cent that we should do likewise, but what we require to do is to find out what is the cost in foreign countries, what are the climatic conditions in Canada and what is the handicap under which the Canadian manufacturers have to prosecute their business, and then let the government impose a duty which shall equalize the conditions and give the Canadian manufacturer a fair chance to hold his own against the manufacturers in other countries. The pickle industry has been one of those which have declined the most since the preferential

tariff has been in force. It can be fostered if you would make the preferential tariff 30 per cent instead of 25 per cent as you are now making it, and then make the general and intermediate tariffs according to the basis or proportion on which the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) now proceeds.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad to find the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille) giving expression to the views which he has just uttered. It is much to be regretted that Canadian sentiment is not as strong as it should be. My experience is similar to that indicated by the hon. member from Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille). Many people will buy imported goods simply because they are imported. But quite a different sentiment prevails on the other side of the line. Go over to Detroit or Port Huron, and you will find the people there giving the preference to American goods because they are American. The strong national sentiment which prevails in that country induces the people to buy American goods, but unfortunately in Canada a great many people will buy American goods simply because they are American and will give these goods the preference over Canadian products of the same class. I have never taken very kindly to the British preference and have never hesitated to express myself in that sense, and one of my reasons was that instead of cultivating Canadian sentiment, that preference has the opposite effect. If there is a lack of Canadian sentiment to-day, along the line indicated by the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille), I think the present government is very largely responsible, because their policy is to induce the people to ignore Canadian goods and buy British goods or goods on which twenty-five per cent of British labour has been expended. These goods may be Russian, German, French or from almost any other country, but as soon as they have been touched up a little in England and are sent out here as British goods, they are given a preference in our market. In that way Canadian sentiment is not cultivated and the tendency is to buy what is imported and ignore Canada for the sake of some other country.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always understood that the aim of the preferential tariff was to favour as far as possible English goods, but not at the expense of Canadian manufacturers. Or, in other words, where the British preference would tend to break down a Canadian industry, we should not favour it. In this particular instance, the preference is injuring a Canadian industry, and our home industry should be our first consideration. Where we find that the British preference does seriously interfere with the growth and development of a Canadian industry, we should not carry it to the extent we do.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) answer the question put to him regarding catsups ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon gentleman will separate the item of catsups and sauces from the pickles, he will find that the imports of that class into Canada are very small and he is mistaken when he says any serious grievance exists. If you bulk pickles and sauces together, the imports are considerable, but the imports of sauces, including catsups, are not very large, and my hon. friend will find that the present duty is not unreasonable.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am not speaking of the sauces, but of the glasses ? We cannot convince the Americans that we can supply them with the glasses cheaper than they can buy them in their own country. The company of which the hon. gentleman spoke is a very large company. They ship the raw materials into their own country and bottle it there because they can get their bottles there much cheaper than here. We are willing to pay the glass men a reasonable price for their glass, but it is a hardship to have to compete with some of the tomato catsups shipped to this country. Some of it is of a very low grade, but still it is here and we have to compete against it. I hope the hon. minister will reconsider this item and give us more protection on tomato catsups.

89. Olives in brine, 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING moved to add the words 'not bottled.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a change here. They were formerly classed as pickles and stood at 35 per cent, but we are making a distinction between olives in brine and olives in bulk, so that when imported in bulk they may be packed in Canada.

90. Fruits, namely: bananas, plantains, pine-apples, pomegranates, guavas, mangoes, wild blueberries, wild strawberries and wild raspberries, free.

Mr. FIELDING. No change in that.

91. Citron, lemon and orange rinds in brine, free.

92. Apples, per barrel, 25 cents, 35 cents, 40 cents.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This is an article which is produced all over this country. British Columbia will be soon able to supply the Northwest and Ontario is the source of supply in the centre and Nova Scotia in the east. We import 20,000 to 30,000 barrels a year, and the duty amounts to only 9 per cent. It is not fair to our farmers who grow apples that this duty should not be higher. Lots of them grow apples in the southern portions of the different provinces to supply the early demand, and it is not reasonable that they should only have a protection of nine per cent when almost every other industry gets a protection of from 20 per cent to 35 per cent. I suppose that 30 per cent to 35 per cent is the average on most manu-

factured articles. Every year thousands of barrels of these early apples go to waste in Ontario. The market is already supplied, and these early importations have to be worked off. Often merchants buy more than they need immediately, and these imports must be worked off before the buying of the Canadian article begins. In all fairness, we ought to have more than nine per cent on apples.

Mr. FIELDING. I should think that this was an item on which we could feel that the Canadian product can look after itself. Last year we imported $89,000 worth and exported $4,000,000 worth. That seems a happy state of affairs for our apple trade. I come from a section of the Dominion where we are proud of our apples. I do not think the industry is suffering for want of protection.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. But at the time we are importing we are not exporting. Our exports are winter apples, but the apples that go to waste in Ontario are summer apples.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is in the same position as the tomato item which we discussed before six o'clock. These early apples are allowed to come in here at a time when apples are worth money, taking away an advantage which the Canadian fruit growers would otherwise have. By putting on a duty you will secure the whole market to the Canadian apple growers. And whom are we legislating for if not for Canadians?

Mr. FIELDING. We do not profess to have a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. HENDERSON. Nobody desires a prohibitive tariff. But we want a tariff that will give more revenue to the government and keep out some of these American apples. The county I have the honour to represent produces a large quantity of apples of a very fine quality, and I am sure that people of that county would heartily endorse the action of the government if additional protection were given to this article. The American duty is 25 cents a bushel —practically 75 cents a barrel—so that there is a material difference between their duty and ours. I am not going to say that because they have a high duty we should have a high duty, or that we should copy them entirely. But if it is considered necessary for the protection of the industry in the United States to have a duty of 75 cents a barrel, surely the same argument would apply to our industry in Canada. I do not think the government would be unfavourably criticised if they increased the duty on apples.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This duty on apples going into the United States of which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) speaks is really four or five times our duty. The American duty affects importations at a time when apples are comparatively cheap. On the other hand, our duty of 40 cents a barrel comes into practical effect at a time when apples are high in price and when our growers could get a good price if it were not for this competition. In effect, our duty is not more than 25 per cent of theirs. I agree that we should not have a high duty merely because the Americans have a high duty. At the same time, if negotiations were ever to be undertaken we should be in a better position to negotiate if we had a duty which would be a benefit to the Canadian producer.

Mr. FIELDING. In view of the state of the trade as between Canada and the United States. I think we should have difficulty in making a grievance in this case. I have said that our imports from the United States are $89,288. Our exports to the United States are $122,000. While, undoubtedly, our producers, in this case as in almost every other, wanted an increase, there were strong representations made, especially in the west, against the increase of duties on fruit. The speeches so far made have been from the growers' side of the case, but the consumers' side must not be forgotten. As between Canada and the United States I think we do not suffer under any grievance.

Mr. HENDERSON. Had the minister considered this apple question in its proper relations he could have got over the difficulty of increased price. Oranges and lemons have been put on the free list. If he had used our duty on these goods to secure an off-set of the apple duty of the United States he might have gained very different results.

93. Apples, dried, desiccated or evaporated, and other dried, desiccated or evaporated fruits n.o.p., 17 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the same, except that the preferential rate is a shade higher.

95. Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, per pound, 1½ cents, 1¾ cents, 2 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. The general tariff rate was the same, but there is a difference in the preference, which was 1¾ cents instead of 1½ cents.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I think the farmers who grow berries will be satisfied that the minister should have the preferential duty in this case as low as he likes. But this duty of 2 cents per pound is only about 21 per cent ad valorem, and as this is largely an article of luxury and in view of the growers' claim to protection, I think the

government would be justified in giving an increase. I think the growers would be satisfied with 3 cents per pound instead of 2 cents per pound. That would be only about 30 per cent which is about the duty placed upon most manufactured goods. Why should not the man who grows berries in this country be protected just as the manufacturer is? I do not object that manufacturers should have protection, but I claim that the berry growers should have equally good treatment He employs a large number of hands; he has a large amount of capital invested, and he makes land much more valuable where he engages in his operation. Besides, as I have said, the fruits that compete with his product are imported at a time when fruit is comparatively dear. They are bought by the rich people who can easily afford to pay more than 20 per cent. I know that the minister has just suggested that the consumers in the west and elsewhere must be considered. I am sure that we are willing to consider them. But let me point out that under this proposed tariff we shall import $3,000,000 worth of fruit free and only about $500,000 worth paying duty. That is, the consumers get six-sevenths of their fruit free and I think they should not grudge the fruit growers protection on the one-seventh. When the manufacturers get protection I do not see why this industry which is really a species of manufacture and which is very beneficial as well as creditable to the country should not be protected also.

Mr. HENDERSON. I endorse as strongly as I can the views expressed by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). His county and mine face each other, one on the south of Lake Ontario and the other on the north side. Both are fruit growing counties, and we naturally feel deeply interested in the fruit industry. I am sure that there is hardly an hon. member here who has not heard of Oakville strawberries. Oakville, in my county, produced strawberries forty years ago and shipped them largely to the great markets of Canada, such as Toronto and Montreal. Our reputation for producing an excellent berry has always been kept up. I should be delighted if the hon. Minister of Finance could see his way clear to adding 1 cent per pound to the duty on these small fruits. He need not be alarmed about the consumer, for he has it in his own power to make an arrangement which would prevent the consumer from being injured. He may say that if you put these small fruits at 3 cents per pound, you increase the price. Well, that is just what the farmer wants, and I think we ought to give it to him. I am not like the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) who says that the farmers should have no consideration and no protection. I hold that they are entitled to be well looked after. And, as to the consumer, as the hon. member for Wentworth has said, the minister is giving the consumport a large quantity of dried fruits—curwould offset any increase of price that might obtain through this proposed increased duty. But let us carry it further. We import a large quantity of dried fruits—currants, raisins, California prunes and other goods of that kind. If the minister would take 1 cent a pound away from the duty on these dried fruits, and add it to the duty on green fruits, he would hurt nobody, and would help the producer of the green fruits. When the housewife went to market to buy fruit, she would buy as many pounds of the dried as of the green fruit, and, as there would be a cent of duty taken off for every cent put on, the account would balance so far as she is concerned, but a great Canadian industry would be helped. I think this is one of the subjects that ought to have more consideration from the government than it has had. I am sure the government would not receive adverse criticism if it were to adopt the suggestion that I have made.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this item should stand over for further consideration. The government must have received representations from the market gardeners and farmers in favour of an increased duty. I think the minister need not fear the increased price to the consumer, because the same argument applies in this as in many other cases—conpetition can be depended upon to keep down prices. There are very few sections of Canada that are not prepared to supply, in some measure, some of the products now under consideration. I would urge the government to let the item stand and to give this matter further consideration.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I am delighted with the extreme generosity of the hon. member from Halton (Mr. Henderson). He is satisfied that the farmers and consumers of Canada should have nothing but dried fruit. Apparently, he is quite willing that the farmers should have dried apples for breakfast. I suppose he would give them water for dinner, and then let the apples swell for supper. So far as I am concerned I think they are entitled to better fare. Take the strawberries of which so much has been said : why should not we have the privilege of buying these fruits from the United States before Western Ontario has strawberries to sell ? When their strawberries are at a reasonable price, so that the ordinary citizen can buy them, we can get our strawberries from our friends in the west. Then, when their strawberries are done, we can get our own strawberries at home, and after ours are finished we go to the province of Quebec for a later supply. Why should we not have this privilege? Why should we be obliged to pay these enormous prices merely to satisfy a few growers in the west?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) is exercised about the consumer. That hon. gentleman was elected one of the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association the other day. He is one of those who are urging free trade in fruits between Canada and United States.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Yes, and we will get it yet.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Certainly, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. Wright) can have his way we shall get it. And this hon. gentleman comes before us as an Ontario fruit grower. If the hon. gentleman is sitting on the board of directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association and trying to direct their efforts in that direction, I think it will not be more than a year before his term of office will expire. He seems to be exercised about the consumer paying a duty on American fruits and wants to know why he should not get berries from western Ontario or from Quebec without paying this duty. Well, what is to interfere with him getting berries from Ontario or Quebec without paying duty ? He will not pretend to say that while these fruits are on the market, he is charged more for them than he would be charged if there were no duty at all. The farmers who grow these berries cannot do as some manufacturers are said to have done—combine and set the price, taking advantage, it may be, of the duty to make that price higher. The price of fruit must be fixed by supply and demand. But is it unfair to say that the Canadian producer should have the Canadian market ? When the Canadian producer can supply the wants of the market, that market should be left to him. This will be a good opportunity to bring in the flexible tariff spoken of by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). And this would suit the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright). Let the strawberries in at a moderate rate of duty for the few weeks before our berries are ready. Then, when our berries come in, put on the duty of 3 cents per pound so as to give our producers their own market in full. The Canadian producer would have the benefit of a little extra price at the beginning, as he ought to have on early fruits, for it is something of a luxury, and it costs more to grow. Now our producer does not get the early market, except to the extent that this small duty gives it to him. Then, when his berries come into the market in the flush of the season, my hon. friend from South Renfrew will not have to pay any more for his berries.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have listened to the discussion so far, and I find that there have only been a few of these items that the government have held back for further consideration. We have so far been able to get through only ninety-four items and there are 711 items on the list. I think if the hon. minister will state definitely that no matter what discussion may take place in the House it is not the intention of the government to change the duty on any of these articles it perhaps might help us to get through these items a little more quickly. The government have put this tariff before us and if there are some items to withhold I think they should say so and give us an opportunity to discuss them ; but, I cannot see where we are going to make much of a change in them if the minister is not going to take any notice of the discussion that is taking place. In so far as I am concerned I am not in favour at all of this preferential tariff. Neither am I in favour of the tariff as it now stands on a great many items. But, if the government will absolutely refuse to listen to any of the discussion that takes place I think it is only wasting time to discuss many of the articles that are on the list.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I do not exactly agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. J. D. Reid). I think it is the duty of members of this House to speak in behalf of their constituents whether they succeed in convincing the government that what they say is right or not. At least they should voice the sentiments of their constituents and the desires of their people. The farmers of this conutry are a large and important class. There are many lines that with a fair and adequate protection they could go into and make money, but they are deprived of this for want of adequate protection. Now, fruit is one line. There are very few portions of Ontario where you cannot raise these small fruits and where they could not be successfully cultivated if the parties who raised them got a little more for them. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) thinks that they should be able to get them in free, and he is speaking for the farmers of the country. All the farm produce ought to come in free ! I do not think he holds that opinion in regard to cheese. I did not hear him so express himself.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. We are not afraid of cheese ; we can beat the world on that.

Mr. SPROULE. Then he does not want any duty on cheese at all ? How is he on that question ? Is he in favour of a protection on cheese or against it—which ? He fails to answer that question. I was going to say that there are many of these lines that hon. members know their constituents could go into if they had the Canadian market, but as they have not the Canadian market they cannot go into them, and for the want of an adequate tariff they do not get the benefits which otherwise ought to accrue to them of right as people carrying on those lines in their own country. When we voice the sentiments of these people we at least bring them to the attention of the

government and if afterwards the electorate of the country visit their displeasure on the government, the government cannot say that they were unaware of what the desires of the people were. I think that when the representatives of the people bring these matters to the attention of the government the government should pay some heed to them, but whether our views prevail or otherwise we at least in duty bound to express them freely in this House, and in doing that I think we do what we are sent here for. In regard to fruit, the hon. member for Renfrew asks: Why cannot you allow the Canadian farmer to get these fruits in free? They want them. Yes, they do and if they got them in free and at a very low price, I have no doubt they would be so gorged with them that they would be satiated before the Canadian fruit came in at a later season. They would have no appetite for Canadian fruit and the Canadian producers would suffer in consequence. This applies to apples, strawberries, raspberries. plums, and to almost every other line. Take apples, if you like; we are providing cold storage for the purpose of keeping and transporting our early apples to foreign markets where they may be sold at a reasonable figure and yet we have a market at home that we are allowing the Americans to monopolize for want of putting up the tariff high enough to keep it for the Canadian people, and we are voting money at the same time to supply cold storage in order to ship the apples we have in Canada over to England and sell them there. Is that wisdom, is it economy, is it proper, is it in the interest of the Canadian farmer whom the hon. member for Renfrew professes to represent? I say it is not. It seems to me that it is a very unwise and unbusinesslike procedure, that it is indefensible or would be indefensible, in my judgment, before any intelligent class of farmers. The government may turn a deaf ear to our arguments and do nothing, but we think that we should at least put ourselves on record as representing what we believe to be the desire of the farmers of Canada, and if the government do not comply with their demands then they will have to settle with the farmers and not with us.

Mr. PATERSON. I agree that hon. members have a perfect right to lay their views before the committee. The House is in committee. parliament makes the tariff law and they are only exercising their rights in speaking out. I know that they cannot move to increase the duties but if they offered arguments that would tend to show that an injustice was being done and that an increase ought to be made, I am very sure that my hon. colleague would not turn a deaf ear to any argument which was made use of in that direction. Of course, if, in the opinion of hon. members, a duty is higher than they think the interest of the country demands they are at liberty to move for a reduction.

Mr. SPROULE.

I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Sproule) and with other hon. gentlemen that in many sections of Ontario we can grow these fruits and do grow them to a large extent, and if Ontario were alone to be considered by the Minister of Finance I think that their arguments would prevail with him. But this is a tariff which applies to the whole of the Dominion of Canada as hon. gentlemen know. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat alludes to the farmers of Ontario as growing these fruits. Farmers are fruit growers, or at least a great many farmers, while fruit growing would not be their main occupation, do grow more or less fruit. But, there are a great many farmers in the Northwest and there will be many thousands more, and at the present time, whatever they may be able to do in the future, I do not think this is a very large crop with them. But, these are consumers, these are the parties who want to buy fruit and in framing this tariff certainly Ontario's needs are not lost sight of, but we are bound to give consideration to the interests of all the other provinces and the different sections. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen in criticising this, if they would look upon it from the standpoint from which the Finance Minister felt it to be his duty to look at it—that is to see what he could do that would be fair to all parts of the country—may be they would modify their views somewhat. For instance, take strawberries which you mention. In a large portion of Canada strawberries are not perhaps grown to advantage. Yet, strawberries will come down as low as 4 cents a quart, and 2 cents a quart is 50 per cent on that fruit. The people who have to pay that may think that is a pretty stiff figure to pay for the benefit of those who are growing that fruit.

Mr. E. D. SMITH.—Are they paying duty on strawberries at 4 cents a quart?

Mr. PATERSON. I will not argue the point now, but I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider the tariff in all its bearings as applied to all parts of Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can assure the minister that practically everything in this item can be grown in abundance in any one of our provinces. When you learn from the Trade and Navigation returns that $200,000 worth of these small fruits came into this country last year, the necessity for protection becomes apparent. I hope the minister will give the matter consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Customs has stated that if a case was made out the Minister of Finance would no doubt try to meet the wishes of the people. I call to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and also the attention of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) to this resolution passed at a very large meeting of the fruit growers of the Niagara section of the province of Ontario.

That this meeting of the fruit growers of the Niagara district desire to express our disapproval of the action of the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association in appointing a committee to confer with a committee of Michigan state fruit growers with a view to arrange a reciprocal tariff on fruits and fruit products. The present tariff on fruits is too low, when we consider the increasing expense in fighting the many insect enemies and diseases, the very high price of labour, the scarcity and high prices of fruit packages, and the enormous cost of and loss in transportation. We can produce all the domestic fruits required for home consumption, and the home market should be protected for Canadian growers.

These gentlemen who are deeply interested in the production of these fruits have pointed out that the tariff is entirely too low, and therefore, when my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) was passing his resolution he did not speak for the producers of Canada. I am told that it was a very small meeting that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) took part in ; I am not sure that there were enough present to move and second the resolution although the hon. gentleman put it forward as the opinion of the farmers of Canada upon the tariff. I have here a memorial with regard to the tariff from the Dominion Grange, the Ontario Farmers' Association, and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, an extract from which may prove instructive. When certain agricultural items were being discussed the other night the hon. gentleman from South Renfrew (Mr. Wright), among others on that side of the House, declared that the farmers of Canada did not care whether or not there was any protection on their products. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) went so far as to say that he would vote to abolish all protection on farm products, but I think he is the only man in the House who would venture to make that statement. If he moves a resolution to that effect he will be the only supporter of the government who is prepared to carry out the pledges which the Liberals gave to the people of Canada some years ago. I quote from this memorial :—

The aggrandizement of the urban at the expense of the rural sections is an effect of protection. The protection accorded by the tariff enables manufacturers of certain classes of agricultural implements to charge Canadian consumers 25 per cent more than the value of the articles manufactured. The same protective tariff permits an overcharge of 30 to nearly 50 per cent on woollen goods and 50 per cent on the cheaper lines of farm carriages. The average rate of taxation on dutiable goods in 1904 was 27½ per cent, and to that extent, speaking broadly, Canadian manufacturers were enabled to overcharge Canadian consumers on purchases made by those consumers. Farmers do not and cannot secure any compensation in return for all this by any tariff that can be devised. We have to-day a surplus of $120,000,000 of farm produce for export ; that surplus is continually increasing and so long as these conditions continue, the foreign price must control the home price of farm products. While a protective tariff can and does not limit our purchasing power, it cannot and does not enchance the price of articles we have to sell.

Now, this is the point.

We, therefore, ask in the coming revision of the tariff, that the protective principle be wholly eliminated ; that the principle of tariff for revenue only, and that revenue based on an honest and economical expenditure of the public funds, be adopted ; and, as proof of our sincerity, we will, if this position is adopted by the government, gladly assent to the entire abolition of the whole list of duties on agricultural imports.

In other words, these gentlemen say to the government : If you are prepared to abolish the protective duty on manufactured goods which we as farmers have to consume, then, but not till then, we are prepared as a proof of our sincerity to consent to the abolition of duty upon farm products. But at no time in the history of Canada, so far as I am aware, did the farmers of this country come forward with the bold statement—as the hon. member for South Renfrew asserted—that they would ask the government to abolish the duty on farm products. On the contrary, the demand of the farmers from every part of Canada is that if there is to be a protective tariff in this country then the farmers of Canada should have their fair share of protection upon all their products including the small fruits which are now under discussion.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has alluded to the Fruit Growers' Association which met in Toronto and he ventured to insinuate that there were scarcely enough people present to move and second the resolution which was passed unanimously at that meeting. Allow me to tell him that there was a full representation from every part of the province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How many ?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Nearly every district was represented.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How many ?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I didn't count them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Six ?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Far more than six ; don't be alarmed about that. I draw attention to the fact that the meeting to which the hon. gentleman refers was called especially for the purpose of voting down this resolution, and it was composed of friends of his own and nobody else. Our meeting in Toronto was not a packed institution, but it was free to every one to vote exactly as he pleased and that is the difference between the two.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Were there twenty-five there ?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. There were more than twenty-five there; the room was full.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many directors were there?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. There are not twenty-five directors altogether, but it was a good meeting.

Mr. KNOWLES. It has been with much surprise that I have heard so many conservative members press for an increase in the duty on fruit. I think those who have so spoken are nearly all from Ontario, but I want them to remember that Ontario is not the only province in Canada. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just laid it down that each member should state the views of his constituents. I speak for a class of people very far removed from the place where fruit is produced, and I regard it as a most artificial arrangement that we who live so far away from Niagara should be called upon to build up a trade there to an extent that is not reasonable. We are not loath to pay a little duty and to do a little protecting when it is for the sake of our brother farmers. If it were for any class of people other than those who are farmers like ourselves out there, I would oppose this duty, even as it stands here to-night. We are giving a large protection for these people, but I am free to say to the people whom I represent, and I often have to defend this fruit duty out there, that it is for the tillers of the soil that this item is there, and it is because of that that we are willing to accept the duty. It may be that the organization whose view the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) presents, speaks the mind of a large part of the fruit-growers of Ontario, but in regard to the organizations that throng the corridors here, I want to say that I have very little respect for their opinion. I have no doubt that the gentlemen who compose them are as honourable, just and independent as they can be, but in my opinion the organizations that come here have as aggregations more of the hog spirit in them than they should be found to possess. When they come here and say they cannot earn an honest living without the people paying an artificial price for what they produce, I think we might as well give them a little money, give them what we have to spare as a present and let them go home. I really believe they go too far, and that as individuals they would not ask what they do as organizations. To speak frankly, I do not take any stock in what the fruit-growers' associations come down here to ask. As I say, we are willing to pay a reasonable duty to help along our brother farmers, but when my hon. friends opposite ask for an increased duty, I feel that we must oppose it. I happen to be the only western Liberal member present, but if my colleagues were here I am sure you would hear from them in the same spirit in which I speak. I am glad that my hon. friend for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) is here, and I wish he would express his opinion and his view of what the opinion of the people in the west is.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am delighted to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) speaking for the tillers of the soil. I would point out that the tillers of the soil in his part of the country are protected as highly as the protection that is here asked. They get 12 cents a bushel on wheat, as good a proportion of protection as any one wants to give the fruit-growers. He lectures us for asking reasonable protection for people who built up the country before the Northwest Territories were heard of, years before it was considered likely to amount to much the descendants of the stalwarts of Ontario who have developed the country so that they are able to live on one-tenth the acreage with which the tiller of the soil in the west is able to get along.

I want to say a word or two to my friend from Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright), because I am afraid he may make a mistake again if some one does not say a few words. He the other day undertook to speak for the fruit-growers of Ontario. Now he tells us it is a consumer that he is; we thought the other night that he was talking for the producers and that they did not want a duty, that they were like the three tailors of Tooley street, who represented the whole people of England, and that he was undertaking to represent the fruit-growers of Ontario. We now find that the hon. member for Renfrew is representing the consumers, and wants to go to the United States and buy United States strawberries for breakfast, and then fill up with United States water for dinner, and then come here and give off all the United States gas he can in this argument; that is the kind of diet he prefers. I apprehend that the people of this country would rather eat Canadian strawberries all the time; it would do them good; it would put their blood in good order and make them a little more reasonable in their treatment of Canadian fruit growers, lead them to assist the Canadian fruit growers in their great industry. When the hon. member was asked how many were present at this wonderful meeting of the so-called Ontario Fruit-Growers' Association at which they undertook to tell the government that they wanted nothing but reciprocal trade relations with people from Wisconsin and Michigan, he said there were more than enough to move and second the resolution, and when I asked him purposely if there were six, he said: Yes, there were eight or more. Now, there was a gentleman at Grimsby at this meeting, of the same stripe of party politics as my hon. friend, and he said there were only six at the meeting when the resolution was carried. I do not know which of these supporters of the government told the truth. I must correct my hon. friend from South

Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) when he says that my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) had a meeting especially called of his party friends. I have here the poster calling that meeting. It is not a mass meeting of Conservative fruit-growers, but of all fruit-growers. It says :

A mass meeting of the fruit growers of the Niagara district will be held in the town hall, Grimsby, Friday, January 18, 1907, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, to protest against the action of the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Associataion in appointing a committee to confer with a committee from the Fruit Growers' Association of Wisconsin, with a view to arranging a reciprocity tariff on fruit products between Canada and the United States.

All fruit growers——

Not all Conservative fruit-growers.

All fruit growers are called upon to attend this meeting to consider what action should be taken to prevent any change or interference with the present tariff on fruit.

Prominent fruit growers will be present to address the meeting and all are invited to take part in the discussion.

This is signed by four gentlemen of different shades of politics.

I have here a clipping from the Toronto Globe.' I am willing to admit that I use the 'Globe' sometimes, I use it to show the nonsensical arguments sometimes put forward in this House by people of the same stripe of politics as the 'Globe.' I clipped this item from the 'Globe of January 12; it is a despatch from Grimsby—not from a Conservative supporter of the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), not at all from a supporter of my own, but from the special correspondent at Grimsby of the Toronto 'Globe' :

Grimsby, January 11.—At a meeting of fruit growers, held in Grimsby to-day, the action of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association in appointing a committee to meet a committee from the Wisconsin Fruit Growers' Association to discuss a reciprocity tariff on fruit was discussed. Strong feelings against the action of the directors of the Ontario fruit growers was expressed, and the following resolution was unanimously passed :

That the fruit growers of this district view with alarm the action of the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, who do not represent the commercial fruit growers of Ontario, in agreeing to discuss the question of reciprocity with the Wisconsin growers. We consider the action of the directors unwise, uncalled for and entirely unauthorized, and we call upon the fruit growers of the Niagara district to hold a mass meeting at once to protest against the action of the directors of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association and to show them that their action is most detrimental to the best interests of the fruit industry.

That meeting was held. Here is one of the posters sent to me. I took the train and went to that meeting, which I attended as a listener The hon member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has read one of the resolutions which was passed and which was moved by a Conservative and seconded by a Reformer. I doubt whether the seconder would vote any longer for this government under the circumstances, even if he did up to the last election, or whether he voted against me. There were between 125 and 130 present at that meeting. They were men who had paid from $200 to $500 an acre for their holdings where they grow their fruit. They employ a great many men all the year round; they use a great deal of machinery on which they pay a good protective duty; they pay high wages and are very progressive, and are doing as much for the development of the country as any class in this Dominion. They are doing more to destroy the opinion circulated by Kipling when he described Canada as the 'Lady of Snows,' and to advertise Canada as a country which is not all snow and ice-bound, but which grows the products of tropical countries—they are doing more in this sense than probably any other class in the Dominion. They have developed from grain growers and ordinary farmers to high-class growers of fruit who can live and prosper on twenty acres of land and all they require is reasonable protection to develop their industry. One resolution which they passed was moved by a Conservative and seconded by a Reformer, or at any rate a gentleman who until now might be a supporter of this government. That resolution was referred to by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), but that was not the only resolution passed. There was another resolution moved by Murray Pettit, a staunch Conservative and protectionist and seconded by W. L. Wolverton, always known as a strong supporter of the other political party and the editor of the 'Canadian Horticulturist' for many years.

That this meeting request our representatives in the Dominion parliament, Mr. E. D. Smith and Mr. E. A. Lancaster and Mr. Henderson to urge the government to incorporate in the new tariff, the schedule presented to the Tariff Commission at its last session in Ottawa by the commercial fruit growers of Ontario.

Then it was moved by A. H. Pettit, seconded by Robert H. Lewis:

That this meeting send a deputation to interview the Ontario Minister of Agriculture with regard to the action of the directors of the Ontario association.

Then follow the names of the members of the deputation. Therefore, they not only passed those resolutions, but sent, under the second resolution I have read, a deputation to Toronto to protest to the Ontario government against the action of the directors of the fruit growing association. This fruit growers' association had asked for and received financial assistance for educational purposes and they had met for educational

purposes alone, and consequently had no mandate to deal with any tariff question. They met to discuss the best disposal they could make of the funds which the Ontario government had given them for educational purposes with regard to fruit growing, and it was not supposed that they would discuss anything else. But some of them apparently realizing that they could get the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) to leave the impression that they were fruit producers whereas to-night he admits that he was arguing from the consumers' standpoint and not for the commercial fruit growers at all—

An hon. MEMBER. Who brought in the resolution?

Mr. LANCASTER. I was not there and am not sure, but I know who brought it in this House and who raised the question in this House and who then spoke as representing the Ontario fruit growers. I am not protesting to-night so much about the difference of opinion as to whether the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) should be able to buy cheap strawberries in the United States at the expense of the Canadian fruit growers, but am protesting against his pretension to represent the fruit growers of Ontario when we find that he simply wants to buy the cheapest fruit he can in the cheapest market. And I would urge the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) in future to understand that when he comes into court he should state whether he is for the plaintiff or the defendant, and not ask the judge and jury to give judgment for the plaintiff when he is trying to get the defendant out of a scrape. Beyond giving this brief statement of the facts I do not think I need trouble the House any longer. We quite understand now where the argument for free fruit comes from. We can quite understand that the hon member for South Renfrew (Mr Wright), while putting up an argument as coming from the fruit growers' association, was really arguing for cheap fruit for the consumer, because he wants to go to the states first and to the province of Quebec afterwards and then to Ontario, according to where the markets are cheapest, when, if he would wait a few days, he could buy just as cheap in Ontario. He wants to deal with those people on the other side of the line, but I want this House to understand that those of the Ontario fruit growers' association, who are quite satisfied to have reciprocal trade relations with Wisconsin and Michigan, do not really represesnt the fruit growers of this country, and I base my argument on the resolutions passed in Grimsby at a meeting attended by as many Reformers as Conservatives. If this government do not want the facts, but want to make mere political capital out of the tariff, let them go ahead, but if they are prepared to protect the fruit growers, I want them to listen to the demands of these men whose interests are bound up in the fruit growing industry of this country and not to the demands of the consumers like the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) who are quite content to let their brother farmers go into insolvency provided they can buy their strawberries in the United States when they are cheaper there than here.

96. Cranberries and fruits, n.o.p., 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the hon. Finance Minister to let this item stand.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection to letting almost any item stand if any one expresses a particular desire that we should allow it to stand and deal with it again. I would not, however, encourage this general demand for an increased duty on fruits.

Item allowed to stand.

97. Pears, quinces, apricots and nectarines, n.o.p., per 100 pounds, 35 cents, 45 cents, 50 cents.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I would wish to know whether this is an increase or not. The item of pears is a very large one and although 50 cents per 100 pounds specific is better than an ad valorem duty on low priced pears, this is going to give the farmers a good deal of trouble. Many carloads come into the factories when the price is low and some growers consider the duty should be 1 cent per pound. This is not a very great duty especially as against the pears coming from California.

Mr. FIELDING. Pears, apricots, and nectarines were not specified in the former tariff. They came in as unenumerated at 20 per cent. By putting on this specific duty we make a slight increase.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. We are pleased to have the change to a specific even though the duty were no higher than under the ad valorem, because it is the low-priced fruit coming in that is the most damaging.

97a. Plums, per bushel, 20 cents, 20 cents, 20 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. This is governed by the French treaty, so there is no change.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Governed by the French treaty in what way ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the rate stipulated in the French treaty and we make that the rate in the three columns.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. How was it that the duty was 25 cents before ? Surely plums cannot be affected by the French treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. They are called plums, but I fancy they are the same as are sometimes spoken of as prunes. This duty was required under the treaty. But, as the item seems somewhat complicated by the French

treaty I would prefer to have it stand over for more particular inquiry.

Item allowed to stand.

98. Melons, each, 2 cents, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What was the previous duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. Twenty-five per cent.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Has the minister had representations concerning the duty on this article ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Is the government going to consider the matter ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have considered it.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I mean, reconsider it then ? Let me point out the difficulty. Some of the larger melons, water melons for instance, may be valued at 35 cents or 40 cents each, whereas many of the smaller ones are worth only 5 cents each. There is a specific duty of 3 cents each without discrimination. Surely the government will reconsider this matter.

Mr. FIELDING. The average price was ascertained to be about 7 cents. I think that in the case of these very cheap melons to which the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) refers. they do not come in to any very considerable extent.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. But the minister's argument does not meet the case. A large quantity of melons are entered at Toronto. In the early part of the season, the water melons, for instance, run from 30 cents to 40 cents each. As the season advances, the smaller melons come in—musk melons and cantelopes—in may cases worth from 5 cents to 10 cents each. It is manifestly unfair to have a duty of 3 cents each on all these melons.

Mr. FIELDING. If the range of prices is as great as that, there is room for criticism.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I think that case was made out by the fruit dealers of Toronto, perhaps if the matter were allowed to stand, the minister might see his way to reconsider the item.

Mr. FIELDING. No objection to let it stand.

Mr. PATERSON. These melons come in car lots. They have given great worry to the customs officers. A carload comes into Toronto consigned from California or Georgia. The melons may be in a somewhat damaged condition. They will rapidly deteriorate, they are placed upon the market, and the price realized may be something like what the hon gentleman states. But there was a good deal of consideration given to this question from a customs point of view, and these duties were fixed having regard to all the circumstances the hon. gentleman has been speaking of. I think representations were made on this point. But the interests of the dealers and the growers are not identical.

Mr. GANONG. I do not think any one should pay two cents duty on water melons. But it does seem reasonable that there should be a specific duty both on imported water melons and musk melons. It seems a ridiculous duty to put on musk melons in comparison with water melons.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The Minister of Customs misapprehended my point. I am not arguing for or against a high duty, I am objecting to the want of equality in the application of duties. I say an article of the value of 35 cents should not pay the same duty as an article of the same class that is worth only 5 cents. These are extremes of the principle I am advocating, but these prices will range form 5 to 35 cents, and I submit that the articles should not be taxed three cents apiece. There should be more equity in the application of the tax. I would suggest that the matter stand.

Mr. FIELDING. We will let it stand.

Mr. PATERSON. In what direction does the hon. gentleman think we should go ? Does he mean that we should make a separate item in the tariff and draw the line between a water melon and a musk melon.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I think that a line should be drawn somewhere as to value, and perhaps that would be a good place to draw the line, between a water melon and a musk melon. I think a duty of three cents on a small musk melon worth 5 cents or 7 cents is altogether too much.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I suggest, in the interest of the growers of water melons, that you make water melons 6 cents and musk melons 3 cents.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was wondering whether the minister had made a calculation to ascertain whether the proposed duty is higher than the former duty. One is specific and the other is ad valorem. I think the proposed duty will be about 43 per cent as against 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman is about right. But there is this difficulty, that fruit deteriorates coming in by carloads.

Mr. HENDERSON. As in the case of strawberries and other perishable goods, it is essential that the market should be kept open for the reception of the goods. If a load of melons came into Toronto from the other side just at the time the Canadian grower was ready to place a lot on the market, the latter would probably have his whole stock spoiled, or be compelled to sell at a very unprofitable price. I do not think

the duty is too high. A person who wants to buy a melon is not going to hesitate at two or three cents on the price, even if it is a small one. These small ones no doubt are very delicious, and it may be that people would prefer even to pay three cents rather than do without one. But three cents on an ordinary melon is not much of a duty. In many articles the prices are not fixed by the actual cost. You buy an article at 25, 30 or 40 cents, and the selling price may not be based exactly upon that cost. It is something like the hon. gentleman's tariff; he has a unit of two and a half. A great many dealers have a unit of 5 cents in fixing the price. So, in that way the minister will see that 3 cents is not at all an exorbitant duty.

100. Grapes, per pound, 1½ cents, 1¾ cents, 2 cents.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I have not any complaint with regard to this item. But I rise to answer my hon. friend from the west who objected to these duties on fruit, or at least to an increase, on the ground that it would increase the price to the consumer, and that the consumer in the west ought to be considered. I quite agree with him. I do not think there is a grower in the Niagara district who does not, at every meeting where these matters are discussed, desire it understood that he does not wish the consumer to pay any appreciable addition to the price of the article. Here is a case in point. We have a duty of 2 cents a pound on grapes. At the season when the greater portion of our crop is in the market, that is 100 per cent. But all through the season, year after year for the last ten years, the price of grapes has only been from 1 cent to 1⅜ cents per pound at the point of production. That is the wholesale regular price, ranging from 1 cent to 1⅜ cents is the highest I have known for ten years. The consumer does not pay a duty on that. The duty is 2 cents a pound and the cost of the article is only a cent a pound. The fact of the matter is that the price of the article is regulated entirely by the supply in the country, and the supply of nearly all these fruits is ample, plentiful for the whole Dominion. There is land enough that can be planted with these fruits, and where they can be grown with success, to supply the Dominion even if we had fifty millions of people. Our growers are not asking the consumer to pay any additional price. All they want is the Canadian market, and they want that for more reasons than one. Here is one very important reason why they want this market. They have a great and growing consuming market in the Northwest, and this market is a long distance from us. It is now in the hands to a large extent of the California growers, for reasons I have pointed out before; and in these fruits that are somewhat perishable, such as peaches and plums, the California growers produce an article not so good as ours in quality, but it lasts longer, it ships better; and so the dealers in the west want to handle this article because they can do it without loss, and they do not want to handle the Ontario article because it is more or less perishable. But we have demonstrated over and over again that we can put these fruits, peaches and plums, even though they are somewhat perishable, in perfect condition into the hands of consumers in the west, but the dealers in the west would not handle them and so would not get any profit ouf of them. Our fruits would go directly from the producer to the consumer, whereas the California fruits all pass through the hands of wholesale dealers who reap a profit upon them, and they are easy to handle. The dealers in western fruits are a large body, this is a large industry, westerners buy almost all the fruit they eat. These dealers want to handle California fruits and they do not want to handle Ontario fruits, for the reason I have stated. In the matter of grapes, I wish to point out that we can grow them in abundance and supply the whole Dominion, and when we do so the consumer does not pay one bit of this duty. It is an article, the price of which is entirely regulated by the supply. When the supply is ample, as it is in the matter of grapes, and as it is almost every year in the case of plums and peaches, the price is barely above the cost of production. Many years these fruits have been sold below the cost of production. Peaches and plums have been more than once sold at an absolute loss, and thousands of baskets left rotting on the ground. Now, if we can, by the aid of a stroke of the pen of the Finance Minister, secure this market for ourselves, why should we not do so? Because we do not ask that the duty be levied before our fruits come in, if that can be done. But if this market is left to the Canadian producer, in a very short time we will have such a large trade that, instead of paying as we do now, $500 to ship a car by express, we could have that car delivered for $300.

If we could to-day be guaranteed that we could lay these peaches and plums down in Manitoba at an express rate of a cent and a half a pound, or $300 a car, we would not ask for an increase in the duty. But as it is we pay $500 a car while the California grower gets his fruit in by freight, not by express. We cannot ship ours in by freight, whereas the California shipper can because his products are of a non-perishable character. He lays it down at a freight rate while we have to pay this exorbitant express rate of $500 per car. If we could get a large trade in fruit there so that instead of shipping a car of fruit every day or two we could ship five or six cars a day we could get a lower rate. The effect of putting on a tariff that would enable us to get the whole of the market ourselves not only will not compel the consumer to pay any more for his fruit, but will develop that trade to

such an extent that we can get lower express and freight rates and then one Canadian will be helping to assist another.

101. Oranges, shaddocks or grape fruit, lemons and limes, free, free, free.

Mr. FIELDING. We have abolished the duties on oranges as already explained.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Where does the bulk of the oranges come from ?

Mr. FIELDING. California, Florida, to some extent from the West Indies at certain seasons, and a considerable quantity from Spain.

102. Peaches, n.o.p., weight of a package to be included in the weight for duty, per 100 pounds, 67 cents, 90 cents, $1.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In regard to peaches, the commerical fruit growers asked for 2 cents a pound on the ground that I have previously stated, first, that the consumer would not have to pay an additional price, and, second, that we would be able to get hold of the market. I want to point out, in regard to the item that we have just passed that oranges and lemons previously paid 10 per cent and that now they are free. This is a large concession to the consumers. The duty at 20 per cent—not a very high duty upon these articles such as oranges, bananas and pines—would amount to $678,000. There is practically a remission, if you like, of $678,000 on these items at 20 per cent. I think it is something that ought to be taken into consideration in connection with the duties on fruit. Here are six-sevenths of all that the fruit consumers buy from abroad brought in free. At all the meetings that I have attended of fruit growers in regard to asking the government for an increased duty on fruit there has always been some one who has suggested that we should have a higher duty on bananas and oranges. The argument was presented that these fruits come into competition with ours and that every bushel that is consumed takes away so much from the supply that might be offered to the Canadian public by the Canadian producer, but the fruit growers always took a more generous view. They said : No, we will not ask the government to put any duty on these articles ; we do not grow them, and we are quite willing that this enormous importation should come in free, but we think that in consideration of the fact that $3,000,000 worth of these fruits do come in free we should have a fair and legitimate duty placed upon those fruits which we grow, especially considering that we cannot add the duty to the price, as the manufacturer probably can, but that the price must be regulated simply by the supply in the country in which we have an abundant acreage and a favourable climate.

Mr. PATERSON. It was largely out of consideration for the Northwest in connection with this fruit business that my hon. friend the Finance Minister was led to put these articles on the free list. He felt that in doing that there was a justification not only for maintaining the old rate, but, on some of the articles, exceeding it. I have listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks in regard to grapes. If I might state my own personal views I think there is a great deal in what he says, but I am of the opinion that his remarks which would apply with force to grapes would not apply with equal force to peaches. I do not think we are in a position yet, as far as my knowledge goes, to say that we can produce enough peaches to supply the market at all seasons of the year or even at a time when our peach crop is fully in. In reference to grapes I think he is right, stating my own view, but I do not think his argument will apply with equal force to peaches. Therefore, we have not felt at liberty to make that rate as high as we did the other.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The ministers must see their way to hurrying up the investigation of express charges in this country and if they apply themselves diligently to that they will get a substantial reduction in the express charges, especially on big lots of this kind. They can do a great deal to improve the trade in the way of sending fruit from one province in exchange for the fish of an other province, if they get the lowest possible express charges for the people and especially on the lines suggested by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) if the exchange is in many car lots instead of one which would bring the rate down more nearly to a freight rate than an exorbitant express rate.

Mr. PATERSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman entirely and I do hope that we will be able to secure reduced express rates, especially on fruit, which will do a great deal to solve this problem and I might suggest to the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) that perhaps as he is as large a dealer in this way as there is in Canada, it does seem to me that the Fruit Growers' Association, which is a powerful body, would be able, if they took the matter up very thoroughly, to make the arrangements somewhat better than they are at the present time. There is no doubt about it that if you could get your express rates down to about the level of freight rates—and perhaps you could give them as much more expressage as would partly compensate the railway for the reduction—you would do a great deal to make it easier to have these duties upon fruits in such a way as to preserve more of the market and without burdening the people in the west who are such large consumers.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I must assure the hon. minister that every year for the last twenty years the fruit growers have been doing everything they could, coaxing, persuading and threatening, trying to get the express

companies to reduce their rates, but without any success. It is to be hoped, now that the express companies are under the Railway Commission, that we will get some redress. We would not require that the express rates should be reduced to the level of the freight rate. The freight rate on a car of fruit to Winnipeg is 83 cents per 100 pounds, while the express rate is $2.15. If we could have it reduced to $1.50 per 100 pounds for distribution in car lots in Manitoba we could have that market at our disposal with the present duty. It would be equivalent to the increased duty that we are asking for. But, we cannot get any redress in that line and we think we should have an increase on many of these articles. I want to assure the minister that in regard to peaches he is not well informed if he thinks that the peach growers of Canada cannot grow all the peaches that the Dominion can consume even with the orchards which are now planted.

Mr. PATERSON. Every year ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Except at the season of the year before our's come in.

Mr. PATERSON. Every year ?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Of course, there will be years when the demand will be such that the price will be comparatively high. There would be peaches enough at a price, but there are many years when there are so many peaches that we could supply all the peaches required in this Dominion and the price would be cut right down to the cost of production. It only requires a year or two to bring about the planting of an enormous number of acres. There is the acreage, there is the climate and there are people anxious to plant trees. A little encouragement in the way of an increase in duty would cause several thousand more acres to be planted. When they come into bearing if there is too great a supply and the price goes down to the cost of production the planting stops. It is a question of demand : there is enough land to supply any demand when the price is very profitable. A low price is profitable : 25 cents a basket will pay peach growers fairly well. If they could be assured of that price they could grow all the peaches wanted and the peaches could be shipped successfully to the Northwest in the splendid express cars we have, if we only had a low express rate.

Mr. PATERSON. Would it be possible to make the shipment so large that the railways could be persuaded it would be in their interest as well as in the public interest to run fast freight trains on certain days of the week.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. There is a fast freight service between the Niagara district and Montreal but not to the Northwest. The distance between the fruit district and Winnipeg is about 1,500 miles, but it now takes eight days, or over to carry these perishable goods. With the fast freight service the minister speaks of, it would take four days and that would be an enormous advantage to grapes, pears, and early apples. But the peaches and plums must go by express. We have splendid express cars if we only had a reasonable rate, and we have a splendid system of distribution by express so that these peaches could be landed in the different districts in Manitoba, inside of 36 hours. But the express rates are excessive.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. As far as the Niagara district and the west is concerned there will be new service in the next twelve months via Toronto and Sudbury which will shorten the distance 150 miles. The government could do a great deal by impressing on the railway companies that in the interests of this country they must give low express rates to the farmers. The railways are giving advantages in freight rates to the farm and fruit products of the United States that pass over our railways, and they carry them at less than they carry our Canadian products of the same kind. The government can do nothing better for the country than to improve the express service, and the more it is improved the easier it becomes to improve it further. There is no reason why there should not be in the fruit season an express train every other day between the Niagara district and Winnipeg. I notice that the chairman of the Railway Commission stated yesterday in Montreal that the Canadian Pacific Railway claims they have some kind of exclusive privilege which prevents the regulation of their charges by the Railway Commission. I know that two years ago the Minister of Justice expressed the opinion in this House that all the freight charges of the Canadian Pacific Railway were subject to revision by the commission and I hope that that is so. If it is not so, now that the government has given notice that they intend to investigate the express charges, I trust they will press the matter vigorously and ensure the carrying of these products between the east and the west at reasonable express rates.

Mr. LAKE. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) has challenged me to place the position of the Northwest farmer in regard to the tariff before this House. I have already twice stated what the general view of the western farmers with regard to the tariff is, and it is not necessary for me to state it a third time at any length. Briefly, it is this : That the farmer of the Northwest does not consider that the duties on wheat and cattle, which are his two great staples, are of any practical benefit to him at all, and that rather than have that tariff used as an excuse for increasing the duty on the articles which he consumes, he would prefer from his own standpoint to see the whole tariff upon all agricultural products

swept away completely. But of course he does not ask for that, he is willing to live and let live. He does not wish to see any increase in the present tariff, and especially is that the case with regard to fruit, for in the Northwest we are not yet able to grow the larger fruits for ourselves, although we can now produce the smaller varieties. Any measure which would tend to increase the price of fruits to the people of the Northwest would be resented very strongly by them. In my opinion it would be very wrong to pass such a measure at the present time. I gather from the remarks made by gentlemen interested in fruit growing, that under the present condition of freight rates they would not be able to supply the demand of the Northwest for some classes of fruit as well as it is now being supplied from the adjacent States of the American union. They tell us however that they will be able to supply us at some time in the future with these fruits on the same or more advantageous terms than the growers in the United States, and when that time comes about it will be time enough to consider the question of duties. At present, in my opinion, the people of the Northwest are most strongly opposed to anything which will increase the price of fruit to them.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to state that in my opinion a duty of one cent per pound on peaches in quite sufficient. We are large packers of peaches and when the crop is short in the Niagara district we have to obtain our peaches from the American side. If we had to pay more than one cent per pound duty it would make the cost of the peaches too high. It must also be remembered that on the basket which weighs about 4 pounds we have to pay a duty of 4 cents. I think the peach growers are well protected at the present time and as a packer I would be opposed to raising the duty on peaches. We have only one section of the country to depend on for our supply of peaches. At one time we thought we could look to the district of Kingsville near Lake Erie but they have been unfortunate in their peach crops and they are devoting their attention to tobacco culture, so that the Canadian packers have to depend entirely on the Niagara district ? I do not think that the duty on this article should be raised. The consumption of canned peaches has increased nearly 50 per cent on account of the Northwest filling up. We are actually packing 50 per cent more than we did three years ago.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. As a canner, I quite agree with my hon. friend, but, as a grower, the argument he used is one why he should have more protection.

Mr. PATERSON. Are you a grower or a canner now under this?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I am a grower. I am talking in the interest of the great body of the people. The canners are few in number and there are enough Canadian peaches to supply them, and if there is not we can grow them ; and so I think that the growers are the ones who ought to be most considered in this case. I read a letter the other day from a gentleman in Michigan, addressed to one of the committee appointed at these meetings at Grimsby, as an argument why Michigan and Ontario should lie down in brotherly love and have free trade in fruit. This gentleman came from Port Huron, and he said he had a brother-in-law or a friend who had a large peach orchard, and the peaches one year rotted on the ground, but at that very time he could have sold them to a canning factory in Grimsby if it had not been for the duty, and that was advanced as an argument why the fruit-growers of Ontario should have free trade with Michigan. It appeared to me to be about the same as an argument of another gentleman in regard to a field of blackberries. He said his friend had a field of blackberries, but the price in Port Huron was so low that there was no profit, but in Canada, just across the river there was a profitable market and therefore the Canadian fruit-growers should have free trade in fruits with the Ontario growers. I think that is an argument like that of my hon. friend, that what is in the interest of the canners is not exactly in the interest of the fruit-growers.

103. Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, and containing not more than 40 per cent of proof spirit, in the liquid contents thereof, 50 per cent, 50 per cent, 50 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, in the old tariff the duty was $2 per gallon on fruits preserved in spirits. There was no distinction made between the degree of spirit in one case or another. We have divided the item, making it 50 per cent ad valorem in the case of fruits preserved in spirits up to 40 per cent of proof spirit ; and when there is more than that, we apply the duty of the spirit itself, which is $2.40 per gallon and 30 per cent.

105. Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages, the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, per pound, 1½ cents, 2 cents, 2½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. Insert please after the word 'other' and before the word 'packages' the word 'air-tight,' the same as in the previous case; and after the word 'packages' the letters 'n.o.p.' The rates are as before.

Amendment agreed to.

106. Jellies, jams, preserves, n.o.p., and condensed mince-meats, per pound, 2¾ cents, 3 cents, 3¼ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out the letters 'n.o.p.'

Motion agreed to.

109. Almonds, walnuts, Brazil nuts, pecans, and shelled peanuts, n.o.p., per pound, 1¾ cents, 2 cents, 3 cents.

Mr. GANONG. There seems to be some difference between that and the old item 96.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; the old item was 3 cents and the preferential rate would be 2 cents, and it is now 1¾ cents. We want to take a middle rate of 2 cents, which is the rate governed by the French treaty, so that if at any time the middle tariff should come into operation, the rate would be the same as that established by the French treaty.

Mr. GANONG. The old rate admitted peanuts at the rate of 2 cents per pound in the shell.

Mr. FIELDING. We have also item 112.

Mr. GANONG. But still under item 112 you have the 3-cent rate on the peanuts in the shell. Under the old tariff it was 2 cents. As I understood, under the old tariff the rate of 2 cents was levied on peanuts because of their not having the same value as other nuts. The duty of 3 cents seems to be very excessive.

Mr. FIELDING. Two cents is the rate established as the French treaty, and we took that as the rate for the intermediate tariff. There is an increase in that under the general tariff, but that would be subject to the French treaty all the same. It would apply, for example, against the United States at the high rate, but from all treaty countries the French treaty rate of 2 cents would still prevail.

Mr. GANONG. The intention of this is to raise the duty on American peanuts from 2 cents to 3 cents?

Mr. FIELDING. That would be the effect.

Mr. GANONG. Does the minister not think that is a rather excessive rate on goods that are not worth more than 3 cents a pound?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a heavy rate; it is a revenue item.

Mr. GANONG. In comparison to the value of filberts, almonds and Brazil nuts, it would certainly seem to be an excessive rate.

Mr. PATERSON. It is an increase on that, not on the shelled peanuts, but on the other.

Mr. GANONG. It is on peanuts in the shell.

123. Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, including oysters, n.o.p., 17½ per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an increase. It was 25 per cent under the old tariff.

Mr. FIELDING.

124. Oysters, shelled, in bulk, per gallon, 7 cents, 9 cents, 10 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the same.

125. Oysters, shelled, in cans not over one pint, including the duty on the can, per can, 2 cents, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the same as the general tariff. The difference sometimes is a fractional one.

126. Oysters, shelled, in cans over one pint, and not over one quart, including the duties on the cans, per can, 3 cents, 4½ cents, 5 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. It was 5 cents before, general.

127. Oysters, shelled, in cans exceeding one quart in capacity, including the duty on the cans, per quart, 3 cents, 4½ cents, 5 cents.

Provided that a fraction over a quart shall be computed as a quart for duty purposes under this item.

128. Oysters in the shell, 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

129. Oysters, seed and breeding, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters, free.

130. Turtles, free.

131. Leeches, free.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the same.

132. Live fish and fish eggs, for propagating purposes, free.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a new item.

133. All other articles, the produce of the fisheries, n.o.p., 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 23, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. W. S. CALVERT (West Middlesex) moved that all petitions for private Bills presented on Tuesday the 22nd instant, and all like petitions presented on Wednesday the 23rd instant, be read and received forthwith.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Explain.

Mr. CALVERT. I understand this is the last day for presenting petitions, and that if these petitions were not read until to-morrow the parties would be liable to a fine of $100.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have adopted rules, and I think they should be

followed. The public have been notified of what would be the consequence if they did not avail themselves of the delay accorded them. This is a matter so well known that I do not think we should depart from the rules at all.

Mr. CALVERT. Of course this being the last day of presenting petitions, I did not know for my part that they had to be read to-day in order to avoid a fine. The time was extended until this day, consequently I myself as well as others thought that by presenting petitions to-day we would be in ample time. I was advised however by the clerk that they would have to be read to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we adopted this motion we would always be in this position, that if some petitions happened to come up on the last day before the expiry of the prolonged delay, we would simply have a continued repetition of motions of this kind. I agree with the Prime Minister that we should abide by the rule. I do not think that I would be much in favour of extending the time so much as it has been extended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The petitioners lose nothing, simply the payment of a small sum of money. But it is a lesson for the public, if I may use that word in no invidious sense, to give them to understand that they must be diligent, and that if there is not diligence there is a penalty to which they must submit.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I think if the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition will reflect for a moment and remember that this is the last day in which petitions can be received, I do not think they would insist in opposing the motion. The petitions which are presented to-day are within the time limit, if presented to-morrow a fine will be imposed. I think it is stretching the rule one step further than the language would convey. But in order that there could be no question about it, it was suggested by the clerk upstairs that a motion of this kind should be made in order that the petitions might be read and received to-day, and so the rule would be complied with in all respects if the question were raised to-morrow. Now the parties who have petitioned to-day for a private Bill, I presented one myself, thought that by presenting it this last day they would avoid a fine which otherwise would be imposed. If the construction of the rule is to be that the petition must be read and received within the time limited by that rule, it should be understood, but I would submit to the House that it is not reasonable, upon this the first occasion when the rule is put in force, that it should be so rigidly construed. But if in future it is to be construed in that way, then the public will have notice, and that fine will be imposed. As to what the hon. leader of the opposition said, I do not think, with all respect, that it is applicable to the case. If the petition were presented before the fine would apply, there would be no question of making a motion that it should be read and received on that day. The fine would have to be paid according to the rule unless the House remitted it, so that I would with all respect, submit that what he suggests might happen might not happen as he suggested. I would therefore ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to reconsider what they have said in that light, and I would ask if it is fair on this first occasion when the rule is to be made applicable that the fine should be imposed. I think the parties who have presented their petitions to-day can be said to be within the rule without that motion, but if this motion is requisite I submit that it should be allowed to pass and that in future it should be understood that the fine will be inflicted unless petitions are read and received within the time limit. Then, the purpose of making this rule would be thoroughly understood.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know anything about the construction of the rule. In whatever way the rule may be construed by the officers of the House I am prepared to acquiesce in it, but I object to departing from the usual practice of the House simply because we have a graduated scale of fees. It is not a fine; it is simply a graduated scale of fees. We are asked to depart from the general procedure of the House for that reason. I see no good ground for it. In so far as I am concerned I do not know who presented the petitions. It is not on account of any personal objection to the particular persons who are presenting these petitions but because I think that having made this rule we should follow it out and not alter our procedure in a way which may establish a precedent.

Mr. CALVERT. It does seem to me that when you state that petitions shall be presented up to a certain date the public and even the members of this House would not be aware that it would be necessary to receive these petitions one day in advance in order that they may be read in the House at the proper time. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said that if you are going to have the petitions in at the proper time you must have them presented one day in advance of that time. Then, we will know what to do, but it does seem that when a day is set for the receiving of petitions, so long as the petitions are received within that stated time, they should be received by the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the rule is that petitions can be presented to-day I imagine it would follow as a matter of course that they could be read to-morrow. If that

does not follow then you pay the increased fee. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be content to leave himself within the rules of the House and then if he is really under a hardship—the increased fee is only $100 and it is not much of a hardship—it will be open for the House to grant relief if it sees fit.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that under rule 87 no such motion as this can be made unless a report has been first made by the Committee on Standing Orders recommending it, and I therefore declare the motion to be out of order.

Mr. CALVERT. Well, there is a report.

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk tells me that there is not.

Mr. CONMEE. The rule states that petitions shall be presented within six weeks of the opening of the House. Now, I think everybody who read the rules understood—for myself I so understood—that it would be perfectly within the rule to present these petitions to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is so, then there will be no extra fee.

Mr. CONMEE. Now is the time to put it right.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not say anything about the presentation of petitions but it says that :

Petitions for private Bills shall only be received by the House within the first six weeks of the session.

Shall only be received.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Great West Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Prudential Savings Society.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Calvert.

QUESTIONS.

WELLAND CANAL—CONTRACT OF CATARACT POWER COMPANY.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN asked :

1. How much water was the Cataract Power Company allowed to divert from the Welland canal by the original lease ?

2. Has the amount of water so allowed to be diverted been increased since then ? If so, when and to what extent ?

3. Is there an application now before the government for a further increase in the water taken by this company ? If so, what is the amount requested, and what is the date of such application ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. 100 cubic feet per second.

2. Yes. December 31, 1902. 700 cubic feet per second.

3. There appears to have been no application received by the Department of Railways and Canals, for a further increase of water from the Welland Canal.

PERFORMANCE OF HOMESTEAD DUTIES.

Mr. WALSH—by Mr. Blain—asked :

In respect to the following lands, viz., the northwest quarter of section 22, township 31, range 11; the southeast quarter of section 16, township 31, range 11; the west half of section 16, township 31, range 11; the southeast quarter of section 12, township 31, range 11, all west of the 3rd meridian : (a) In whose names are they held ; (b) the date of original entry; (c) have the necessary homestead duties been performed; (d) if not, are they subject to cancellation ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The northeast ¼ of section 22, township 31, range 11, west 3rd meridian, was entered for as a homestead on the 6th June, 1905, by H. Gansaker. According to the inspector's report the duties are being performed.

The southeast ¼ of section 16, township 31, range 11, west 3rd meridian, was entered for on the 9th February, 1905, by William A. Jones. According to the inspector's report the duties are not being performed, and cancellation proceedings have therefore being instituted.

The northwest ¼ of section 16, township 31, range 11, west 3rd meridian, was entered for on the 4th October, 1904, by John Cameron and voluntarily abandoned by him; and on the 14th of October, 1905, entered for by A. Salisbury. Cancellation proceedings have been instituted, and the entrant given a certain time within which to satisfy the land agent that he was in residence. The time has expired, and the agent is being asked for a report.

The southwest ¼ of section 16, township 31, range 11, west 3rd meridian, was entered for on the 7th December, 1905, by J. G. Lark. The entry was cancelled, and entry therefor allowed to Gabriel J. Fournier on the 25th July, 1906. It has been represented in letter, dated the 4th December and received on the 3rd instant, that the entrant is ill, and that the homestead will be abandoned ; and in a letter of the 27th ultimo, received on the 10th instant, it is stated that the land is vacant and it is asked whether it is open for entry. Inquiry is being made with a view to deciding whether cancellation proceedings shall be instituted or not.

MANUFACTURE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. DUGAS asked :

1. How many manufacturers of Canadian tobacco are there in Canada, including manufac-

turers of combined Canadian and foreign tobacco ?

2. How many of such manufacturers existed before 1897 ?

3. What quality of Canadian tobacco has been prepared in this country during the last fiscal year ?

4. Since the customs duties have been raised in regard to the importation of foreign tobaccos into the country and have been converted into an excise tax on tobaccos prepared or intended to be prepared, can tobaccos that are not intended for fabrication be imported free of duty ?

5. If so, what might be the quantity of foreign tobacco that has been imported free of duty into Canada from 1897 to the present ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Tobacco manufacturers—Canadian, 29; combination, 9 ; total, 38. Cigar manufacturers—Canadian, 3 ; combination, 13 ; total, 16.

1895-6.

2. Tobacco manufacturers—Canadian, 10. Cigar manufacturers—Canadian, 3.

3. The quantity of Canadian tobacco manufactured was as follows :

	Tobacco.	Cigars.
Canadian..	3,178,725 lbs.	1,031,110 No.
Combination.. ..	1,845,272 "	9,630,795 "
Combination cigarettes.. ..	7,161,500 No.	

4. Tobacco leaf which is not intended to be manufactured under excise supervision cannot be imported free of duty.

5. None.

CUSTOMS DUTIES COLLECTED.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. What were the amounts collected for customs duties at each of the ports of Sydney, N.S., Sault Ste. Marie, Hamilton and Midland, for the fiscal year 1898-9 ?

2. What were the amounts collected for customs duties at the above-named ports each year since 1899 ?

3. What was the gross amount so collected at all of said ports since 1899 ?

4. What was the gross increase in customs collected at said ports since 1899 ?

5. What was the gross amount paid by the government of Canada to the various manufacturing companies carrying on business at each of the above-named ports each fiscal year since 1899, for bounties for the manufacture of iron and steel ?

6. What was the gross amount paid for said bounties since 1899 ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1 and 2. Customs collections :—

Fiscal Year.	Sydney, N.S.	Sault Ste. Marie.	Hamilton.	Midland.
	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1898-9.	10,790 35	19,491 39	634,614 07	32,295 85
1899-1900.	251,472 91	89,140 74	795,407 11	21,527 22
1900-1.	271,018 13	222,880 70	735,550 30	14,146 19
1901-2.	131,443 53	386,460 03	798,878 87	26,585 36
1902-3.	168,679 70	265,950 13	1,003,081 20	23,342 74
1903-4.	125,192 04	47,041 01	1,166,006 71	34,853 52
1904-5.	125,738 43	222,716 93	1,204,674 60	12,518 37
1905-6.	145,129 37	192,474 80	1,469,407 88	23,673 10

3. $9,974,991.62.

4. $5,094,650.

5. The bounties on iron and steel paid to the companies carrying on business at the undermentioned ports, since 1899, were as follows :—

Fiscal Year.	Sydney, N.S.	Sault Ste. Marie.	Hamilton.	Midland.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1900.	.....	.....	115,931 00	.....
1901.	55,287 00	.....	167,469 00	59,169 00
1902.	304,901 00	.....	223,057 00	80,146 00
1903.	960,980 00	48,297 00	148,276 00	71,285 00
1904.	468,134 00	.....	165,445 00	69,376 00
1905.	676,880 00	404,956 00	187,994 00	55,388 00
1906.	957,337 00	535,190 00	206,839 00	32,013 00
	3,466,519 00	988,443 00	1,215,011 00	367,377 00

6. The gross amount of said bounties is $6,037,350.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN asked :

1. Was any arrangement made, and if so, what, between the government of Prince Edward Island and Canada, in the year 1900 or 1901, with respect to non-fulfilment of the terms of union, as regards winter communication ?
2. Has any demand been made on the Dominion government by the government of Prince Edward Island, for like breach of contract, subsequent to such arrangement ?
3. If so, what is the amount of such claim, and has the government decided to pay it ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There is no arrangement between the Dominion and Prince Edward Island beyond what we have already placed before the House and no correspondence beyond what has been brought down.

MR. JUSTICE MAGEE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. How many cases have been tried by Mr. Justice Magee on which he has reserved his decision ?
2. On what dates were said cases so tried, in which he has reserved his decision ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The government is not possessed of any information on the subject.

DREDGING IN ST. CLAIR RIVER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked :

What was the amount paid by this government each year since 1896, for dredging at the mouth of the St. Clair river, and Sarnia bay, the price per yard paid in each case, and the amount paid for tug service each year ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Paid for work at Sarnia. No division made for work done at Sarnia and in Sarnia bay. In 1901, $3,250. In 1902, $6,250 at the rate of 9½ cents per cubic yard, including towing. In 1904, $5,651.40 at the rate of $12 per hour for dredge and plant; 167 hours at $3 were allowed as extra towing. In 1905, $1,200 at the rate of $15 per hour for dredge and plant. In 1906, $8,396.95 at the rate of 17 cents per cubic yard, including towing.

RED ISLAND, N.S., DREDGING.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Has the government had any work done by dredging or otherwise in cutting a sand bar at Red Island, in the county of Richmond, N.S., for the purpose of providing a harbour ?
2. If so, how long has the work lasted, and how much money was spent on such work ?
3. Was the work done by government dredges or by contract ?
4. If by contract, were tenders called for, who tendered, and to whom was the contract awarded ?
5. By whom was the coal for the dredges furnished, and at what cost ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). We have wired to the local superintendent of dredging, but have not yet received his answer.

Question allowed to stand.

WHARF IN RICHMOND COUNTY.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Has the government bought a wharf in the county of Richmond, N.S. ?
2. If so, from whom, for what price, and for what purpose ?

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

1. If the hon. gentleman refers to River Bourgeois, yes, the government has bought a wharf at that place.
2. From Angus J. Boyd. Price paid, $1,000. Bought in connection with proposed improved wharfage accommodation at that place.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

In addition to the amounts paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, as shown in return to order of the House of Commons, dated November 28, 1896, are there any accounts still unadjusted, or any claims for compensation ? If so, what are they, and for what amounts ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Yes. There is under adjustment the balance of an account amounting to $31,804.18, on account of 6,536 immigrants.

FISHING SEASONS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. What constituencies in the province of Ontario are subject to an open season and closed season for fishing ?
2. What period of the season are they closed and open ?
3. Were any special regulations applied to the constituency of North Bruce during 1906 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The whole province of Ontario is subject to close seasons for fish.
2. The close seasons are :—Speckled trout, 15th September to 30th April ; salmon trout, 1st to 30th November ; pickerel, 15th April to 15th May ; bass, 15th April to 15th June ; maskinonge, 15th April to 15th June; *whitefish, 1st to 30th November. (*No close season for whitefish in Detroit river or off the coast of the county of Essex.
3. Yes, the open season for salmon trout and whitefish was extended five days.

FISH BREEDING AND PROTECTION.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

What amount of money was expended propagating the fishing interests in each province of the Dominion during the year 1906 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The following is the statement of expenditure :—

Province.	Fisheries.	Fish Breeding.	Fisheries Protection Service.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Ontario	4,949 67	14,911 64	32,585 51	52,446 82
Quebec	8,123 04	12,774 54	26,969 49	47,867 07
Nova Scotia	49,351 10	33,203 27	74,816 39	157,370 76
New Brunswick	35,856 38	25,759 09	14,746 04	76,361 51
Prince Edward Island	9,351 81	6,419 04	26,364 36	42,135 21
Manitoba	3,687 07	25,923 29	7,867 70	37,478 06
Saskatchewan and Alberta	11,124 22	.....	.....	11,124 22
British Columbia	30,141 33	83,687 16	54,113 76	167,942 25
Yukon	1,083 31	.....	.....	1,083 31

Not chargeable to any particular province :—	
Building fishways and clearing rivers	$ 2,926 63
Oyster culture	3,708 14
Cold storage for bait	84,678 90
Disposal of dog fish	63,114 35
Fish drying experiment	10,509 50
Georgian Bay laboratory	2,110 39
Marine biological station	2,914 03
Fishery commissions	14,998 22
Legal expenses	780 47
Fishing bounty	158,546 65
General	25,653 64

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham) moved :

For a copy of all reports and plans of engineers during the years 1905 and 1906, regarding the Trent Valley canal, and especially that portion thereof between Rice lake and Lake Ontario.

He said: In moving for the reports of the engineers for 1905-6, regarding the Trent Valley canal, I do not propose to discuss the question of outlet at any length, but I simply desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson), if the reports are not ready to be brought down at the present time when they will be in such a position as to enable him to take the House into his confidence. I may remind the minister that in reply to a large deputation that waited upon him last session from the territory served by the canal he stated that he would be in a position this session to decide upon the southern outlet of the canal and that he hoped to go on with the construction and completion of that southern outlet. I find that in the estimates only $280,000 is asked for the purpose of construction during the coming year, and if that is the only sum that is to appear in the estimates during the present session, it seems to me that the construction of the canal will not be pushed on with a vigour which would lead the people of the country to suppose, that it is intended to prosecute the work to completion at an early date. I would ask the minister for such information as he can give to-day, reserving any remarks I may have to make in regard to outlets for a future time.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I would like to make a few remarks as to the entrance to the canal from the Georgian bay. I am not aware whether or not a survey was made last year of that portion of the Trent Valley water system between Lake Couchiching and the Georgian bay, but I am glad to know that the minister was over that part of the line and, if all reports are true, he was most favourably impressed with the enormous possibilities of the Severn river as an entrance from the Georgian bay to this canal. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) that if no further amounts are to be voted than the sum now in the estimates, it is evident that the construction of either the Lake Ontario or the Georgian bay outlet is not contemplated, and I hope that in the supplementary estimates there will be such a sum as to enable the work to be taken up from Port Severn on the Georgian bay clear through to Lake Couchiching. I wish to impress on the government the fact that this canal system is now open from

within ten miles of Lake Ontario to Lake Simcoe. There are on that portion of the canal a number of large towns, Peterborough, Orillia and others. At Midland a large quantity of coal is delivered annually by vessels that have gone to Tonawanda with lumber, and if this canal was constructed to-day from the Georgian bay to Lake Simcoe, the result would be that Peterborough, Orillia, Barrie and these towns would be in the advantageous position of securing cheap freights. I am not going to argue the possibilities of the system from Lake Simcoe to Nottawasaga bay or from the Severn river to Lake Couchiching, an arm of Lake Simcoe, because I think it is a foregone conclusion in the mind of the minister that the only entrance for that system will be by the Severn river. All the arguments that have been advanced are in favour of that entrance. I hope that the minister will be able to announce here to-day that final surveys have been made and that the Georgian bay entrance of the Trent Valley canal will be at Port Severn, via Lake Couchiching, and that there will be a sufficient amount in the estimates to prosecute that work.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I entirely concur in what the previous speakers have said in reference to the propriety of putting a more substantial sum in the estimates so as to have this work completed at an early date. There is a very large investment in this work already—an investment which can yield no adequate return until the outlet and the inlet of the canal are completed. It seems to me therefore, that the wise course for the government to adopt is to proceed rapidly to the completion of the canal. In fact, I can conceive of no excuse for not completing this work at any early day, and, to that end, appropriating whatever amount is required, except the impossibility, if such there be, of securing the necessary number of men to do the work. That, I grant, would be an excuse. But the money has to be expended ultimately, and, until it is expended, we shall not receive any adequate return from what has already been invested. That view of the case, I think, has been concurred in by everybody. But, when my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says that it is a foregone conclusion that the connection at the western end is to be by the Severn river, I do not at all agree with him. There is no foregone conclusion, nor any ground for a conclusion upon the matter. Whatever may be the feeling in the riding which my hon. friend represents, I can tell the minister that, in the very large section represented by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) and myself, including the town of Barrie, there is a very decided feeling that the proper course will be shown to be westward from Kempenfeldt bay by way of the Nottawasaga river to the Georgian bay. And, while I do not propose to go into any long argument on the matter at present, I wish to impress upon the minister that the government, instead of being committed to the proposition that this inlet is to be by way of the Severn river, the government have promised in this House—the minister himself has promised—that there shall be a careful survey made of this alternative route, before the government commits itself to any scheme one way or the other. Following that matter up, I had correspondence with the government in the same direction. In December last, I wrote to the minister, and received the following reply from the deputy minister :—

Ottawa, December 11, 1906.

Dear Mr. Lennox,—In reply to your inquiry of the other day asking if any survey had been made between the Georgian bay and Lake Simcoe by the Nottawasaga river, I may say that a recognizance survey has been made which has not yet been reported upon to us.

Now, until the report of that survey has been obtained and an exhaustive survey has been made, I submit, the minister should not commit himself to one or other of these inlets. I am perfectly satisfied that, after the proper investigation has been had, whichever inlet is shown to be most in the interests of the country at large, that route shall be adopted. But I enter my earnest protest against the minister committing himself to any scheme until there has been a sufficient survey made of the alternative route suggested by way of the Nottawassaga river.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Like the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), I desire that the minister should wait until he receives the report of that recognizance survey made through the townships of Nottawasaga, Sunnidale and Vespra reaching to the town of Barrie. I understand from the department that the report of the survey is about completed, that it will be thoroughly considered by the minister, and that we should be given an opportunity to state our views. I have that assurance in writing from the minister, and it is only right that we should be so permitted to present our views and those of our constituents of North and South Simcoe before action is taken. On an occasion of this kind, I suppose, one ought not to discuss either the Severn route or the route by way of Kempenfeldt bay, the western end of Lake Simcoe. But I may say that the people of that locality look anxiously for that decision. They are anxious that the canal should be built. And I quite concur in what my hon. friend from South Simcoe says, that the people want that route selected which is shown to be the best; they do not want the canal built through their territory if that does not offer the best route. I think that, on this occasion, one should not say more than that the people of that region believe

that the route through the townships I have mentioned is the best one. That, of course, is only a belief. It is not founded upon reports of recent date, though, I believe, surveys were made many years ago which would point in that direction.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). It affords us old timers along the Trent canal great pleasure to see the procession of hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House rising to speak in favour of this canal. The latest accession is the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, who a few days ago, announced his belief in the construction of the canal and gave it as the mandate of the government that the work should be pressed to a speedy completion. Now, we have been looking for a very large sum—two or three millions of dollars—in the estimates to complete the canal. It matters not specially to me, or to the people residing along the canal, what outlet is taken, so long as at each end, the best is taken. The people demand that the canal shall be completed. I am sure that the remarks of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) will be hailed with great pleasure on both sides of this House, especially by those interested in the canal. Very rarely have we heard his musical voice advocating the Trent canal. But, in him, we have one more in the ranks of those in favour of the completion of the work.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) has not been present when I have advocated the canal. I have spoken five or six times in support of it.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I am always here when the Trent canal is up for discussion. The excuse that the minister is waiting for surveys will not do. The Nottawasaga route, the Severn river route, and the shorter route through Lake Couchiching direct to Midland harbour, as well as the surveys from Rice lake to Port Hope, and down the Trent river, and five or six others through the riding of my hon. friend from West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) are all in the department. In fact, if the minister of Railways and Canals is of the same mind as the Prime Minister, all he has to do is to look up the surveys, put a sum in the estimates and proceed with the building of this very necessary work. Some of us want to see it completed before we are called to join the great majority—

Mr. FIELDING. This majority.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. That is a very common place majority, where the hon. member (Mr. Armand Lavergne) sits. I speak of the great majority, and before we join it we want to see this work completed. I trust the minister, in making his announcement to-day, will tell the House that he has decided upon a certain outlet at either end, and that he has determined, before the estimates of another year are brought down that the work shall be pressed forward to a speedy conclusion.

Mr. R. R. HALL (West Peterborough). Considering the spirit of levity, considering the ill-suppressed fun of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes) in discussing this matter, we can understand how it came about that during the eighteen years of Conservative administration the Trent canal was merely the political football of that party. We can readily understand the spirit of levity in which he speaks of this great Trent canal project which the Transportation Commission has found to be a very important link in our transportation system. We can readily understand how, when the Conservative government were in power, they treated this matter in a spirit of insincerity, since they only spent in eighteen years upwards of $800,000; whereas the Liberal administration during the last ten years have taken hold of the matter in a business-like way and have expended upwards of $4,100,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to point out what new contracts have been let by the present government?

Mr. HALL. I may point out that the same spirit of insincerity characterized the late government in 1896 when they called for tenders and let contracts right on the eve of an election in order that they might influence the votes of people living along the line of the canal. I look upon this matter as being in the interest of the whole Midland district, in the interest of a large section of the province of Ontario, in the interest of the people of the Northwest, in the interest of a transportation route that will afford cheap freight rates from the Northwest to the sea-board. Therefore, I contend that the present government have taken hold of this question in a serious way. They have investigated it as business men in order to find out the cheapest, the most efficient and the most economical outlet on Georgian bay and on Lake Ontario. I submit that we can rest in patience until that report is brought down, as I hope it will be the present session.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I notice that this is the second time that the hon. gentleman from Peterborough (Mr. Hall) in discussing a simple question of transportation has shown himself unable to do so without introducing partisan politics. The other day the hon. gentleman made the same assertion he has to-day, that this canal has received an impetus from the government now administering the affairs of the country, far greater than the impetus it had received by their predecessors. If my memory serves me right, there

has not been a single contract let by the present government since they came into power for extending the Trent canal. There may be for a small portion, but I do not think there is. The hon. gentleman says that these contracts that have been lately carried out were made on the eve of an election for the purpose of gaining political support for the Conservative party. I am not aware of anything of that kind having occurred. When I was Minister of Railways I was a strong advocate of the Trent canal, but it was always opposed by the party supporting the present government. But to-day hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their views with regard to the Trent canal, as they have on many other questions. We were always supporters of the Trent river navigation, and we promoted it, not from a political point of view, but because we believed it to be in the interest of the country that that section should receive canal accommodation. Perhaps we did not go as far as these gentlemen have done who think that in order to satisfy that section of the country the canal should be extended up to Newmarket. Everything we did was constantly opposed by hon. gentlemen in the opposition. Not only, however, is it a good thing now, in their estimation, but we must have several branches of that canal for the purpose of assisting hon. gentlemen with political objects in view, like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I suppose they have no intention of doing anything of the kind. Of course, the extension of the canal to Newmarket had no political object whatever. When the Conservative party were in power they made such an expenditure on the canal as our revenue enabled us to do with a view of building and completing it as soon as our resources would allow. Now this hon. gentleman, for the second time in discussing the transportation problem, has made a comparison for political purposes between what this government has done and what their predecessors did for the Trent canal. He did the same the other day, and I thought it was in very bad form. The fact of the matter is that since these gentlemen have been in power they have not let a single contract for the extension of that canal.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am sorry my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has originated this post mortem inquiry as to the past conduct of governments in connection with this canal. Whatever atmosphere may have surrounded this proposition in years gone by, I think to-day the House and the country recognize the fact that the matter is now being dealt with from a business standpoint. We are not letting any contracts or reaching any decisions without first having a proper survey and plans, as I think was the case with respect to some of the contracts which were let early in 1896, when there were no proper plans before the department. But I need not occupy the time of the House in discussing a matter which, it seems to me, is premature. I will content myself with answering the question of the hon. mover of the resolution.

Mr. HAGGART. What plans and contracts were let to which the hon. gentleman alludes?

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to the lift lock and that portion of the canal near Peterborough.

Mr. HAGGART. I simply deny it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a matter of positive proof, demonstrated by an examination which was held by an independent gentleman, not an official of the government, not in any way connected with politics, and his report has been laid before the House. I have stated that we propose to deal with this matter in a business-like way. My hon. friend has asked a fair question: When we may hope to have the report from the engineer in charge as respects the canal entrance, both from the Georgian bay and from Lake Ontario. I may say to my hon. friend that I hope before next week passes over our heads to be in a position to lay on the table of the House a full report of the surveys which have been made by Mr. Welch, superintending engineer, as well as reports from members of his staff. I presume there will be reports to him from the different resident engineers, and all these papers will be laid on the table. Comment has been made upon the fact that there is nothing in the estimates this year.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that apply to the Georgian bay as well as to Lake Ontario?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the surveys of all. I will bring them as fast as they are received and I am in hopes, from a conversation had only yesterday with Mr. Walsh, of being able to present all the reports of the whole canal system next week, certainly within the next ten days or a fortnight. They will be laid before the House at the earliest possible moment. I anticipate that I will be able to lay them before the House within a fortnight and I hope next week. Now, comment has been made on the fact that nothing has appeared in the estimates. It would be absurd for us to undertake to make an estimate of what would be required until the report from the engineers is received.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Has the hon. minister in his department now and has he had for the last ten, fifteen, or twenty years, reports just as accurate as the one he is going to have now and from just as competent engineers as those who are now employed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam Hughes) I will say, most unmistakably and unqualifiedly, no. There are reports but they are not sufficient; at least, they are so regarded by those who are competent to judge. I am not personally competent to judge and because of the want of information it was necessary to have these surveys made in order to obtain a comprehensive idea of the whole situation. I have been endeavouring to deal with this matter from a business standpoint and not from a political one. I had the pleasure of going over the portion of the country between Couchiching lake and Georgian bay. I went by way of the Severn river route and I am bound to say that I was very much impressed with the conditions found there. But, I am not a judge. It must be left to those who are competent to judge although I am sure if I were to speak offhand, as one not having much knowledge of such matters, I would say that there could be no better scenic route or more agreeable route than that by way of the Severn river. But, from the engineering and other standpoints it may be that it is not the best one. However, I am in this matter, in so far as I am personally concerned, with an open mind. I am open to conviction and I will give weight to the judgment of those who ought to know. When the reports are received they will be laid before my colleagues and before this House and then the matter can be discussed. Then it may be proper for us to take up the time of the House in dealing with the matter or discussing it with full information before us. Until that time arrives I do not think that any one is in a position to properly discuss it. I hope I have answered the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. WARD. There is just one point that the hon. minister has not touched upon and perhaps it is the most pertinent to this inquiry. That is the question which I asked him before if he would state to the House and to the people of the country, whether, when these are received, it is the intention of the department and of the government to push the matter to a speedy completion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say to my hon. friend that at the very moment the government is in possession of the necessary information a very decisive 'yes' or 'no' will be given and the House will be informed of the decision. If it is 'yes' I may say to my hon. friend that I think he will find the government are determined to push the work to a speedy completion, because, if it is a good thing, we cannot have it any too soon.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one thing that must be said that is that if the government intend to push it to a speedy conclusion their attitude up to the present time seems to be a strong argument to the contrary. There are two ends to this canal—one on Lake Ontario and the other on the Georgian bay. Surely it does not require ten years for the government to get their engineers to report upon at least one end of it. For two years that question has been under the consideration of the government. Two years ago, they endeavoured to elect the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) upon the ground that they would reach a decision in regard to that very shortly, but he could not tell the electors of West Durham whether the mouth of the canal would be at Port Hope or somewhere else. But, it was said that it would be decided at a very early date, and the government were apparently most anxious to have this work carried on. Yet, they stand after two years in just about the same position as that which they occupied then. They have added a little more to it because they have taken up the other end and now they cannot decide at which port on the Georgian bay the mouth of the canal will be. It will be a very pertinent problem for the people in the locality to put to themselves, if the government after ten years, cannot get from their engineers a report and cannot reach a decision in regard to one end of the canal, how long it will take them to reach a decision in regard to both ends.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SITE OF STATION IN QUEBEC.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) moved:

For copies of all correspondence between the government and the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, and with all other persons or corporations concerning the erection of a railway station, either on the Champlain market or elsewhere in the city of Quebec, and copies of all documents in connection with that matter.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this resolution I desire to give a brief explanation as to its object. There is, in the city of Quebec, a great deal of agitation about the construction of the public station of the Transcontinental Railway. We have been told, and it looks as if it were practically decided, that the commission were going to erect the station at the foot of the cliff right below the Dufferin Terrace at a place known as the Champlain market. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the site selected by the commission is very unpopular in the city of Quebec, in fact, the whole city is opposed to it. The board of trade has passed a resolution condemning the proposed site, the citizens of Quebec have written articles in the local press and the railway companies, which have been asked to join in the erection of that station and to make it a

union station, have condemned the proposed site as have also the navigation companies. The opinion has been practically unanimous, except that of the commissioners of the transcontinental, against the selection of this site, and the reason for that opposition is obvious. If that site were selected a whole ward of the city would disappear. Champlain ward would disappear, and it is in that locality that the business men, the men of the legal profession and the great wholesale stores do their business. Not only that, but it is at the Champlain ward that, I should say, fully one-third of the people of the Quebec district have their market facilities. The people from the counties of Lotbiniere, Levis, Bellechasse, and Montmagny have their natural entry at that point, and if the station were constructed there the farmers would be deprived of the place they have now for selling their produce. It would ruin the marketing facilities of fully one-third of the people of the Quebec district. Not only that but I think I might be justified in saying that if a station were constructed at the foot of the cliff right below Dufferin Terrace where the Transcontinental Railway Commission intend constructing that station it would involve an expense of many millions. Wharfs would have to be built because it is a very well known fact that about 25 or 30 tracks would have to be constructed. Most of lower town is actually constructed on wharfs. If this station were constructed there and if new lines were to be added, as they would have to be added, because the Transcontinental Railway, the Intercolonial Railway, the Quebec Central, the Delaware and Hudson and other railways would come in, you would have to build new wharfs. These wharfs, extending from the bridge as far as the city of Quebec, a distance of four or five miles, would cost an immense sum of money and the reason is very clear. It is that about 30 feet from the present wharf the depth of water is 70 feet. That proves the immense difficulty if not the impossibility of constructing these railway tracks from the bridge along the river front and building the union station on the Champlain market. I do not want to cast any blame on the president of the Transcontinental Commission, who is the one who has favoured the building of this station at the foot of the cape. No doubt he thinks that is in the interests of the railway, but it is against the will of the people of Quebec city, and is almost physically impossible, and without imputing any motives to the president of the commission, I may say that although that gentleman may be a very good official and employee of the government in the construction of this railway, there is a rumour current in the city of Quebec that the building of this station on Champlain market, at the foot of Dufferin Terrace, is nothing but a speculation. We are told freely in the city of Quebec that a few speculators have options on almost the whole area of Champlain ward and that it is they who are trying to throw dust in the eyes of the government and force it to bring the railway there.

No doubt I shall be asked where do I want the railway brought. Well, there is a natural entry to the city of Quebec given by Divine Providence long ago for railways that pass over the bridge. You have the valley of the River Cap Rouge, which gives a natural entry to the north, going right into the district of Quebec east, which is the very heart of the city. And for railways coming from the north, you have the valley of the St. Charles, which is used today by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and might be used by any other railway from the north. You have therefore two natural entries to the city—by the valley of the Cap Rouge from the south and the valley of the St. Charles from the north, both of which go right to Quebec east, which is the heart of the city. Quebec east, as is well known to the right hon. the leader of the House, is the commercial part of Quebec. It is there the city is making its natural development. It is that part of the city which is increasing in population and commerce every day. There you have plenty vacant land. I am justified in saying that any railway company could get to the heart of Quebec by the valley of the St. Charles or the valley of the Cap Rouge river at a hundred times less cost than by Sillery, following the foot of the cliff, to the Champlain market. Everybody in Quebec, the board of trade, the navigation companies and the railway companies—all, except the officials of the Transcontinental, agree that the only and proper site in Quebec city for the union station is in Quebec east, where the Canadian Pacific Railway has its present terminus.

There is another reason which, although not as good as the ones I have given, still it should have some weight in favour of Quebec east. Quebec east has done a good deal for the government of the day and deserves to have something done for it in return by this government. Hitherto it has received nothing and has asked for nothing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is going to have a post office.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend suggests that the government are going to build a post office in Quebec east, and I congratulate him on that decision. It is something that has been long required, and the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) will deserve credit not only from the city of Quebec but the whole province of Quebec, for having at last done something for Quebec east, which has been neglected so long. For more than thirty years the people of that constituency have supported, in our country's interests, the right hon.

the First Minister. But 'Ils ont toujours été à la peine, mais jamais à l'honneur.' They have always had to bear the brunt of the fight but have never shared in the rewards. To-day the navigation companies and the population generally of Quebec city want a union station built in the heart of the city and are appealing to the right hon. the leader of the government, who represents Quebec east, to do that constituency justice.

Let me draw a contrast with this city. In Ottawa we are spending $60,000 a year for the purpose of improving it and making it the Washington of the north. In Quebec you will probably have to spend $60,000,000 in order to build a station on the Champlain market, and then you will not have improved the city.

Mr. BRODEUR. $60,000,000 ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. You will have to build a wharf all the way from the bridge to the Champlain market in a depth of water of sixty feet, which is the depth at thirty feet from the present wharf. You are going to spend an immense sum. You will find it not less than $60,000,000 when the work is completed. And in making that expenditure, you will ruin the beauty of Quebec city, which is to-day considered by tourists one of the marvels of the world. When you build a railway station right at the foot of Dufferin Terrace and the Chateau Frontenac—which adds one-third to the wealth of Quebec by the tourists it brings to the city—you will have the smoke of the railway trains disfiguring the terrace, and the continuous noise destroying one of the most marvellous boulevards in the world. And for what ? For no earthly reason whatever. We have an example here in Ottawa of how the passage of a railway can damage a city. Take the driveway along the canal on which so much government money has been spent. On one side the drive is charming and does credit to the Capital, but the other side will never be anything worth seeing because of the railway that goes right into the heart of the city along it. When you have a natural entry to the city of Quebec, which would cost practically nothing, it would be a national crime and vandalism to spoil one of the most attractive resorts in the world, Dufferin Terrace, by running a railway and constructing a station right beneath it. I suppose the objection will be raised here—as it has been in Quebec by certain interested parties—that the station is not a union station but a terminal station. Well, if it were a terminal station, that would change the matter entirely. That would bring up a legal question which we would have to consider.

That is a terminal railway station which cannot be built by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, because everybody knows that the terminus of the Transcontinental Railway is not going to be Quebec, but Moncton. Therefore, it cannot build a terminal station in the city of Quebec. That would have to be built by the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company. But that company has no right to expropriate land in the city of Quebec for the purposes of a railway station. The charter of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company was granted, I believe, in 1884 by 47 Vict., chap. 78, and this has been amended in 1887, 1891, 1897 and 1900. That company has not the right to construct a station ; it has only the right to construct a small piece of railway from the Quebec bridge to Quebec city, and a railway on the south shore for a few miles from the bridge. Another company was created in 1900, called the Quebec Terminal and Railway Company. This company was incorporated by 1 Edward VII., chap. 71. That charter gives this company no right to construct a station. Then the Quebec Terminal, Bridge and Railway Company was created by the amalgamation of the Quebec Bridge Company and the Quebec Terminal Company by 3 Edward VII, chap. 177. None of these companies, by its charter, has a right to construct a station in the city of Quebec, and it is only the Transcontinental Railway Commission that can do so. As the terminus of the railway is at Moncton, the station at Quebec cannot be a terminal station; it must necessarily be a union station. To that the corporation of the city of Quebec is opposed; to that the railways that come to Quebec are opposed; to that the navigation companies at Quebec are opposed; to that one-third of the people of the whole district of the south shore are opposed, because it would ruin their market facilities—and here I am speaking not only as a resident of the city of Quebec, but as the member for Montmagny, representing the interests of the farmers of that county. But there is another argument against the construction of this station, which may not appeal to some members of this House, but which will appeal to any resident of the city of Quebec who loves it as the first city of New France and the first capital of America; that is, that it would spoil the beauty of Quebec and be a national crime and an act of vandalism to build a station right below the Dufferin terrace, which is one of the marvels of the world, which has been styled by Lord Dufferin as one of the grandest and most sublime views in the whole universe. Therefore it is important that the whole of this correspondence be laid before this House, so that the people of Quebec and the people of this country generally should be enlightened as to the reasons for the construction of a station below the Dufferin terrace in the Champlain market in the city of Quebec.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, there can be and there is no objection whatever to bringing down the correspondence that is asked for by my hon. friend; but perhaps

he will be very much surprised if I tell him that he is labouring under a strange delusion in all the remarks he has offered to the House on this subject. My hon. friend will be surprised to learn that there is no correspondence whtever between the government and the National Transcontinental Railway Commission on this subject; nor am I aware that there is any correspondence between the commission or the government and any other person or corporation concerning the erection of a railway station, either on the Champlain market or elsewhere in the city of Quebec. I am aware that there has been a good deal of disturbance in the city of Quebec as to where the necessary station for the Transcontinental Railway is to be built. My hon. friend has assumed—he has stated, in fact, in very emphatic terms—that the Transcontinental Railway Commission has contemplated building a station. It has not contemplated building a station; that is no part of its plans at the present time; I do not know what it may do in the futture. The building of a station at Quebec is not the work of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, but the work of the Quebec Bridge Company. It is not necessary, for the purposes of this discussion, to refer to all the Acts with which that company has been dealt with by this parliament. It is sufficient to cite one, the Act of 1887:

The company may lay out, construct, maintain, work, manage and use a railway bridge with the necessary approaches over the river St. Lawrence at or near the city of Quebec; and may construct and arrange the said bridge for the use and passage of foot passengers and vehicles, or either, as and whenever they deem advisable.

When this Bill was passed, it was of course understood that the bridge itself without the approaches, would be absolutely useless. The necessary approaches to it were to be built to connect the bridge, first of all with the existing systems of railway, and then with the River St. Lawrence for navigation purposes. Where these approaches would be constructed was not then determined. But in 1903, the government came to parliament with a Bill to authorize the government to guarantee the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company, and then the approaches to the bridge were determined and set forth in the Act and they are as follows:

Whereas the company has by several Acts of the parliament of Canada been duly authorized and empowered to lay out, construct, maintain, work, manage and use a railway bridge, with the necessary approaches over the St. Lawrence river at or near the city of Quebec, and also to lay out, construct and operate the following lines of railway:

(a) Commencing at or near the northern terminus of the bridge of the company at a point in the parish of Ste. Foye in the county of Quebec, thence easterly following the general line of the St. Lawrence river to the city of Quebec;

(b) Commencing at a point at or near the southern terminus of the said bridge, in the county of Lévis, to a point at or near the intersection of the Grand Trunk Railway with the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière curve, in the county of Lévis, or to some point on the Grand Trunk Railway, or on the Intercolonial Railway near such point of intersection.

I may say that this approach on the south side has been completed and is now ready for operation. That was in 1903. The company then clearly laid down before parliament and the public generally the route which it was intended the railway should follow. We decided that the approaches should be not by the valley of the St. Charles but by the valley of the St. Lawrence. It is manifest to everybody that the Transcontinental Railway would be of no use whatever unless it had access to the St. Lawrence, unless it was placed in communication with the ocean. The Bridge Company thought it preferable and more in accord with the fitness of things and the physical conditions that the approach should be made by the Valley of the St. Lawrence, and not by the valley of the St. Charles river. As to that I have no opinion to express at the present moment, but that proposition was before the city of Quebec and before the parliament of Canada and no exception was ever taken, I am not aware of any exception being taken and even to this day, I am not aware that any protest has been received by the government. The company has proceeded upon this system, not only this system but this authorization, and is at this moment and has been for the last two years constructing its line of railway down the cliff to the Valley of the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend says it will cost $60,000,000 to bring that railway to the St. Lawrence. I do not know where my hon. friend gets his figures. I cannot say that it will take $60,000,000 to bring the railway down to the terminus on the St. Lawrence. The walls, &c., will cost money I have no doubt, but I am as much impressed with the value of the St. Charles river as my hon. friend is. The division which I have the honour to represent is situated not upon the St. Lawrence but upon the St. Charles river. I do not know that it would be cheaper to bring the railway down to the division of Quebec east on the St. Charles than to a point in Quebec west on the St. Lawrence river. I am not familiar with that and I cannot say if there is much to be said but I am certain of one thing that if you were to bring the railway by the St. Charles river to Quebec east and were to proceed to construct wharfs there, there would be as much if not more expenditure than there would be by having them upon the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend knows that the confluence of the St. Charles with the St. Lawrence is very shallow water, and you would have to construct enormous works in order to have communication with the St. Lawrence for navigation purposes. This matter has been be-

fore the public and no protest so far as I know has been raised.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) information as to the difference in level between the end of the bridge on the north and the point spoken of below the Dufferin terrace, where the station will probably be placed, and also the distance between the two ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no difference in level at all because you have to reach the level of the sea at one side or the other. The St. Charles flows into the St. Lawrence, and therefore the level is the same on the south and on the north.

Mr. BERGERON. What would be the distance ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The distance would be the same also.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears to me as if there must be a difference in level between the northern end of the bridge where it crosses the St. Lawrence, and the point where the station will be at the water level.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes, there is a difference, the difference is some hundreds of feet, but the difference of level, whether you reach the sea by the St. Lawrence river or by the St. Charles, is the same. There is a very considerable difference of level and it is a very heavy piece of work to get down, but where you have that heavy piece of work on the north or the south it is the same.

Mr. FOSTER. It would have to be built on either side ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been in the city of Quebec quite an anxiety as to where the terminal station should be. There are several railways now coming to Quebec. At the present time those to be served by this bridge are, first, those coming from the south, the Grand Trunk, the Intercolonial Railway, the Quebec Central and the Delaware and Hudson, four. On the north there will be the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern, the Quebec and Lake St. John, four also, and perhaps one or two others.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the Canadian Northern now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Quebec and Lake St. John Railway is not the Canadian Northern. It is quite proper that there should be a common terminal union station for all these railways. Where it should be is a question which is open for consideration, but it is quite premature to quarrel about that at the present time. The first thing we have to do at this moment is to get access to the St. Lawrence for the Transcontinental Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the first thing to be considered, because the railway if it is to have any object at all, if it is to serve any good purpose, and to do what we expect from it, must first of all have access to the ocean. It is contemplated that it should have access to the ocean by the St. Lawrence, in front of the city. My hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) says it would be an act of vandalism, it would destroy the beauty of the terrace. It will not improve the view but my hon. friend carries his case very far. He objects for instance to the entrance into Ottawa of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway on the bank of the canal, because just on the other side is the driveway which has been built by the Improvement Commission. It is certainly not adding to the beauty of the drive to have this railway on the other side but I am afraid there is no help for it. We cannot altogether sacrifice utility to beauty, we cannot give up transportation to preserve the beauty of the city and so it may be in Quebec. Any one who goes to Quebec and walks upon that lovely spot which my hon. friend has so eloquently described, the Frontenac Terrace, is rather shocked when he looks over the beautiful panorama before him to see the elevators of the Canadian Northern Railway. They do not improve the beauty of the scenery, but wheat is taken from them ; there is no help for it we must have these modern elevators, they are a necessity of our civilization.

Mr. BERGERON. Have they been used very much since they were built.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have not been used very much since they were built but they are a necessity and I hope they will be used by and by, and I am quite sure that the Canadian Northern will use them later on. At all events they were built for a very good purpose and whether they are used or not used, they are a necessity. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) I am sure would not say that if these elevators are used they should be removed. His argument would be if it has any force, that if they are not used they should be removed. They may shock the æsthetic taste of the man on the Dufferin Terrace, but it is one of the consequences of civilization which we must adopt and therefore I do not understand all the fuss about the union station. Where should the union station be ? I have always been of the opinion that it should be somewhere on the Plains and I think it will come to that in the end, but my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) altogether minimizes the enormous development which must take place in Quebec by and by. We must have railway communication as we have it at the present time we must have railway access the west just in front of the city——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would that be for freight ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That would be for everything. At present the Canadian

Pacific Railway has its line just on the wharf, and its passengers from the Empresses step out of the steamers and step into the train for the west. The same thing must take place for the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the Canadian Northern, for all these railways and these railways must come to the water front, must come to meet the steamers and come as near to the wharf as they can possibly be brought.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If my right hon. friend will allow me—could not the Grand Trunk Pacific meet the steamers exactly as the Canadian Pacific Railway does, instead of going right in front of the city?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. I suppose there were good reasons for choosing the course decided upon. At the very least, even if there be anything in the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne), it comes too late. It should have been made three years ago, when this Bill was passed. Now, after the work has been three years in progress, is no time to raise objection. I do not agree that it would be better to enter the city in the way my hon. friend proposes ; I believe it would be found preferable to come in the way that has been selected. My hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, stated that the railway companies were opposed to this entrance into the city—he stated that very positively. I think he has spoken without sufficient information. I have reason to believe exactly the contrary.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They have changed their minds.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Even in that statement, I believe, my hon. friend is not well informed. We shall have to place the views of the railway companies before parliament, and when they are before us, I think my hon. friend will have reason to change his views. There is no objection to bringing down the papers. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) will be surprised, no doubt, to know that there is no correspondence on the subject. So far as I know, there is none, even between the government and the Transcontinental Railway Commission. I have only to add that the hon. gentleman is under a delusion when he imagines that the Transcontinental Railway Commission is attempting to build a union station in Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask further, in the Act to which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred, if any power was reserved to the Railway Commission or any other body as to the particular location of lines from the bridge to Quebec city and the location of a terminal station?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. So far as concerns any intention on the part of the government, we had nothing to say on that subject—we simply agreed to leave it to the discretion of the company. The works to be built by the Bridge Company are to be as provided in the statute which I have already quoted. I find that Mr. Fitzpatrick, then Minister of Justice, amplified the language of the statute in what he stated on the subject in this House. On October 22, 1903, he said :

> The approach starts from the north abutment of the bridge and goes down along the river front, extending to the city of Quebec and ending in a place called Champlain market, at which point the existing railway systems—the Great Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Lake St. John—will connect with the contemplated terminus.
>
> Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that near the dock which the government built ?
>
> The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. About a quarter of a mile from it. The point I speak of now is immediately below the Dufferin Terrace.
>
> Mr. GOURLEY. Does it go around the bank of the river ?
>
> The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. The result will be you will not only have a bridge at Quebec, but material for the best harbour in the world.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister two questions. I gather from what he said that he thought that in the future some portion of the works would have to be on the plains.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated that my own individual opinion was that at some time we would have to have a union station on the plains.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is what I wanted to ask about. The building of the Grand Trunk Pacific is a very important national undertaking. So far as I can make out, there is to be a tide-water terminal there to meet the Atlantic steamers. Personally, I regard the port at Quebec as the most available port for this country in many respects. Now, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether parliament is free to pass judgment as to where these docks shall be and where the connection between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the ocean steamships is to be, or is that great question in relation to our transportation system subject to the choice of some local corporation in Quebec which may have other reasons than national reasons for the choice of location where ship and car shall meet?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In our plans the works of the bridge company are to be part of the Transcontinental Railway ; and, according to the law which has been passed by parliament, the railways are to be brought to tide-water in front of the city of Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me a little unfortunate that neither the Railway Commission, the Transcontinental Railway

Commission, the government nor parliament has anything to say about the location of what has properly been described as a great national work. This will be in one sense the terminus of what is called the National Transcontinental Railway. At the moment, I cannot quite understand the reasons why the construction of a great terminal station such as this should have been removed from the jurisdiction of the bodies to which I have referred——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Especially of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Especially of parliament—and placed under the control of a corporation which has for its immediate object, as I understand, the construction of the Quebec bridge. Of course, the Prime Minister points out that no objection was raised at that time by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) or any one else. But whether objection was raised or not, the responsibility rests upon the government——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—and it would seem to me that that responsibility cannot be very well discharged, so far as securing the best location is concerned, if entire control has been handed over to the corporation whose work is the construction of the bridge. If that be the real situation, it seems to me, to say the least, unfortunate. Of course, it is quite possible it may all work out right ; but, if so, it will not be by reason of any special regard having been had to the very important interests concerned, but by reason of the fact that the bridge corporation, in serving its own interterests, may also serve the interests of the nation as well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is under a misapprehension. I stated that parliament undertook, in 1903, to come to the help of the bridge company, and it decided where the approaches and the terminal should be. That route, as given in the statute, is as follows :

> Commencing at or near the northern terminus of the bridge of the company at a point in the parish of Ste. Foye, in the county of Quebec, thence easterly following the general line of the St. Lawrence river to the city of Quebec.

Of course, we must reach tidal water, and it was then decided that we should reach tidal water, not by the valley of the St. Charles, as now proposed by the member for Montmagny, but direct along the bank of the St. Lawrence to the front of the city of Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that, but it does not seem to alter the situation very much. The termini are given, and the general course is given, but, apart from that, nothing is defined. In addition to what I said a moment ago, there is this further unfortunate feature of the situation, that although this line of railway is to be built out of the bonds guaranteed by this country, the country has no voice, so far as I understand the Prime Minister, in fixing the particular location within the city of Quebec. The city of Quebec is the ultimate location, but the city of Quebec covers a pretty large area.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the river side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood one terminus was at the northern end of the bridge, the other was the city of Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Upon the St. Lawrence. That is defined in the statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not remember that the words 'on the St. Lawrence' were used in the statute.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statute says : 'Thence easterly, following the general line of the St. Lawrence river to the city of Quebec.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would that determine the location within half a mile or even a mile within the city of Quebec ? I do not think it would. Then as I say, you have this unfortunate situation, that although the country is providing, by means of a guarantee, all necessary funds for the construction of this work, the country does not seem to have much to say with regard to the particular location or character of these terminals in the city of Quebec, and it may be of the utmost importance to the National Transcontinental Railway that these should be located in a particular place. But the difficulty seems to be that the direction which will determine the location will not proceed from the government or the commission itself, but from the corporation to whom has been delegated the construction of this work at the expense of the people of this country.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). I am like the party who, after hearing the lawyers, felt that the more he heard them talk the more he got confused. I had an impression that I understood the actual condition of these two companies, but at the present time I am not so sure about it. If I remember correctly the Bill by which the Grand Trunk Pacific, or the Transcontinental Railway was brought into existence, specifies clearly that the commission have power to construct the main line only, they have not power to construct one mile or foot of road excepting the main line. I think if you look up the charter of that road, or the authority given to the commission to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific, it will be found that the Transcontinental Railway Commission have no power to build one foot of a Transcontinental Railway excepting the

main line. Now, the main line reaches the Quebec bridge, but it goes no nearer the city of Quebec, nor can it go any nearer the city of Quebec than the Quebec bridge, if I understand the case correctly, until the Grand Trunk Pacific is either taken out of the hands of the commission, or that is provided for by special Act, passed here. But, at the time we passed the charter guaranteeing the bonds of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, there was a proviso inserted that this government may take over at any time, and under certain conditions, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company. The impression I got from the remarks of the right hon. the Prime Minister was that he was talking as though these two roads are government roads, or they may be, but they are not yet. The power is given under that Act of 1903 by which, when the government chooses, they may take over that road, and then they may connect the Grand Trunk Pacific as a road with the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company and come down from the bridge into the city. But at the present time the Grand Trunk Pacific has no power to build a station, nor to build a foot of that road from the bridge into the city of Quebec, and they have no way of getting into the city on government property excepting by way of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company. I think that these few remarks, if they are correct, should clear up a good deal of the discussion we have heard.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell me, after all the expenditure that is about to be incurred, how the government is to see that the terminal facilities to be constructed are sufficient to accommodate this great traffic that is supposed to come from the west. The commissioners cannot provide it, the hon. gentleman says they are prohibited.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He has made that clear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then somebody else has to do it. But apparently they can do as they like. Now, I want to know in what way has the government a check on the action of this bridge company to compel them to build terminals in such a place, and of such a nature, as will accommodate the traffic whether it be sea-bound or land-bound.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Glengarry has answered that. We have full control over the Quebec Bridge Company, and we can take the work out of their hands at any time if the company does not pay its expenses.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Have any bonds been endorsed for that company as yet, and to what extent?

Mr. FIELDING. Bonds have not yet been issued to the public, but banking arrangements have been made based upon the government guarantee. I could not give the hon. gentleman the amount offhand.

Mr. FOSTER. That is practically the same as though they had been issued. They have been allowed to make financial arrangements.

Mr. FIELDING. The money which will build the bridge will be largely raised in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the question is rather an important one, from what the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. J. T. Schell) has said, if after all the expenditure on the Grand Trunk Pacific, after all the millions that we have given, the line stops short of the city of Quebec, namely, at the northern end of the bridge, and that the company has no power to enter the city of Quebec, and no power to build terminals in the city of Quebec, but that power is intercepted by the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, which has an independent power of its own. The government contributes its credit to enable that company to make this expenditure and to build its line down to the city of Quebec, and the company may go on and make expenditures with reference to terminals or stations, but the government has no control with reference to the character of these expenditures, the buildings which should be erected, or anything of that kind. When it comes to the final analysis, the only remedy the government has is that if the thing is not satisfactory, they can avail themselves of the privilege of buying out that company and taking the whole thing over to themselves, which may be a very expensive transaction to the government. The fact is that the cash and credit of the country is enabling the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company to build that, but the government has no control at all over all the expenditures to be made, with the exception that it is defined in the statute that the company shall proceed along the course of the St. Lawrence river into the city of Quebec. Is not that the case?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not think that is so. I think the manner in which the money is to be expended and the location of the road, are subject to the government engineer.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was going to ask the right hon. gentleman if he knows as a matter of fact that his government is exercising supervision over this expenditure that is now going on and for which banking arrangements have been made on the guarantee of the country. Is supervision being exercised to-day in regard to the expenditure on his great undertaking?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I can assure my hon. friend that all the money which has been drawn by the government for this expenditure has been drawn on the report of the engineer of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) answer another question? Is the Finance Minister prepared to say approximately how much has been advanced? Would $6,000,000 be too large a figure?

Mr. FIELDING. I was not aware that there was to be a discussion on this subject, and I have not the information here. I would not care to answer off-hand, but I might say that the bonds have been placed in the hands of a trust company and arrangements have been made with the bank. This is practically equivalent to the issue of the bonds under the guarantee, but all the money going into this undertaking is drawn on the reports of the government engineer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Reports of what character?

Mr. FIELDING. Not having heard the discussion I do not wish to break into it here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend, the leader of the House that the reports might be of such a character as not to affect the point we are discussing just now. The reports might be merely as to the expenditure incurred. That would not be of any use in so far as the point we are discussing is concerned, but if the reports are of the character that has been suggested by my right hon. friend they would, of course, meet a great deal of the criticism that has been made this afternoon. Perhaps the Prime Minister will be good enough to bring down the contract and all the reports?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is not at all germane to the question before the House. We would have to bring down during the session all the reports as to the expenditure of money and everything connected with the bridge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not the motion cover these?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it does. At all events my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) is not here, and I am not prepared with all these details.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It calls for all documents in connection with these matters?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it refers simply to the building of the station.

Concerning the erection of a railway station, either on the Champlain market or elsewhere in the city of Quebec, and copies of all documents in connection with that matter.

The discussion has branched off to the location of the bridge, the location of the approaches, the character of the contract and so on. These are very legitimate questions, but I do not think they are germane to this motion, and I am not prepared for it, but the information will be brought down in due time.

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand that the right hon. leader of the government agrees to bring down all the papers?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, everything.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I was very much surprised to hear that there was no correspondence in the hands of the government or of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, but I hope there will be tomorrow some strong correspondence on the part of the government addressed to the Transcontinental Railway Commission directing them to stop any idea of building a station on the Champlain wharf. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said that the construction of this station was in the hands of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company. Well, there are two questions which arise. First, has the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company the necessary legal power to expropriate the property of the city of Quebec for the purpose of building a station? Secondly, who is going to pay for the station? Is it the government, as it appears, or the country? Then, the station is not built for the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, but it is built for the Transcontinental Railway. On the other hand, if the country pays for it and it is built for the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company is having a public expenditure made on its account without any reason or colour of right. Further, my right hon. friend has said that I was rather exaggerating in quoting the expenditure at $60,000,000. I think my right hon. friend did not catch me entirely. I said that we were spending $60,000 on Ottawa to improve the city and we would probably spend $60,000,000 more in the city of Quebec not to improve the city, but on the contrary to make it uglier. I am not exaggerating when I place the sum of $60,000,000, but I believe that that statement may be far below the mark. There will have to be a descent of 400 feet to get down from the level of the Quebec bridge to the river front and you will have to build a wharf from the Quebec bridge to Champlain wharf, a distance of four or four and a half miles. There are a few old wooden wharfs to-day that will have to be taken away. New ones will have to be built and I think it is the Quebec city engineer who has reported that 30 feet distant from the present wharfs the depth of the River St. Lawrence is 70 feet. Therefore, wharfs four or four and a half miles long would have to be built in a depth of 70 feet of water.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend pretend that we will have to build wharfs four miles long?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I think we will have to do more than that. Here is the reason: We are going to build about 25 or 30 tracks. It is a well known fact that all the railways will have to come through there from the bridge. It will be the only way into the city of Quebec from the bridge. I understand very well that the other railways have the right to build from the Quebec bridge through the valley of the St. Charles or of the Cap Rouge river, but they will not build by that route because they will come into the city by the other ready built route and you will have to build twenty-five tracks on the river front. To support these twenty-five tracks you will have to build wharfs and these wharfs will cost money. Besides that, as I have said, you will have to connect two different levels varying in altitude for 300 or 400 feet. On the other hand you have a natural entrance without building any wharfs through the valleys of the different rivers to the heart of the city of Quebec which is the Quebec east district. I am not exaggerating at all in saying that the work on the river front with the building of the station below the Dufferin Terrace will cost many, many millions, while on the other hand the work of coming into the city of Quebec by the St. Charles valley or the Cap Rouge valley will cost practically nothing. What are the terms of the Act of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company? The Act says that the railway shall follow the general line of the St. Lawrence. Anybody can take a glance at the map of the city of Quebec and see that you might as well go through the valley of the St. Charles or through the valley of Cap Rouge to follow the general line of the St. Lawrence as by the other route. By following of the river front closely you are not following the general line of the St. Lawrence any more than by taking the other route because everybody knows that Cape Diamond is merely a point advancing into the St. Lawrence, forming a sort of peninsula, and if you start from Quebec bridge and go down by the Cap Rouge or the St. Charles river valleys you follow the general line of the St. Lawrence. You can go to Quebec east and there you can just as well build wharfs where the Grand Trunk Pacific can reach the steamers of the navigation companies in the very same way as the Canadian Pacific Railway, going through the valley of the St. Charles, goes right to the river front and reaches the steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway line as well as of other lines at the Louise basin in Quebec east. It is following the general line of the River St. Lawrence from Portneuf right straight along the St. Charles valley. It goes through the St. Charles valley straight to the river front following the general line of the St. Lawrence without following the river front below the cliff where it is physically impossble to construct tracks without building these wharfs and where necessarily you will have to build many large wharfs at a cost of immense sums of money. My right hon. friend has given us a good argument, it seems to me, when he says that we must sacrifice utility to beauty, but there is no necessity here of sacrificing utility to beauty. We are sacrficing both beauty and utility, but I do not know why except for the reason which I have given and which is current in Quebec and that is that those who are in favour of erecting the station below the cliff have no other reason than speculation and nothing but speculation. You are sacrificing the utility and beauty of the city of Quebec by going along the river front when you have a natural way by the St. Charles and Cap Rouge valleys. Therefore it seems to me that copies of all documents relating to this question should be laid before the House so that the people of the city of Quebec may know whether their interests are going to be sacrificed to those of the bridge company or whether their rights are going to be respected.

Motion agreed to.

DENATURED ALCOHOL.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the subject of denatured alcohol, and legislation permitting the manufacture and use of the same, free from excise duty for fuel, light and power, and in the industrial arts, is one which is worthy of and should receive the early and careful attention of the government and of parliament.

He said: I may say that denatured alcohol is simply alcohol so changed that it is rendered unfit for use as a beverage. Alcohol is usually denatured by the admixture of some ingredients which makes it both unsafe and unpleasant as a beverage. In a discussion of this subject the terms 'ethyl alcohol' and 'methyl alcohol' are frequently used. Ethyl alcohol is the chemical or laboratory equivalent for the commercial term 'grain alcohol.' Ethyl alcohol however is not always manufactured from grain. In Europe it is largely manufactured from potatoes and sugar beets and also from a low grade of molasses. Methyl alcohol is a product of the dry distillation of wood.

During last year the United States congress appointed a special committee to inquire into the whole subject of denatured alcohol. And in speaking this afternoon I shall frequently refer to that committee and to the evidence of witnesses who appeared before it. It is expected that denatured alcohol, if permitted to be sold free from excise or any other internal tax, will take the place to a large extent of wood alcohol, coal oil, gasoline and other by-products of petroleum and turpentine. It will take the place of these

because, in some cases, of its greater degree of economy; in others because of its greater efficiency ; and in other cases because of the lesser degree of unpleasantness, unwholesomeness and danger to health and property in using it. I should like to place upon the record the important part of the Bill passed last session by the United States congress with reference to this subject :

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that from and after January first, nineteen hundred and seven, domestic alcohol of such degree of proof as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, may be withdrawn from bond without the payment of internal revenue tax, for use in the arts and industries, and for fuel, light and power, provided said alcohol shall have been mixed in the presence and under the direction of an authorized government officer, after withdrawal from the distillery warehouse, with methyl alcohol or other denaturing material or materials, or admixture of the same, suitable for the use for which the alcohol is withdrawn, but which destroys its character as a beverage and renders it unfit for liquid medicinal purposes ; such denaturing to be done upon the application of any registered distillery in denaturing bonded warehouses specially designated or set apart for denaturing purposes only, and under conditions prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The remaining parts of the Bill—which is not a long one—provides for the enforcement of the Act and imposes penalties for its infringement.

I might point out that Germany leads the world in the consumption of denatured alcohol in the arts and manufacture and for technical and domestic purposes. But it is only fair to point out, that if denatured alcohol is so largely used in Germany, its use is fostered to a great extent by the government. A bounty is paid not only on alcohol but upon many other substances and articles in the manufacture of which alcohol is used.

Again in Germany there is quite a heavy import duty upon coal oil and the various products of petroleum, so that for those reasons alcohol is considerably cheaper there than in Great Britain, while in Britain petroleum and its products are cheaper than in Germany. In 1886 Germany used about ten million gallons of denatured alcohol. In 1901, which is the latest year for which I have a return, the consumption increased from ten million gallons to over thirty million, about two-thirds of which was used for fuel and heat and in manufacture. The remaining one-third was used for lighting and various chemical purposes.

Before the special committee of congress to which I have referred, Prof. Zintheo was one of the witnesses in favour of the proposed legislation. He is now an officer in the United States Department of Agriculture, and his duty is to investigate and report upon the various new farm motors and other implements of such character as are used upon the farms of the United States. He was formerly engaged in the State college of Iowa as professor of agricultural engineering. Before the special committee of congress he produced cuts, photographs and descriptions of a great many devices manufactured for sale and sold and used in Germany in which alcohol is used. For instance motors for use in the fields for ploughing and other purposes. Other motors used on the highways for traffic purposes. Stationary engines used by the farmers for running various implements in their dairies and houses. Other small stationary engines for military purposes. Stoves for heating purposes—all of which use alcohol as fuel. Lamps for lighting, smoothing irons used in the laundries, self-heating, with alcohol as a fuel, at a cost of one cent an hour. One of the members of the committee asked whether these devices were actually in use in Germany. The witness replied that he was giving the information from the catalogues of German manufacturers who made these things for sale and who sold them in that country, and that they were being commonly and generally used. In conversation a day or two ago with the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon), who spent during last summer a considerable time on a business trip in Germany, he told me that on every hand in the German empire one found various implements, in which alcohol was consumed, used for almost every conceivable purpose.

I would call particular attention to the possibilities of the use of alcohol for lighting purposes. Mr. Nahum Bachelder, president of the patrons of industry of the United States, giving evidence before the committee of Congress stated that alcohol at any price was as economical for lighting purposes as coal oil at one-half the price, and the alcohol light was a better light than the petroleum light, being much easier on the eyes, with no disagreeable odour as in the case of coal oil, and with absolutely no danger from explosion, it being perfectly safe. Professor Rosseau, of the University of Brussels, Belgium, said that as a result of repeated experiments extending over a considerable period, he had found that alcohol selling at 31 cents a gallon was as economical for lighting purposes as coal oil at 15 cents a gallon. In Germany, Belgium, France and other countries of Europe there are a great variety of lamps made for the use of alcohol for illuminating purposes, varying in power from twenty-five to more than six hundred candle power. In fact, it is said that there are in use to-day, alcohol lamps giving more than one thousand candle power. These lamps are used not only for indoor lighting, but also for street lighting. I may say that the Imperial palace of Germany is lighted with

alcohol lamps. One German manufacturer says that his firm alone has manufactured alcohol lamps for lighting three hundred German railway stations and two hundred railway stations outside of Germany. In the New York electrical testing laboratories, by actual experiment it was proven beyond any doubt that alcohol is as economical for lighting purposes as coal oil at half the price. In these repeated experiments at these laboratories an alcohol lamp of 30·5 candle power occupied fourteen hours 11 minutes in consuming one quart of alcohol, while a coal oil lamp of the latest improved style of slightly less capacity, 30·3 candle power, burned only 7 hours 8·8 minutes in consuming one quart of coal oil. Those of us who have noticed from time to time the alcohol lamp in the laboratory or work shop of the worker in metals, with its little insignificant blue flame, may wonder how it is that an alcohol lamp may be successfully used for lighting ; but alcohol lamps constructed for lighting purposes are equipped with a Welsbach incandescent burner similar to those used by us on our gas jets. Alcohol is successfully used not only for lighting, fuel and power, but also in many lines of manufacturing. It is used in the manufacture of varnish. Before any tax was imposed on grain or ethyl alcohol, it was used largely for that purpose; but now, because of the heavy excise duty collected on alcohol, the manufacturers of varnish use either turpentine or wood alcohol. But it is said that the ethyl or grain alcohol makes a much better varnish, more easy flowing and smoother, than the wood alcohol, besides being cheaper. And a large number of furniture and piano manufacturers using varnishes, appeared before the committee praying that the proposed legislation might be enacted. Alcohol is also used in hat manufacturing for the purpose of dissolving the shellac used for stiffening hats, either felt or straw. A large number of employers, and also employees, of American hat factories appeared before the committee of Congress to give evidence and to ask that the legislation might be proceeded with, not only because of the greater economy in the use of grain alcohol but also because of the disastrous effects upon the workmen from the use of wood alcohol. Two witnesses, employees of the hat factories, who appeared before the committee, were perfectly blind, and one of them was also deaf and dumb, and they said that eminent physicians whom they had consulted had stated that their blindness, and in the one case the deafness and dumbness, were due to the use in their occupation of wood alcohol, which diffused fumes such as a man would feel if he were standing over a grater all day grating horse radish. Alcohol is also used in the manufacture of analine dyes, blackings, dental goods, silks, paints, Japaned ware, lacquering, photographers' supplies. smokeless powder, and a large number of other things. Referring again to the use of alcohol for power purposes, we all are aware of the large number of gasoline engines being used in this country as well as in the United States. Where small power is required, the cylinder of a gasoline engine is air cooled; but the cylinder of a gasoline engine of larger power becomes much more highly heated and requires to be cooled by a water jacket and requires an auxiliary water bucket. These add to the weight of the machine, which, in a machine used for traction purposes, is a great disadvantage ; they also add to the expense. The alcohol engine does not develop so much heat, and the water jacket is not required, even in engines of the largest power. Alcohol is used in Germany, France and Austria for the propelling of automobiles. It is said that in the automobile races that are frequently held in France and in Germany the alcohol automobile has in every way held its own with the automobile driven by gasoline, electricity or any other power. Not only may alcohol be used just as cheaply as gasoline for driving an automobile, but it is attended with a great deal less inconvenience. Gasoline, I am told, is never free from a slight sediment, which clogs the delicate feed ducts of the engine ; and when this takes place the engine stops and the automobile is at standstill. I was told by a gentleman in Ottawa who handles a large number of automobiles that water in the gasoline is a greater nuisance than any other substance, and in order to exclude the water and other substances, the gasoline has to be strained through chamois. With alcohol there is no such inconvenience. Again, the automobile and the motor boat, when used for pleasure purposes, are to a large extent luxuries ; and the man who can afford an automobile or a motor boat, with all the expense of keeping it up, would prefer to use alcohol, even if it were to cost a little more than gasoline, because of its much greater convenience and safety, and every one knows that gasoline is not only offensive, with its disgusting odour, but that it is very dangerous also either to use or to store.

In 1896 the Belgian government removed the duty from denatured alcohol, and while in 1896 in Belgium they used denatured alcohol to the extent of 126,000 gallons, six years afterwards, in 1902, the use of denatured alcohol in that country had risen from 126,000 gallons to 924,000 gallons, an increase of more than sevenfold, and it is said that the use of alcohol in France and Austria increased to even a much larger extent. It may be thought that as the United States have only during the last year passed any law permitting the manufacture and use of denatured alcohol without duty, perhaps we had better delay for a little while, had better go slowly and see how this legislation works out on the other side of the line. I may point out that if Canada should follow the

example of the United States in passing such legislation, we would not be the second on the list or even the tenth but really about the twentieth, for the following peoples, and perhaps others, have already passed legislation by virtue of which denatured alcohol is made and used without any excise duty having to be paid: France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Norway, Austro-Hungary, Portugal, Cuba, Peru, Brazil, Venezuela, the Argentine Republic and Chili.

A word as to the source of supply or the varied sources of supply from which alcohol may be derived, and as to the cost at which alcohol can be produced, which is a matter of very great importance. The cost will depend to a large degree upon the source from which the alcohol may be obtained. In Germany alcohol is manufactured from potatoes, grain and from a low grade of molasses, most largely from potatoes. In France alcohol is largely produced from the sugar beet. Professor Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, of the United States Department of Agriculture, says that in Europe the potato is almost the sole source from which commercial alcohol is made. I have said that it is manufactured in France from the sugar beet. I was reading the other day an article in a sugar journal published in Chicago pointing out that the sugar beet is one of the sources from which alcohol may be economically manufactured in the United States, and if it can be manufactured in the United States it can be manufactured from the same source in Canada as well. That article pointed out that away in the western states, far from the source of the petroleum supply, and where by reason of the long haul and heavy freight charges petroleum is expensive, the country is well adapted to the growing of sugar beets, especially upon irrigated lands. I would point out that we have in the province of Alberta, irrigated lands as well adapted for the production of sugar beets as any in the United States. It is also pointed out in this article that sugar beets containing too small a proportion of saccharine matter to be profitably manufactured into sugar may be manufactured into alcohol with a considerable profit. While in Germany the potato is the chief source of the alcohol supply, in the United States alcohol has been manufactured and is likely, for a little time, at least, to be manufactured almost entirely from corn. A word as to the probable price of alcohol manufactured from corn. There is a distillery in Peoria, Illinois, that has been manufacturing alcohol for ten years almost continuously, that is to say from the first of January, 1896, to December 31, 1905, and that distillery at Peoria shows by an examination of its books that in some years the cost of corn alcohol has been as low as 9·36 cents per gallon, and that the average price for the ten years has been 19·40 cents per gallon. It is estimated that corn at 30 cents a bushel will give alcohol at 11 to 12 cents a gallon, and that corn at 35 cents a bushed will give alcohol at 14 cents a gallon, and corn at 40 cents will give alcohol at 16 cents a gallon. The Hon. Mr. Payne, chairman of the committee of congress to which I have referred says, that he thinks the figures are scarcely reliable, that they are somewhat too low, and that we may safely suppose that the cost of a gallon of alcohol will at all times be about equal to half the price of a bushel of corn. It is estimated that one acre of corn yielding 50 bushels to the acre will yield from 125 to 150 gallons of alcohol per acre, a bushel of corn yielding from 2½ to 3 gallons of alcohol. It is further pointed out that the manufacture of alcohol for beverage purposes or for medicine, must be only from the highest grade of grain, that imperfect and inferior grain cannot be used for such purposes, but the manufacture of alcohol for manufacturing purposes or any technical purpose, may be from second and third class or inferior grain. In the Canadian Northwest we have every year a certain amount of grain damaged by frost, some years a large amount of this grain, and it is well pointed out that from grain so injured alcohol may be manufactured of just as good quality for manufacturing or technical purposes as any other, at a greatly reduced price. Professor Wiley, the eminent chemist to whom I have before referred, says, that if we will take the whole corn product of an acre of ground, that is to say not only the grain but the plant as well, at that period when the corn is beginning to glaze in the ear, that that acre, using the whole plant, stalks, leaves and grain, will yield twice as much alcohol as if the grain alone is used. If that be true. it will give us alcohol at a greatly reduced price, and I further point out that in many parts of Canada corn can be grown to the period when the grain is beginning to glaze in the ear while it cannot so safely and certainly be raised to the time when the corn fully ripens. As I have said, the chief source of the alcohol supply in Germany is the potato. The Hon. James Wilson, United States Secretary of Agriculture, states that alcohol may be very cheaply made from the potato in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture, who ought to know whereof he speaks, says that we may safely count upon an average yield of 300 bushels of potatoes to the acre, and that this is not an impossible average using and cultivating the varieties of potatoes we now cultivate for table use and he says that if the varieties of potato we now grow will yield 300 bushels this will yield, about 255 gallons of alcohol as a bushel of potatoes will give us about 5-6 of a gallon of alcohol. This would give us 255 gallons of alcohol from one acre of potatoes, with a yield of 300 bushels to the acre.

But Mr. Wilson points out that if we chose our variety of potatoes, not as we do, for table purposes but selecting the variety that will give the largest possible yield, we can grow 500 bushels to the acre, because he says there are many varieties that will give to us an extraordinary yield but which we do not grow because they are of inferior quality for use upon the table.

I think that Hon. Mr. Wilson is somewhat extravagant in his estimate. I do not think that 300 bushels of potatoes can be counted upon as an average yield for an acre in the province of Ontario. I believe we do not grow nearly so large a yield per acre as that. I do believe, however, that, in some parts of the province of New Brunswick, and perhaps, in many parts of our Northwest, if we choose the right varieties and cultivate them in the proper manner, we can count upon an average yield of 300 bushels to the acre. If we cultivate potatoes largely for the production of alcohol, as in Germany, we will cultivate them by better methods, as I understand, is done now in Carleton county, N.B. All the planting, cultivating and harvesting will be done by machinery rather than by hand and a special fertilizer will probably be used in growing the crop. If we can produce 255 gallons of alcohol from an acre of potatoes, we shall be able to pay the grower a very profitable price for his product, and, at the same time, produce alcohol at so reasonable a figure, as to permit of its use for light, fuel, power and mechanical and manufacturing purposes. In Great Britain, it is said, the denatured alcohol is sold at about 36½ cents per gallon. The price is made up as follows : The actual cost of the alcohol is about 20 cents ; the cost of government supervision of the manufacture is about 9 cents ; and the cost of supervision of the sale and use a little over 7 cents. But it seems to me quite unreasonable that alcohol which costs 20 cents a gallon to make should cost 16½ cents for government supervision. A special committee was appointed by the British House of Commons in 1904 to investigate this question of denatured alcohol. That committee reported in 1905, and recommended that the rules for the manufacture, use and sale of denatured alcohol, should be made less stringent, more elastic, and the cost of government inspection very largely reduced.

Mr. W. L. Lummis, manager of the Commonwealth Manufacturing Company of Boston, Mass., appeared before the congressional committee to give evidence in opposition to the legislation then proposed. It had been argued that, were this legislation carried into effect, the farmers of the United States would be given a very much enlarged market for the products of their farms Mr. Lummis argued against that, and endeavoured to make it clear that the farmer would have no such enlarged market. He pointed out that, if the law came into force in the United States, it would not be the product of the American farm that would be used in the manufacture of the alcohol. To be exact in my representation of his views, I desire to quote the words of this adverse witness :

> As is well known, millions of gallons of base molasses are produced in all the central and South American countries and the West Indies, which is now largely burned, fed to animals, or destroyed, although a portion is dumped on our shores, at almost any price above freight, and at New Orleans, Boston and Brooklyn is being worked up into inferior liquors. That it is not more generally used at present is due to the fact that alcohol made from molasses has a disagreeable odour and taste which renders it less acceptable for the chief purposes for which ethyl alcohol is now employed in the United States, namely, liquors and medicines.
>
> For industrial purposes, however, especially where repulsive denaturants are to be employed, the odour and taste of molasses alcohol are not a defect, and should the tax-free law open an avenue to its more extensive use it is difficult to see how any other material could be considered for the manufacture of industrial alcohol.

And, in another part of his evidence, Mr. Lummis pointed out that alcohol from this base molasses could be manufactured for 12 cents a gallon less than from corn. If this be true, it would give a very cheap alcohol indeed. I am informed that in the Hawaiian Islands millions of gallons of this base molasses are destroyed every year, merely in order to get rid of it. Mr. J. S. Capen, of the Detroit Board of Trade, appeared as a witness before the congressional committee, and spoke in favour of the legislation. He said :

> Alcohol can be produced from any old thing that has sugar or starch in it, and once give our American inventor a chance at a market as great as this and in a very short time he will have processes that will do away with any fear of scarcity of fuel.

Now, I claim that the Canadian inventor is just as clever and ingenious as is the American. And there is a great deal in what Mr. Capen said. With the very heavy excise duty which has been imposed upon alcohol, it was impossible to use that material for any of the purposes to which I have referred, and therefore, the minds of our scientists, our chemists, our manufacturers, our inventors, have not been directed to the subject of alcohol. But, remove that duty, make it possible that alcohol may be used for these purposes, and then our scientists and inventors, with the commercial men to back them, will put their best intellects to work to discover the cheapest possible source and methods for the manufacture ; and, as Mr. Capen says, I have no doubt that alcohol will be furnished us at a price that will put it within our reach for all the purposes of which I have spoken. Professor Zintheo produced cuts or photo-

graphs of a farm still of which several thousands are used in Germany by means of which the German farmer distils alcohol on his own farm for his own use. He takes over-ripe fruit and other material that otherwise would go to waste and distils from them alcohol for power, for fuel, for light and any other purposes to which it may be applied or used on his premises. When I first entered upon the study of this subject, I thought that, in a large country like Canada, where people are not so accustomed to be kept track of and where we have not the system of espionage known in continental Europe, it would be impossible to allow the use of such a still without danger. But I understand now that this tank still is so arranged that it can only be opened by the government official. The law provides that the government official must be present and break the official seal which he had previously placed upon the still, and unlock the still and cause the denaturing to be completed in his presence. It seems to me that, perhaps, on full investigation, it may be found possible that this form of still may be used in Canada without the law being broken or the revenue suffering loss.

It may be asked, what is the necessity for denaturing the alcohol that is to be used for the purposes referred to? It will be readily seen that, as long as it is thought advisable to obtain a part of our revenue from a tax on alcohol to be used for beverage purposes, to protect the revenue it will be absolutely necessary to so change the nature of the alcohol manufactured tax-free that it will be utterly impossible to use it for beverage purposes. The material commonly used to denature the grain alcohol, is wood alcohol, although it is not always used, nor is it the common denaturant in every country. Some countries use other materials for denaturing, and where the denatured product is to be used for certain particular purposes, some other ingredient than wood alcohol is necessarily used for denaturing because when that is used it makes it impossible to use the denatured product for those few particular and special purposes. But as a general thing, wood alcohol is the material used for denaturing.

It has been argued that unless we use a very large quantity of wood alcohol in denaturing, there is a danger that people will use the diluted denatured article for drinking purposes. But when alcohol has been denatured by some other material that is poisonous, that has a very bad smell and a very disagreeable taste, it seems to me that it is not at all likely that any one is going to run the risk and take the chances of diluting it for the purpose of using it as a beverage. It has been argued that it would be unsafe to have in common use a denatured alcohol that would be poisonous and fatal to use as a beverage. I would point out that in this country as well as in the United States, wood alcohol is commonly used to-day, and is being sold everywhere without any other precaution than that the container is labelled poisonous and is marked with skull and cross bones. Now, wood alcohol is just as dangerous, in so far as any fatality in using it is concerned, as the denatured alcohol. Highly refined wood alcohol cannot easily be distinguished, even by an expert, either by its taste or smell, from the ethyl or grain alcohol. But as a precaution in countries where denatured alcohol is permitted to be used by law, free from excise duty, and is therefore largely used, the denatured product is coloured. In England, where denatured alcohol is used for such purposes, it is coloured purple, and in France it is coloured green by the use of malachite, a green mineral matter, so that no one can possibly drink this coloured denatured alcohol by any mistake, thinking he is using ethyl or grain alcohol.

Now, as to the price at which denatured alcohol may be sold. Wood alcohol is a great deal dearer than ethyl alcohol. It costs a great deal more to manufacture the wood alconol, or at least it is being sold at a much higher price, than ethyl alcohol is produced at. Therefore, it follows that the larger quantity of wood alcohol we use in the denaturing process, the greater must be the price of the denatured product. Now, Prof. Wylie, the eminent American chemist, to whom I have already referred, recommends the use of from five to ten per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing. The special committee appointed by the British House of Commons to investigate this subject, recommended the use not of ten per cent, as they had been using, but five per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing, and pronounced that quantity to be quite sufficient. But I would point out that while Prof. Wylie recommends the American government to use ten per cent, as they do use, and while the committee of the British House of Commons recommended five per cent, our Inland Revenue Department has been using twenty-five per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing, and I think sometimes a higher proportion than that.

Again, as to the price of wood alcohol for denaturing purposes, the Hon. Mr. Yerkes, United States Commissioner of Inland Revenue, says that crude wood alcohol, not the highly refined, is used for denaturing. Other witnesses say that is not exactly correct, that the German people buy in the United States crude wood alcohol for denaturing, but that they themselves refine it to a certain limited extent, and that this is somewhat refined when it is used in Germany for denaturing. But it is pointed out that the crude wood alcohol is a better denaturant than the highly refined, because its disagreeable taste and odour make it much more powerful and effective for the purpose of denaturing. In the United States the crude wood alcohol is sold at forty cents a gallon.

but the American manufacturers of wood alcohol are selling the crude alcohol in Germany at thirty-seven cents per gallon and refined wood alcohol is sold in Germany at 63 cents per gallon. But our Inland Revenue Department is paying to-day, $1.29 per gallon for wood alcohol for denaturing purposes. I am not finding any fault with the department because they pay a high price for the article they use. I am informed that they advertised for tenders for wood alcohol for the use of the department, and they accepted the lowest tender, $1.29 a gallon. I find by reference to a Montreal commercial journal that the market price of wood alcohol to-day is from $1 to $1.25 per gallon. But this I do say, that if the manufacturers of wood alcohol in Canada are not willing to sell wood alcohol to the government for denaturing purposes at the same price, or about the same price, that it is sold in the United States, we would be doing no wrong to make our purchases in the United States, because I contend that wood alcohol can be manufactured in Canada just as cheaply as in the United States. Wood alcohol has been selling in the United States for the last five or six years at from 60 cents to 70 cents per gallon, that is, refined wood alcohol. It is also argued by those who object to this proposed legislation that there is danger that the denatured alcohol may be renatured, that is, that by redistilling the denatured alcohol the denaturing ingredients mixed in it may be distilled out of it, and that by that means the wood alcohol may again be made fit for use, and possible to be used for beverage purposes. However, an eminent chemist giving evidence before the American committee, said that it would cost more to renature the denatured ethyl than to make a further supply of grain alcohol. He says that it would require the use of a great deal of water, that it would require several distillations through the highest and most expensive type of fractionating stills, and would cause the waste and loss of great quantities of alcohol. Prof. Wylie said :

> I think the cost of restoring denatured alcohol to pure alcohol would be greater than to manufacture and pay the taxes on a fresh portion of properly made alcohol.

Grain alcohol with the tax removed will be used for the manufacturing purposes for which wood alcohol is used to-day, because in many cases it would be cheaper, in many cases more efficient, and in many cases less dangerous to be used. Wood alcohol was unknown outside the laboratory of the chemist until after the close of the American war. Before the civil war in the United States grain alcohol did not pay any tax, and was used tax free either for beverage purposes or for manufacturing purposes. At that time alcohol was largely used in the United States for manufacturing, also for lighting and for fuel. But because of the war debt of the United States, the government placed a heavy excise duty upon alcohol, and then the manufacturer finding it impossible to use the grain alcohol and pay the heavy excise duties, looked for a substitute to use in its place, and wood alcohol was the substitute that he found. Wood alcohol was a by product made in the manufacture of charcoal. It is said that a gentleman went to one of the factories where charcoal was being made, and desired to make a contract for the purchase of the smoke that was escaping from the chimneys of the mill. The proprietors of the charcoal industry thought that the man was surely insane, who was endeavouring to make a contract with them to buy the smoke. However, he persisted, and they closed a contract with him. They soon found that the man who had purchased the smoke was making more money from it than they were making from the charcoal. And, in place of wood alcohol being a by product of the charcoal industry, it is found that the charcoal is a by product from the manufacture of wood alcohol. A cord of wood produces from forty to fifty bushels of charcoal, about ten gallons of wood alcohol, and 200 pounds of acetate of lime. The profit from each dollar obtained from such a factory is made up as follows:—

Wood alcohol, 52·65 cents, acetate of lime, 26·13 cents and charcoal, 21·22 cents. So that the alcohol made from the wood has a greater value than the charcoal and acetate of lime added together. The price of 95 per cent wood alcohol in the United States for the last five years has ranged, as I have said, from 50 to 70 cents per gallon, so that it is entirely out of the question to use it for lighting, fuel or power. One Mr. Gray appeared before the congressional committee to give evidence against the proposed legislation. Mr. Gray was a commission merchant in the city of New York, handling and dealing in wood alcohol and he said that this proposed legislation should not become law as just as soon as it became law it would give ethyl, or grain alcohol, control of the market and wood alcohol would be entirely out of it. Asked why he had such an opinion he said that because of the lower price at which grain alcohol would be sold. Now, Sir, in connection with the use of wood alcohol as compared with grain alcohol I would like to point to one other matter. Wood alcohol is manufactured from hardwood, principally from oak, beach, birch and maple. One of the witnesses representing the manufacturers of wood alcohol testified before the American committee that in the state of Michigan from which he came the hardwood supply would be exhausted in about fifteen years and that the wood alcohol industry would be a short lived one. One of the members of the committee asked him whether some of the other states of the union had not a larger supply of hardwood than Michigan. He said that possibly some of the other states might have a larger supply but that

Michigan was well up in the list of hardwood states. If within fifteen years the hardwood forests in Michigan would be destroyed and used up because of the making of alcohol from wood, is it not true that in Canada we shall shortly meet with the same conditions? Then, we will have to find a substitute for wood alcohol, and if we must do so we might as well be hunting for a substitute now.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it not a fact that along the north shore of Georgian bay there is a company proposing to make wood alcohol from the refuse of saw mills?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, I think that is so, but I understand that the refuse from saw-mills is used for fuel for the furnaces in the production of wood alcohol and that it is largely the wood that is used for the manufacture of the alcohol. It is said that the better wood is used for lumber and the inferior wood is used for the manufacture of alcohol. But I point out that if 40 or 50 bushels of charcoal and ten gallons of wood alcohol worth 60 or 70 cents a gallon and two hundred pounds of acetate of lime can be produced from a cord of wood there is no other use to which wood can be put that will give it so great a value and therefore there will be a strong inducement to use wood in the manufacture of wood alcohol which might be used for other purposes. As a great economic question it seems to me that it will be better for us, who oftentimes consider the question of reforestry, to use for the manufacture of alcohol, not our forests which we cannot replace in a day, or a year, or a generation, but to use the crops produced in our fields when we may sow the seed in the spring and reap the product in the fall from the manufacturing of alcohol, repeating the process year after year.

But ethyl alcohol, if untaxed, would be used not only in the place of wood alcohol but also as a substitute for gasoline. It will be admitted by every one that alcohol for many purposes would be much preferable, if brought within a reasonable cost, to gasoline. I do not know how many gasoline stoves and heaters are used in Canada, but statistics presented to the committee of congress to which I have referred show that 800,000 gasoline stoves were in use in the United States. We all know something of the advantages of the gasoline stove and heater. We all know that it is a convenience for the housewife for use in the house or laundry where a fire is required for a short time which may be economically and quickly placed in use and quickly extinguished, thereby preventing the further heating of a house already too hot. We know too that although a great many gasoline stoves and heaters are now in use a great many more would be used were it not that people are afraid to use them. They are afraid of gasoline explosions and gasoline fires and well they may be afraid. Gasoline is very explosive and dangerous to store and use but there is no such danger in connection with the use of alcohol which is absolutely and perfectly safe. Then the use of gasoline and gasoline stoves and heaters oftentimes makes insurance utterly impossible to obtain and in other cases increases the cost of insurance. I point out again that the gasoline flame cannot be extinguished with water as an ordinary flame can be. The pouring of water upon a gasoline flame only makes the mischief worse and the danger greater while the alcohol flame can be extinguished with water the same as an ordinary flame of wood or any other material. As the demand for gasoline is rapidly increasing, as it has been increasing during the past few years, the price of gasoline is rapidly advancing and I point out that it is difficult or impossible to increase the supply of gasoline as the demand increases because gasoline is a by-product of petroleum and petroleum, in the process of refining, only yields 2 per cent of gasoline. Therefore our gasoline supply depends not on the demand for gasoline but altogether on the demand for coal oil or refined petroleum.

In conclusion I would quote from a report recently made by the Hon. Frank H. Mason, United States consul general at Berlin. In a recent report to his government at Washington the Hon. Mr. Mason said:

> The exposition of this year——

That is the exhibition held in the German Empire.

> —confirms and reinforces the impressions made by the display of 1902—that the law of 1887 governing the manufacture and use of untaxed alcohol for technical purposes was one of the wisest and most far-seeing enactments in the legislative record of the empire.

Now, Sir, the special committee of congress to whom this question was referred received a very great deal of evidence and listened to a very large number of witnesses, some of them giving evidence in favour of the proposed legislation and others giving evidence in opposition to it. I point out that the largest, the greatest and almost the only objection to the proposed legislation in the United States was the opposition that came from the manufacturers of wood alcohol. I will not be surprised if such legislation is talked of in Canada that the greatest amount of opposition will come from the Canadian manufacturers of wood alcohol. There are, Sir, at the present time, 118 or 120 manufacturers of wood alcohol in the United States. There are in Canada only four or five companies or persons engaged in making wood alcohol and while the manufacturers of wood alcohol may object to this legislation I think they would be unwise to make any such objection because if there shall be legislation that shall

permit the free use of alcohol in this country for the purposes I have referred to, the entire production of the four or five manufacturers of wood alcohol will very soon be required for the purpose of denaturing the ethyl or grain alcohol that will be required or used. That special committee of congress considered the matter very fully. Let me say that this is not a new question in the United States. The first committee of congress appointed to consider it was appointed in 1888, and the subject has been more or less a live issue in that country since then. The committee found as follows:

1. That wood alcohol would be the most natural material for denaturing.
2. That civilized countries which allow free alcohol, methylated, have found no difficulty in protecting the revenue against fraud.
3. That the loss of revenue would be practically nothing.
4. That in the judgment of the committee the result of the legislation would be to very widely extend the use of alcohol.
5. That one gallon of alcohol is equal to two gallons of coal oil for lighting purposes.
6. That a gallon of alcohol will produce at least ten per cent more power than a gallon of gasoline.
7. That alcohol for power purposes produces best results when mixed with ten per cent water.
8. That with corn at 42·36 per bushel (the actual ten years' average price), using ten per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing, denatured alcohol, from corn, will cost 20½ cents per gallon.
9. That low grade molasses appears to afford a much cheaper source of alcohol supply than corn.

The last paragraph of the report of the commission is as follows:

Alcohol will be able to supplant gasoline and kerosene in the production of power and light and great good would result especially to the farmers of the United States. It seems reasonable that this result would follow, and, that the resulting good to the great mass of our people would far outweigh the temporary loss which would come to the wood alcohol industry. This belief is shared by the great mass of our fellow citizens from all parts of the United States, and the demand for tax-free denatured alcohol is well nigh universal.

If that demand is almost universal in the United States and if the findings of the committee of Congress are applicable to the United States, they are just as applicable to Canada. It may be that denatured alcohol will cost a little more in Canada than in the United States, but on the other hand coal oil and gasoline cost a great deal more here than across the line.

Just a word as to the prices at which the Inland Revenue Department may be enabled to sell denatured alcohol, if they will use a small quantity of wood alcohol for denaturing and purchase the denatured wood alcohol at the prices at which it ought to be obtained. When you take ethyl alcohol at 25 cents per gallon and use 25 per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing, you have three quarters of a gallon of ethyl alcohol for 18¾ cents, and adding one quarter of a gallon of wood alcohol at $1.29, for 32¼ cents, you have the denatured alcohol at 51 cents per gallon. But if you will, on the other hand, use only 10 per cent of wood alcohol for denaturing, you will have nine-tenths of a gallon of ethyl alcohol at 25 cents for 22½ cents, and adding one-tenth of a gallon of wood alcohol at 70 cents a gallon at which price it should be purchased, for seven cents, you will have one gallon of denatured alcohol not at 51 cents per gallon but for 29½ cents per gallon.

I may be told that grain alcohol cannot be manufactured in Canada for 25 cents a gallon. But if the government are to make it as easy as possible for farmers and manufacturers and others to use denatured alcohol for light, heat, power, fuel and manufacturing, they may reduce the cost of the grain alcohol at least 4 cents a gallon by removing the duty on American corn when used for making denatured alcohol just as they take off the duty when it is used for feeding purposes.

As to the use of denatured alcohol in Canada, with prices as they are to-day, I made inquiries in Ottawa hardware stores a few weeks ago and was told that coal oil was selling at from 25 to 30 cents per gallon for the best quality. I realize that when I quote the price of coal oil in Canada, I am giving the price per imperial gallon, and when I quote the estimated cost of denatured alcohol, as given by the United States authorities, I am quoting the price per wine gallon. With coal oil at 25 cents per gallon we could economically use denatured alcohol for lighting purposes at a cost of 50 cents per gallon. I was informed that the price of a gallon of gasoline in small quantities was 30 cents and in larger quantities 27 cents, and with the evidence showing that alcohol produces one-tenth more power per gallon than gasoline, we may economically use alcohol, if we only consider the question of cost, for power in the place of gasoline at from 30 to 33 cents per gallon. Then the evidence shows that the alcohol has a heating power 65 per cent greater than gasoline so that taking gasoline at the present prices, we may use alcohol for heating at about 50 cents a gallon.

I do not care whether denatured alcohol is manufactured by the Inland Revenue Department or by private enterprise. It may be true—and I shall not be surprised if it is—that the Inland Revenue Department may continue to manufacture denatured alcohol and hold a monopoly of the business with great profit to the country and that we may obtain denatured alcohol, through the department, cheaper than would be likely from private enterprise. But if the department is to continue to manufacture denatured alcohol, they should buy wood alcohol at the lowest possible price and use, not 25 per cent of wood alcohol, but

10 per cent for denaturing, and should have their denaturing warehouses in the various business centres of the country where grain alcohol is made, thus saving freight charges. My hon. friend from East Kent, who has a considerable knowledge of this question, has assured me that denatured alcohol can be made and sold in Canada at a price not exceeding 35 cents a gallon. When we can obtain denatured alcohol in Canada at 35 cents a gallon, we can well afford to use it for light, fuel and power, and in many processes of manufacture, and so far as light is concerned, we could use it especially to the advantage of people who live—not in the larger towns and cities which are lighted by electricity and gas—but in the country places and small villages. I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having taken up so much time and for not having made the subject more interesting, but I have endeavoured to give the House some degree of information.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). I desire, in the first place, to congratulate the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) on his very comprehensive speech on this very interesting subject. The subject is one of great importance to the people, and one which I have taken a great deal of interest myself, which is my only apology for adding a few words to what my hon. friend has so well said. I think there can be no question that alcohol can be used a great deal in this as well as other countries, if it be obtainable at a reasonable price. The reason why ethyl alcohol has not been used in greater quantities is simply because the governments of this and nearly every other country are raising large revenues from the tax on alcohol, used as a beverage. But alcohol is used—not only ethyl alcohol but also methylated spirits and denatured alcohol—in the arts and many manufactures, as shown by the returns brought down by the Minister of Inland Revenue. On page 1112 of 'Hansard,' will be found the enumeration by him of many things in the manufacture of which alcohol is used. But the main question, it seems to me, is, how we can make the alcohol cheap enough to be used by the farmers for ordinary purposes, such as light, heat and power. No one will dispute the fact that ethyl alcohol would be used in every case in preference to kerosene or gasoline if it could be obtained at a price proportionate to the results obtained. That is to say, we must obtain alcohol at a price, which in proportion to its merits, will be as low as the price of any of these other articles. It is true, we cannot expect to obtain alcohol in this country as cheaply as it is obtained in the United States—not at present, at all events; but we do not obtain kerosene or gasoline as cheaply as they do in the United States; and therefore we can use the denatured alcohol even if it does cost a little more in Canada than it does in the United States. The manufacturer might get along very well with alcohol at 50 cents or 60 cents a gallon, but it would be impossible for the farmer to do so. In the return of the Minister of Inland Revenue to which I have referred, the price of alcohol in Canada at the present time is stated to be from 65 cents to 80 cents a gallon. A gallon of alcohol will produce as good results as two gallons of kerosene; so that we can very readily get denatured alcohol in this country at a price at which it will compete very well with kerosene and gasoline. I may say here that if cheap alcohol could have been obtained in the Northwest during the present winter, we would not have had any trouble from the coal famine, because the farmer of the Northwest would have been able to produce denatured alcohol at a price which would have enabled him to use it for fuel, and heating purposes. The main item in determining the cost of denatured alcohol is the denaturing agent. As the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has said, wood alcohol is used in most countries for that purpose; but there are several kinds of tar and oil which can be used for denaturing such as coal tar, turpentine and fish or animal oil. The question which the government ought to keep in view is how they can give the farmers a cheap denaturing agent and allow them to make the alcohol in small quantities on their own premises from the refuse of their farms. In a recent newspaper report it is stated:

> The Internal Revenue Commissioner and Congressman Hill, of Connecticut, went to Europe to look over the situation and have just returned. They investigated the regulations in Great Britain, France and Germany, and found that they had no more difficulty in buying completely denatured alcohol than they had in buying any other article kept for sale.
>
> In Germany the farmers conduct little stills on their own farms, and convert their waste products into alcohol, which, on being denatured, they were at liberty to use for any purpose that they wished. The farmer just erects his still and sends for the local revenue officer, who attaches a 'container,' made in accordance with government regulations. All the alcohol produced goes into the container, which is sealed, and the farmer cannot get a drop of alcohol without breaking the seal, and being subject to severe penalties. When the container is practically full, the revenue officer is again sent for, and he detaches the container, measures the contents, witnesses the process of denaturing (adding some ingredients which make it impossible for the article to be used for beverage purposes), and then the producer is at liberty to do what he likes with it.

That is the method used in Germany to enable the farmer to use any poor vegetables or refuse containing starch and sugar, to convert into alcohol for use on his own farm for power or other purposes. In this connection I wish to say a few words with regard to the danger of using wood

alcohol as a denaturing agent. Probably all the members of this House know that wood alcohol is a very dangerous poison, not only when it is drunk, but when used otherwise. For instance, men who use varnishes containing wood alcohol are liable to become blinded or to die from the effects of the poison. On this point I wish to read some evidence presented to the committee of the United States congress last year by an old friend of mine, a gentleman born in this city, one of the many Canadians who have made their mark in the United States. I refer to Dr. Casey A. Wood, now president of the American Academy of Ophthalmology, and one of the best known eye specialists in the city of Chicago. Referring to wood alcohol, he said:

That its employment in the arts is fraught with many dangers to life and eyesight is an unquestionable fact. In the first place, when taken into the lungs as fumes, either directly (as from varnishes), or when burned in a lamp, it may produce blindness unless it be freely mixed with pure air. Cases of blindness from the absorption of methyl alcohol by the lungs or skin, or both are well authenticated.

In the second place, it is well known that the employees of factories where Columbian spirits and other forms of 'deodorized' methyl alcohol are used are frequently tempted to drink the fluid. Owing to some extent to the exaggerated claims made for the 'purity' of 'deodorized' wood alcohol, and partly to the fact that thirsty individuals are often willing to take risks, the poisonous nature of the spirits does not seem to deter them from indulgence in them, and many cases of death and blindness have resulted in this way. Whenever 'alcohol' in any shape is placed within easy reach of workers in it they are prone at all hazards to use it as an intoxicant, especially if it is deprived of its nauseous odour and taste and made to resemble ethyl alcohol.

It is, however, the drinking of adulterated fluids that is responsible for more deaths and cases of blindness than is brought about by inhalation or other form of ingestion of methyl alcohol by workers in the arts. These victims of misplaced confidence are generally those who indulge in the commoner forms of whisky and other adulterated spirits, but to these must be added many a case of fatal intoxication or blindness from drinking methylated essence of peppermint or patent medicine (whose chief menstrum has been 'deodorized' alcohol), 'eau de cologne,' 'bay rum,' 'Florida water,' lemon extract, etc., made with Columbian or colonial spirits instead of ordinary grain alcohol. The individual thus affected drinks one or more of these concoctions for their intoxicating effects, thinking they are made up with ordinary alcohol, and finds too late that he has imbibed some kind of poison.

It is quite easy to understand why these cases of death and blindness are so rare in continental countries, where there is a cheap commercial ethyl alcohol to be had. No labelling of bottles and packages will guard against the evil effects of wood alcohol as long as people are free to indulge in a poisonous product that so closely resembles ethyl alcohol, as do Columbian spirits or other 'deodorized' product. Safety lies in an untaxed mixture of ethyl alcohol for commercial uses mixed with some nauseous protective agent, corresponding to the 'Brennspiritus' of Germany. Another effective method would be an untaxed or slightly taxed pure ethyl alcohol for commercial purposes, combined with a strict prohibition of the manufacture or sale of 'deodorized' wood alcohol.

Wood alcohol is made at the present time, as the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has already said, so exactly like ethyl alcohol that the purified and deodorized product cannot be distinguished from ordinary alcohol by any one but an expert, and I cannot see why this wood alcohol should be deodorized and purified. It seems to me there should be a law in this country to prevent its being deodorized and purified. There is no purpose that I know of for which wood alcohol is better than good ethyl alcohol. Wood alcohol has its own uses, which will keep continually increasing, but it should not be put on the market in a purified and deodorized condition so that it cannot be distinguished from ordinary ethyl alcohol. I feel that for these reasons the government ought to take particular pains to try and find some denaturing agent which is cheaper and less dangerous than wood alcohol. If that can be found, and some general plan can be worked out to allow our farmers to make this alcohol on their own premises and use it right there, it will be the greatest boon to the people of this country, and particularly to the farmers of the Northwest. The Minister of Finance, the other day, in the budget speech, said :

It may be a suprise to some to be told that where the United States will be on the 1st of January next by their new legislation, Canada has been for some years.

Of course, these words were said before the New Year, and the date referred to is the first of the present month. I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that these words of his are not quite accurate. It is true that this country has had denatured alcohol for a good many years, but the conditions are not the same as they will be in the United States or as they have been there since the first of this month. In this country it is a government monopoly, and the denatured article has been manufactured in Ottawa only. The United States propose to allow this denatured alcohol to be made in different parts of the country, and it also proposes to try and find some other method of denaturing it than by using wood alcohol.

If the denatured product is made entirely by the government and entirely in Ottawa, that takes away, to my mind, from the great benefit which would accrue to this country generally from being able to get a cheap and useful article such as ethyl alcohol would be, if properly denatured and at a reasonable price.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At what price would it be made?

Mr. PERLEY. In the United States, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has said, they say the ordinary alcohol can be made for 15 cents a gallon. That is to say, if the corn is worth 30 cents a bushel alcohol can be made for 15 cents a gallon. To refer to Dr. Wiley, whom the hon. member for South Grey has already quoted, he claims that if the whole stalk is used you can make ethyl alcohol at one half the cost of the alcohol made from the grain alone. He says :

At the time the starch, the hardening, makes the complete grain, the cornstalk by analysis contains quite as much fermentable matter as the corn itself; and if that is utilized, as I have utilized it experimentally, it yields practically the same amount of alcohol from the stalk as from the grain. If you allow the cornstalk to dry up, then it will only contain a trace of fermentable matter. If the whole stalk should be used at that period, it would yield about twice as much alcohol as it would when dry.

In other words, if the whole stalk was used, the alcohol would only cost one-half as much as if it was made from the ordinary corn. It is for these reasons, which I have already stated, that the United States government sent these men to Germany to try and find a cheap denaturing agent, and also to try and find some method by which farmers and the people of the country generally could be allowed, with safety to the revenue, to make this alcohol on their farms in small quantities, so that the cost of transportation back and forth would be avoided, and they might get the utmost benefit from being enabled to make this alcohol themselves and use it where it was made. For these reasons, I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution, and I trust the government will take it up as soon as possible, and try and find some practical method of giving to the people of this country the great benefit that would accrue to them from cheap alcohol.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). As I desire to make some observations on this question, particularly to present the departmental view on denatured alcohol, and as it is hardly possible to do it before six o'clock, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all documents and all correspondence concerning the erection of the Ross rifle factory on the Plains of Abraham, at Quebec.—Mr. Armand Lavergne.

For a copy of all correspondence and written communications between judges of the provincial courts and the Minister of Justice, or any member or official of the government, since the passing of Dominion Act 4-5 Edward VII., chapter 31, in reference to section 7 of said Act, or in reference to judges acting as executors, administrators or trustees of estates, directors or managers of companies, corporations or firms, or arbitrators, umpires or referees in matters of controversy, or engaging in other extrajudicial work ; and including a copy of a circular letter to judges issued by the Minister of Justice, and referred to by minister in 'Hansard' for first session of 1906, at page 869, and of the answers of the judges to this circular.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing : 1. All sales of Dominion lands of 160 acres and upwards, in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, which have been made by the government, exclusive of school lands, since the 1st January, 1905, with the prices obtained, and dates of sales.—Mr. Lake.

For a copy of all correspondence, with the papers and reports made by superior officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or by Captain Wakeham, or any other person regarding the dismissal from the service of R. P. Dubé, second mate on board 'La Canadienne', also for a copy of the report made by the said R. P. Dubé to the Department of Marine and Fisheries regarding the fire on the 'Aberdeen,' on the 10th November, 1905.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of all applications for the lease of grazing lands within the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, between the 1st day of February, 1905, and the 1st day of August, 1905.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

For a copy of all papers, correspondence, reports, plans and profiles, and estimates of costs, at any time received by or filed with the commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway, or with the Department of Railways, respecting : (a) That portion of the route of the said railway between the Quebec bridge and the vicinity of the Maine boundary line, as the route for such portion has been approved or adopted, or respecting any suggested variations of the location of such portion of the railway ; (b) respecting another suggested route for the said portion of the said railway between the points aforesaid, but passing by way of Lake Etchemin, and sometimes known as the Morin route.

2. For a copy of all orders in council approving, adopting, or respecting any such routes between the points aforesaid.—Mr. Morin.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bills of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. Meat inspection first and then cold storage.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1906-7.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Conside; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques-Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4754 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3491 (ii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Bay of Quinte Lights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 1303, 1624 (i).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4749 (iii).

Election Frauds and Corruption, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6866 (iv).

Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. of Sup., 7645 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2802 (ii).

Interior (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5872 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Fernie) 4042 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Belleville) 4018; (Guelph Armoury) 4020; (Hamilton post office) 4022; (London P.O.) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (St. Mary's) 4026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Que. (St. John's military) 4015 (iii).

Supreme Court Judges (salaries) in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7443 (iv).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

Tariff—Dumping Clause (cream separators) 1196 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5700 (iii).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Athabaska Fish Co., Reps. Cor. Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 1061 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3844 (ii), 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Aylmer, Mr. F. W., Apptmt. as Engineer, and Resignation, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 580 (i). *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.

Brick, T. A., Employment by Govt. *re* Census in Alberta (Ques.) 1135 (i).

Brown, Bedingfield, et al., Grazing Leases, O.Cs., Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 1149

Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c., (Ques.) 720

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 4557 (iii).

Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c. (Ques.) 721 (i).

Deep Sea Missions, Dr. Grenfell's Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).

Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6034 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4678 (iii).

Doukhobor Colonies, Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers *re* inspection of (M. for copy*) 2146 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Fishing Privileges, North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted (Ques.) 1394 (i).
Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys. (M. for cor.*) 1149 (i).
Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
See 'Brown,' 'Grazing.'
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C. &c. (Ques.) 949 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount (Ques.) 3635 (ii).
——— Investigations *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com. 5094 (iii).
——— Surveys, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1394 (i).
——— Western Division, Amounts expended, Verification of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— Western Div., Cost of Construction, Guarantee Bonds, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent overdue Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3476 (ii).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, Transference, &c., (Ques.) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases granted to J. D. McGregor and A. E. Hitchcock, Transfer to the Grand Forks Cattle Co., O.C.'s, Agreements, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c. (Ques.) 484 (i).
Grazing Leases, Sask., Original Applicants, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 1061 (i).
Homestead Entry of Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Application for (Ques.) 1137 (i).
Homesteads unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspection *re* (M. for ret.*) 2146 (ii).
I.C.R., Cars used in U.S., Return of, &c. (Ques.) 7007, 7248 (iv).
——— Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, &c. (M. for ret.) 728 (i).
——— Moncton Lands acquired by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3885 (ii).
——— *See* 'Moncton.'
——— Passenger Tariffs, Standard, from Truro, Moncton and Levis (M. for ret.) 729 (i).
——— Passenger Tariff in 1904, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1118 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Number in use in U.S. (Ques.) 7007, 7248 (iv).
——— Scrap Iron sold to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. (Ques.) 1806 (i).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c. (Ques.) 4611 (iii).
Manitoba Public Works, Dredging, &c., Resignation of Hon. Mr. Aylmer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iv).
Marconi Establishment at Clarke City (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Milk River Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by C. E. Hall, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
Moncton Car Shops, Location, Equipment, &c. (M. for reps.*) 1148 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal (Ques.) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7086 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).
National Art Gallery, Committee of Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchase from by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 1052 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application of C.P.R. for same Lands (Ques.) 1061, 1138 (i).
——— Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson, and Guy T. Robbins, Action taken by Govt. (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Application *re* Water Rights, Plans filed (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— Constitution and Incorporation of (Ques.) 1060, 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c. (Ques.) 2143 (ii).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c. (Ques.) 1137 (i).
——— *See* 'Southern Alberta,' &c.
Rougemont, Senatorial District, Cor. *re* Appmnt. (M. for copies*) 6010 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor., 7011, 7518 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. and Section 2, of Twp. 25, Entry, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5903 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5871; (Marconi stations), 5875; (salaries) 5866; (submarine signals 5873 (iii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine Hospitals (distressed seaman) 5882 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 6996; (Columbia River) 6996; (Coquitlam) 6996; (Fraser River) 6997; (Victoria harbour) 6997; (Williams Head quarantine station) 6999 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredge 'Eastman') 6995; (dredging) 6992 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6017; (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Bay St. Lawrence) 6020; (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Church's Point) 6021; (Cow Bay) 6022; (Eskasoni wharf) 6029; (Glace Bay 6034; (Grand Etang) 6038; (Jersey cove) 6048; (Moose breakwater) 6052; (Phinney's Cove) 6057; (Porter's Lake) 6057; (Scotch Cove) 6066; (Tatamagouche wharf) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6069 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Little Current) 6958 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Father Point) 6099; (Grosse Isle wharf) 6109; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (Percé wharf) 6115 (iv); (Quebec harbour) 5980 (iii); (Rimouski) 6120; (Rivière aux Renards) 6121; (Rivière Batiscan) 6121; (St. Fulgence) 6132; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Ste. Rosalie) 7522 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (cotton fabrics) 2365 (ii); (intermediate Tariff) 556 (i); (military stores, &c.) 2408 (ii); (pickles, &c.) 1887 (i); (settlers' effects) 2407 (ii); (sugar) 4157 (iii); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii).
Timber Lands, sold or leased, subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4458 (iii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13, Topographical Surveys, &c., Reps. (M. for copies*) 1066 (i).
Transportation Commission's Recommendations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Walberg, E. A. Contracts *re* Govt. Rys. (Ques.) 1051 (i).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (post office) 2802 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1610 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809; in Com., 1617 (i), 2011 (ii).
Census Forms for Manufacturing, Distribution and Completion, of (Ques.) 4217 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Cheese hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7140 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses Bill, on M. for Com. on Res. (remarks) 522 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2433; in Com., 2465 (ii).
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 710 (i).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5138 (iii).
Curry, Mr S. G. Payments to as Architect (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Cutlery and Foreign Goods, Surtax and British Preference, Par. in 'Citizen,' 4842 (iii).
Dayley, Dr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Rep., &c. (Ques.) 1988 (ii).
Eastern Townships Counties, Public Works, Expenditures *re* (M. for ret.*) 2838 (ii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906 (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts. (M. for cor.) 1149 (i).
——— Cor. with J. B. Jackson, Inquiry for, 5863 (iii).
German Maximum Tariff, Fiscal Relations, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks in each month of 1906 (M. for ret.*) 4458 (iii).
——— Total Amount, Interest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7401 (iv).
Immigration Agents in Germany, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1988 (ii).
Indian Agents, and Teachers, Average Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
Indian Lands, Sales or Leases, Number of Acres, &c. (M. for ret.) 492 (i).
Indian Dept., Inquiry for Rets., 1699 (i), 2415 (ii).
Indian Lands, Total Acres sold, &c. (Ques.) 2835, 2980 (ii).
Indian Schools at Fort Alexander, &c., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4209 (iii).
Indian Schools, Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ques.) 2582 (ii).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6781 (iv).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190, 7214 (iv).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Products, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1989 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3892 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Postal Express, Legislation, Ref. to in Speech on Address, &c. (Ques.) 613 (i).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) 7026 (iv).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations (Ques.) 1139 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. for Sup., 6640 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost, and Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1387 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7234 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
Revised Statutes (Schedule 'A') Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6766, 6769 (iv).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Furnishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery between Can and U.S., Cor. Reps, &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Seeds Branch of Dept of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1139 (i).
Seedsmen, Reports from Govt., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1140 (i).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3302, 3326, 3367, 3861 (ii). on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5010; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 105) 5011 (iii).
Sugar imported, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys) 7257 (iv).
Excise—(tobacco stamps) 7297 (iv).
Geological Survey (gas borings, &c.) 3159; (maps, &c.) 3163; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (salaries) 3159; (specimens) 3166 (ii).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7294 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 7281 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 7276 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3149 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works— Buildings—Generally (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville) 4018; (Brockville) 4020; (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (London P.O.) 4022; (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4034 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations, &c.) 3608; (furniture, &c.) 3588; (Museum) 3616; (Royal mint) 3603 (ii); (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Sussex St. property) 3952, 3617 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4009 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6940; (Goderich) 6953; (Point Edward) 6964; (Port Stanley) 6978; (Thames river) 6983 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(animals) in Com., 1258; (berries) 1900; dumping clause) 1009 (i); (florist stock) 4148 (iii); intermediate and German treaties) 861 (i); (seeds, &c.) 4146 (iii); (tomatoes) 1876; (vegetables) 1883 (i).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2777 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia River) 6966; Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 6094 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice), *North York, Ont.*
Allegash River, Diversion of Water (Ans.) 6635 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
B.C. Appellate Court, Representations from Provincial Govt. (remarks) 4946 (iii).
B.C. County Court Judges (salaries) prop. res. withdwn. [illegible] (ii).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
——— (remarks) 580 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 108) 1°*, 4209 2°* and in Com., 4656 (iii).
——— (B. 175) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
C.P.R. Lands Taxation, Appeals to Privy Council (Ans.) 3368 (ii), 4666 (iii).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C. (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Criminal Code (public works) Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 5023 (iii); 2°* and in Com., 7187 (iv).
Criminal Code (unorganized ters.) Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 5777 (iii); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7014; in Com., 7015 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency to (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
Election Act Amts., on Inquiry for (Mr. Borden) 2628 (ii).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Electric Power Export (B. 60) 1° m., 1293 (i); in Com., 2229, 2237 (ii); 4616; Mr. Whitney's letter (read) 4654; on M. for 3°, 4669, 4946; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4949; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 4954; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 4961 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt. of French Judge (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt. (B. 170) prop. res., 6257; in Com. on Res., 7255; 1°*, 7257 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. (wages) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2137; in Com., 2479 (ii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2102 (ii).
G.T.R. Car Ferry : *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7325 (iv).
Henderson, Judge, Resignation of (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Pension Claims, Ref. to Justice Dept (Ans.) 1141 (i).
——— Claims *re* Compensation (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Com. on Privs., &c., (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4762 (iii).
I.C.Ry., Accidents, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3417 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T.R., Agreement Act Amt (B. 50) 1° m., 1120 (i); in Com., 2476 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Rep. *re*, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
——— on Charges (Mr. M. Martin) Ques. of Order *re* Statement (Mr. Fowler) 6400 (iv).
——— (personal explanation) in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Cor. between Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
——— Inquiry for further Cor. not in Ret., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2346 (ii).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution of (remarks) 2906 (ii).
——— French Translation (remarks) 7985 (iv).
——— Mr. Shepley's Retainer (Ans.) 3632, 3639 (ii).
——— Total Amounts paid, Information furnished to Min. of Jus., &c. (Ans.) 4215 (iii).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4664; 2° m. and in Com., 5016 (iii).
Judges' Salaries, Man. and B.C. (B. 177) in Com. on Res., 7781 (iv).
Judges, acting as Directors on Boards of Stock Cos. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Judges, Provincial, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 3461 (ii).
Judges, Retired, Practising, Govtl. Action *re* (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
Judges in Review, Selection of, &c. (Ans.) 4853 (iii).
Judges, superannuated and retired, in Quebec Prov., &c. (Ans.) 3640 (ii).
Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave of Absence (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2209 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4128 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
London Election Investigation, Govtl. Assistance (Ans.) 225 (i).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c. (Ans.) 4611 (iii).
——— Pronibition of Sunday School Papers (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 2144, 2292 (ii).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments (remarks) in Com. on Judges B., 7784 (iv).
——— (Ans.) 885, 1927 (i).
Man. and B.C. Judges Salaries (B. 177) prop. res., 5781 (iii); 1°*, 7792; on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 7792 (iv).
Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmt. of Mr. Henderson (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid (B. 176) 1° m., 7696; in Com., 7841 (iv).
Northwest Territories Act (commissioner's powers) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1796 (i); in Com., 2478 (ii).
N.S. Bench, Apptmnts, to (remarks) 7009 (iv).
——— Chief Justiceship, Resignation of (remarks) 5509 (iii).
——— Vacancy, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c. (Ans.) 235 (i).
See 'Supreme.'
Orders-in-Council, Consolidation of (remarks) 4946 (iii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation of, Health of, &c. (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1292 (i).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry, on M. for Sup., 7601 (iv).
Probationary System and Indeterminate Sentences, Observations of Mr. Justice MacMahon (remarks) 3842 (ii).
Provincial Rights : *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. res (Mr. Fielding) 7714; in Com. on Res., 7754 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 2999 (ii).
Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton (Ans.) 471 (i).
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 2832 (ii).
Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 75) 1° m., 1794 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 7410 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B., Change in Rev. Statutes (remarks) 7309 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2161 (ii).
Revised Statutes of Canada (B. 19) 1°*, 945; 2° m. and in Com., 1502; 3° m., 1543; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 1544 (i).
Revised Statutes, Copy laid on Table, 1470 (i).
——— Copies sent to Firms, Corporations, &c., in advance (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
——— Distribution to Libraries, &c. in P.E.I. (Ans.) 2138 (ii).
——— Distribution to Members (Ans.) 481 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c. (remarks) 1614 (i).
——— List of those to whom distribution is made (Ans.) 1801 (i).
——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution (Ans.) 2577 (ii).
——— Translation into French, Delay, &c. (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
——— Typographical Errors, &c. (Ans.) 5288 (iii).
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c. (Ans.) 4856 (iii).
St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Fredericton (Ans.) 6017 (iv).
St. Louis, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3639 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 3638 (ii).
Statutes, Revised (Schedule A) Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 5883; 2°*, and in Com., 5884 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 7689 (iv).
Dom. Police (salaries) 6762 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693; Yukon (judges' living allowance) 7968 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6311; (litigated matters, Dom. and Provs.) 7972; (Revised Statutes) 7972; (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Generally (maintenance, &c.) 7971 (iv).
Saskatchewan Supreme Court Judges, Salaries (prop. res.) 6377 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Statute Law Amt. (B. 146) 1°*, 5778 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7440; in Com. on Bill, 7442, 7578; 3° m. 7578 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (Ans.) 2982 (ii).
——— Rep. from Chief Justice *re* (remarks) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor. read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3922 (ii).
See 'N.S.'
Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1233 (i).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4861 (iii), 6636 (iv).
Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 5778 (iii); in Com., 7019 (iv).

Barker, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Address, The, 161 (i).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6609 (iv).
Boots and Shoes' and Tanners' Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4563 4586 (iii).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture, Prohibition, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4086, (amt.) 4087 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Election Oaths, Form, &c., London Election Trial, on M. for Sup., 7872 (iv).
——— Form of, Further Issue of, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).
Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmt., Duties, &c. (Ques.) 722 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Commissioners Rep., Delay in Presenting (Ques.) 1045 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction (amt.) to 6th Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5027 (iii).
——— Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3136 (ii).
I.C.R., Galena Oil Co., Purchase of Oil by Govt. (Ques.) 712 (i).
——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 711 (i).

Barker, Mr. S.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Rep. *re* Investigation, &c. (M. for copies) 725 (i).
——— Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock, Use of by Strangers (Ques.) 712 (i).
——— Payments to Geo. Cochrane *re* Supplies (Ques.) 725 (i).
——— Purchase of Property in Halifax, O.C. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Reps. and Complaints *re* Coal Supply (Ques.) 1810 (i).
——— Round House and Machine Shops at Halifax, Purchase of Property, &c., O.C. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
London Elections and East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections, Form of Writs, &c., issued (M. for copies*) 803 (i).
London Election Trial, Form of Oaths, &c., on M. for Sup., 7872 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7217 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims and Amounts paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1071 (i).
——— Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5849 (iii).
N.B. Petroleum Co. and Memramcoook and Dover Oil Cos., Quantities purchased and prices paid by Govt. (M. for rets.*) 802 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7205 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Addresss to His Maj., *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 6th Rep., G.T.P. Payments (M.) to consider, 4771; on M. to conc., 5027 (iii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7414 (iv).
Record Foundry Co. Scrap Iron, &c., purchased from I.C.R., Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3337, 3857 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Geological Survey (Nicolas, F., salary) 3165 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Broad Cove Mines) 6043; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Inverness Mines) 6043; (Middle Country) 6051; (Petite Rivière) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich) 6953; (Hamilton) 6954 (iv).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4360 (iii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5519 (iii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Canned Food Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 838; in Com., 1318, 1629 (i), 2011 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, &c., Prohibition, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4079; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4084 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2432 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4805, 4869 (iii).
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5864 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2252 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7352 (iv).
Immigration, Employment of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 4861 (iii).
Immigration from Ont., Statement of Mr. Southworth, 4662 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2950 (ii).
McCracken and McCann, Messrs., Application for Lands in Sask., Papers, &c. *re* (M. for copies) 578 (i).
Meaford Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).
Mines Dept., Esablishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7196 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims, Amounts paid, &c., by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) 1071 (i).
Orangeville P.O., Vacancy *re* (Ques.) 7249 (iv).
Patrick, J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (remarks) 576 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3207 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3692 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3981 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt (Post office) 2788 (ii); (contingencies) 6622 (iv).
Fisheries (fish breeding) 5892 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6711; (agents, Ont.) 6716 (iv).
Labour Dept. (printing, &c.) 6618 (iv).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office (mail service) 3156 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 4021 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3597 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. of Ways and Means (biscuits) 1865; (cheese) 1351; (condensed milk) 1361 (i); (drugs) 2116 (ii); (dumping clause, cream separators) 1195; (dumping clause) 1001; (farm products) 1276; (hay) 1867; (indian corn) 1364 (i); (marble) 2125 (ii); (sago, &c.) 1865 (i); (settlers' effects) 2408; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2380 (ii).
Ventilation in Chamber of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3606 (ii).

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Officials at Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 1612.
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2416 (ii).
Debates of the House, Delay in French Edition (remarks) 3543 (ii).
I.C. Ry., Midnight Train between Montreal and Levis (Ques.) 3180 (ii).
Judges in Review, Selection of, &c. (Ques.) 4853 (iii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress *re* Fire Loss (Ques.) 1612 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3057 (ii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2364 (ii).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4853, 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3083 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of, Apptmnt. of Successor (remarks) 6009 (iv).
Baxter Island No. 136, Sale to L. E. Embrace (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 2983 (ii).
Coboconk and Gull River Waterway, Construction of a canal, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 497 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 2143 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3000 (ii).
——— Ref. to in debate on North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5843 (iii).
Dom. Lands Amt. B. 21 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 4788, 4809 (iii).
Draper, P. M., Emplymt by Govt. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Dugas Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iv).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Erie, Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* Committee, 6910 (iv).
Fishery Commission, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 723 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to W. S. Pratt of Little Beausoleil Island (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
See 'Baxter,' &c.
Gowan, Sir James, Resignation at Senator (remarks) 3626 (ii).
Grain received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Qnantity, &c. (Ques.) 570, 1946 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5077, 5086 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4801, (amt.) agreed to, 4844 (iii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Claims *re* &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3591 (ii).
——— Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7404 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3640 (ii).
Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Hope Island Lighthouse Reserve, Sale of Timber, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation, &c. (remarks) 3108 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4382 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5499 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7446 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 2212 (ii).
Library Bureau Headquarters, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).
Little Beausoleil Island, Georgian Bay, Application *re* Transfer to D. S. Pratt (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Expenditures *re* Govt. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 111 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7067 (iv).

Nipissing Indian Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

——— Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 2832 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5839 (iii).

Northwest Land Deals, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3430 (ii).

Office Specialty Company, Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).

Otonabee River Water Power, Leasing of, &c. (Ques.) 4612 (iii).

Penetanguishene Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U.S., Names of Ports of Entry (Ques.) 708 (i).

Porch in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).

Port Colborne Grain Elevator, Contract, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 483 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7023 (iv).

Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7102 (iv).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'

Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1473 (i).

Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals (Ques.) 710 (i).

Spohn. Dr., Apptmnt. to Senate, Promise *re* (remarks) 4659 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2959 (ii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 7534; (surveys, &c.) 7531; (tow boat) 7534 (iv).

Canals—Quebec (cement) 5551 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531; (Port Maitland wall) 7533 (iv).

Civil Govt—Labour Dept., 2958 (ii); (Acland, F. A.) 6619; (McNiven, J. A.) 6619 (iv); (Post Office) 2781 (ii).

Excise (wood alcohol) 6626 (iv).

Fisheries (fishery commissions) 5941, 5971; (fish transportation) 5932; (legal expenses) 5970; (protection service) 5961 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6711 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (Babines) 7293 (iv).

Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (agents) 7284; (Giant's Tomb) 7288; (medical attendance) 7279; (Treaty No. 9, gratuities) 7290; (Oka settlement) 7292 (iv).

Interior—Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept (Gazette) 3580 (ii); (Pere Marquette Ry. litigation) 6620 (iv).

Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6366 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4599; (Neepawa) 4599; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 4609 (iii); (furniture, &c.) 3590; H. of C. addition) 3614 (ii); (maintenance) 4603 (iii); (Museum) 3616; (Obesrvatory) 3581; (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615; (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3617, 3954 (ii); (telephones) 4609 (iii); (tower investigation) 3616 (ii).

Pubic Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c., 4605 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Digby) 6027; (Parrsboro) 6054; (Port Hastings) 6058; (West Head wharf) 6067; (Yarmouth) 6067

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 6932; (Blanche River) 6933; (Collingwood) 6933; (Goderich) 6951 (iv); (Ice breakers) 5994 (iii); (Little Current) 6955; (Midland) 6963; (Point Edward) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5984 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6966 (iv); (Port Colborne) 6004 (iii); (Port Stanley) 6968 (iv).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6001 (iii).

Railways, I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (drawbars) 7307; (facilities) 7521; (Mulgrave) 7297; (Newcastle) 7300; (Truro) 7300 (iv).

Yukon (council grant) 7278 (iv).

Supreme Court Judges (salaries) in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7442 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. *re*, &c. read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3945 (ii).

Sussex St. Buildings, Architect's Plans, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (animals, &c., 1254; (dumping clause) 1020; (farm products) in Com., 1271 (i); (vessels, &c.) 2389 (ii).

Timber or Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Transportation Commission's Rep., Consdn. of, &c. (prop. res.) 1564 (i); Debate resumed, 3698 (ii), 4092 (iii).

Trent Canal, Lake Simcoe Section, Ref. to, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways, 497 (i).

——— Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies of Reps., 1930 (i).

——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii).

Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

Wabaushene Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order, Reading from Documents (Mr. Johnston) 153 (i).
Address, The, 1670 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation *re* Charges in 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1389 (i).
Beauharnois Canal Water Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation (Ques.) 2999 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4156 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on Sen. Amts., 6772 (iv).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Civil Servants, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).
Clergy from France, &c., Par. in 'Le Canada' *re* Orangemen, &c. (personal explanation) 7092 (iv).
Contractors, Tendering at Ottawa (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4858 (iii).
Criminal Code (exclusive contract clause) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 3726 (ii).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7188 (iv).
Criminal Code (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 5778 (iii); in Com., 7017 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, Purchase of Lumber, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6782 (iv).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1759; Amt. (Mr. Pringle) wthdrwn., 1798 (i).
Debates Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7008 (iv).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4841 (iii).
——— *See* 'Members.'
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7031 (iv).
French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6669 (iv).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3664

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry. Contracts for Construction, Rumours *re*, 3727 (ii).
——— Contract for Ties, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 1396, 1559 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc., in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5054 (iii).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1945 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) 582 (i), 3544 (ii).
Hansard: *See* 'Legislative Union,' &c.
House of Commons Employees, Salaries, Duties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2584 (ii).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6777 (iv).
Insurance Commission, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6402 (iv).
——— Printing in French of Rep., &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com. on Printing, 7004 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Min. of Rys., 5256 (iii).
——— Chaudiere Junction Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 1133 (i).
——— Drummondville Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 1133 (i).
——— Employes Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1486 (i).
——— Riviere du Loup Branch, Total Expenditure for 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Flavie Improvements (Ques.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Rosalie Improvements (Ques.) 1134 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1331 (i).
Legislative Union, &c. Correction in Hansard (personal explanation) 5509 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4860 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7699; in Com., 7841 (iv).
Members Desks in H. of C., Papers taken from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5644 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7253 (iv).
'Montcalm,' Str., Failure as an Ice-breaker (remarks) 1087 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7056; in Com., 7569 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, Nominations and Apptmnts, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Erection of Sheds, Contract *re*, Change of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c. (Ques.) 1395 (i).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 1386 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse. on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5808 (iii).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ques.) 4858 (iii).
Pasbebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Patent Medicine Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5005 (iii).
Patent Medicine B. 99 (Mr. Templeman) Postponement of, &c. (remarks) 4447 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to withdr., 7439 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7021 (iv).
Private Bills (remarks) *re* Translation, 708 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5296, 5331 (iii); on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7053 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7706 (iv).
——— on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7743; in Com. on Res., 7762 (iv).
Pulp Wood, cut and made in Canada, Export Duty *re* (Ques.) 888 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7546 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7417; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 7437 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3691 (ii).
Red Island, N.S., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1927 (i).
——— Dredging Sand Bar, Coal Supply, &c. (Ques.) 1987 (ii).
Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7014 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ques.) 4860 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Abandonment by N.W. Mounted Police, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).
——— (explanation) 572 (i).
Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3789 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1413 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 222, 1126 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship, Apptmnt. *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement (Ques.) 2828 (ii).
Strikes and Lock-outs Prevention B. 86 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i).
——— [illegible]
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6901 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (staff) 7534; (south bank) 7668 (Valleyfield banks) 7539; (Valleyfield repairs) 7668 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Soulanges (Cascades wharf) 7535; (electrical staff) 7666; (lockmen, &c.) 7535 (iv); (maintenance) 5551 (iii).
Civil Govt—Finance (increases) 7690; Justice (salaries) 7690; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 7678; Militia (salaries) 7686; Post Office (asst dep. P.M.G.) 7691 (iv).
Dom. Lands (timber protection) 7268 (iv).
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5921; (fish breeding) 5892; (hatcheries) 5900; (inspectors' salaries) 5890; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913 (iii).
High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Que.) 6717; (bonuses, &c.) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278 (iv).
Interior—Hydrographic Surveys (astronomical surveys) 7269; Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).
Legislation H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7972 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (accountants, experts, &c.) 7682 (iv); (salaries) 5865 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspe Basin) 7120 (iv).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous—(Connaught, Prince Arthur of, visit) 6901; (Insurance commission, printing, &c.) 7972 (iv); (Jamaica Disaster, aid to) 2727 (ii); (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
N.W. Ter. Govt—(commissioner's salary) 7272; (litigation) 7275; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Edmonton) 7823 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3608; (furniture, &c.) 3590 (ii); (H. of C. rooms) 7821 (iv); (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615; (Royal Mint) 3605 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P.O. enlargement) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Eskasoni wharf) 6030 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6093; (Anse a L'Ilot) 6090; (Chateuaguay) 6096; (Chicoutimi) 6096; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Father Point) 6100; (Grand Mechins) 6101; (Lake St. Francis) 6111; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (Peribonka) 6121; (Petites Bergeronnes) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Riviere aux Renards) 6121; (Rivière du Loup) 6122; (Saguenay) 6125; (St. Anne des Monts) 6129; (St. Francois) 6131; (St. Jean) 6132; (Sorel deepwater) 6133; (Yamaska) 6134 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Indiantown branch) 7663; (rolling stock) 7664; Railway Commission (staff) 7670 (iv).
Scientific Institutions—Meteorological Service allowances) 7684 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7095 (iv).
Yukon—(council grant) 7278 (iv).
Supreme Court Judges Salaries in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7440 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means, (animals) 1259 (i); (binders) 4427; (boots and shoes) 4558 (iii); (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (dumping clause Amts., binder twine) 1215; (dumping clause Amts.) 1189; (intermediate tariff and German treaties) 856 (i); (iron or steel beams) 4207 (iii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1252 (i); (pulp wood) 2063 (ii); (steel billets) 4207; (structural steel) 4208; (sugar) 4156 (iii); (U.S. Duties, comparisons, &c.) 1199 (i).
Transportation Commission's Rep., Suggestions *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Ventilation in Chamber of House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Route, &c. (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7507 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7072 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 1119 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 2769 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4330 (iii).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Probition, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4071 (iii).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. (prop. res.) 1445 (i).
I.C.R., Windsor Branch of the Dom. Atlantic Ry., Expiration of Lease, &c. (Ques.) 615, 1141 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1309 (i), 2015 (ii).
Charlesville, Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c. (prop. res) 4053 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* Prohibition (Ques.) 1801 (i).
Clam Point Canal, Sable Island, Report *re* (Ques.) 2836 (ii).
——— Access to, &c. (Ques.) 3188 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7167 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 668 (i).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7030 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7339 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2919 (ii).
Inverness Public Building, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 6011 (iv).
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 941 (1).
London Election Investigation, Govtl. Assistance (Ques.) 225 (i).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire (Ques.) 1557 (i).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3839 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to Com. of Sup., 7905, 7927 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Port Credit Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Hood Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3181 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7024 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7104 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Stoves imported into Western Canada, Value of, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (customs) 2767 (ii).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 5891 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6711; (agents, Ont.) 6715 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5950 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt. (commissioner) 7273 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (life-saving stations) 5770 (iii).
Public Works Buildings Man. (Dauphin) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Parkhill) 7822; (Renfrew) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (maintenance) 4604 (iii); (picture frames) 3972; (Sussex St. property) 3619, 3951; (Laurier Tower investigation) 3972 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018; (Charlo's Cove) 6021; (Glace Bay) 6032; (Inverness Mines) 6045; (New Campbellton wharf) 6053; (Round Hill wharf) 6065 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 6933; (Collingwood) 6936; (Kincardine) 6954; (Owen Sound) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5984 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a l'Ilot) 6092; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Lake Aylmer Wharf) 7825; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6113; (Lake Megantic piers) 7826; (Lake St. Francis) 7828; (Rivière Ouelle) 6124 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (steamer, B.C.) 5880 (iii).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (barley, &c.) 1362; (berries) 1896 (i); (brass instruments) 2400; (brushes, &c.) 2406 (ii); (dumping clause) 1023; (farm products) 1260 (i); (chains) 4270 (iii); (cheese) 1335; (chicory) 1360 (i); items standing, 2405 (ii); (malleable chains) 4390 (iii); (oils, &c.) 2121 (ii); (pease) 1361; (rice) 1859; (tomatoes) 1871; (trees) 1870; (vegetables) 1882 (i); (vessels, &c) 2395; (whips) 2402 (ii); (white lead) 4186 (iii); (wool) 2374 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson and Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 3425 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Yukon Officials, Absence from Duty, Aggregate Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 887, 1062 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 889 (i).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*
Annuity Co. of Canada (B. 65) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, &c. (M.) to adjn. House, Cor. &c. (read) 7131 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5614 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4751 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7475 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. Brown (Ques.) 3839 (ii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1120 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4976, 5205 (iii), 6204 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations &c. on M. for Ways and Means, 4231 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2963 (ii).
Militia (clothing) 5743; (pay and allowance) 5654 (iii).

Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1012 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*
Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence (Ans.) 4051 (iii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp (Ans.) 1050 (i).
Belleville Drill Hall, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1397 (i).
Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c. (Ans.) 474 (i).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply (Ans.) 1395 (i).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2068; 2°* and in Com., 3092 (ii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Total Value (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
Dufferin Rifles, Payment to Men, &c. (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
Dunnville Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 474 (i).
Esquimalt Station, Establishment of School of Instruction (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal furnished, Quantity and Rate per Ton (Ans.) 714 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Docks, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 894 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c. (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres purchased, Cost, Amount of Award, &c. (Ans.) 1385 (i).
Lee-Enfield and Ross Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia (Ans.) 4452 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c. (Ans.) 223 (i).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of (Ans.) 224 (i).
Military Forts at Levis, Clearing of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Military Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Military School at Montreal, Location and Site, &c. (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Military Stores Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Militia Estimates (annual statement) in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5084 (iii).
Militia Arms, 13th Haldimand, Amounts paid for Storage (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
Militia Drill Sheds Ret., on Inquiry for, 4615 (iii).
Militia, Expenditure *re* aiding Civil Powers, Collections, &c. (Ans.) 895 (i).
Militia Officers, Provisional Courses Allowance, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 1073 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. (B. 144) M. for Com. on Res., 4612; in Com. on Res., 5643; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 5645; 3°*, 5646 (iii).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Permanent Force, Qualifications of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1051 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Compensation *re* Timber Licenses (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from English soldiers (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2206 (ii), 4119 (iii).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 741 (i).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re* (Ans.) 485 (i).
Rifles Ranges in Victoria County, Site *re* (Ans.) 224 (i).
Ross Rifle, Accidents, &c. Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4050 (iii).
——— Accidents in N.W.M. Police, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4051 (iii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c. (Ans.) 4214 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Amounts paid to Sir Charles Ross or Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 5025 (iii).
——— Bayonet for, Pattern, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer, &c. (Ans.) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— Inspection, Commissions, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1403 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S. (Ans.) 2834 (ii).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 222 (i).
——— Pattern *re*, Rep. of Commissioner for 1901 (Ans.) 4216 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— Reps from Officers *re* Defects (Ans.) 4273 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3546 (ii).
See 'Lee-Enfield.'
St. Johns, Que., Sale of Barracks, &c. (Ans.) 4215 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis Military Cabins, Burning of, &c. (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Proposed Erection of (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
S.A. Veterans, Land Grants, Terms and Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
——— on Prop. Res., (Mr. Hughes) 735 (i).
Sub-Target Gun Co., O.C.'s, Cor. with Dept. of Militia, on M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to ref. papers to Pub. Accounts Com., 3887 (ii); 3977 (iii).
——— Purchase and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 226 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia, 2822 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (clothing) 5740; (customs duties) 5765; (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5647; (properties) 5736; (rifle ranges) 5764; (Royal Scots armoury) 5765; (supplies) 5763; (surveys) 5723 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4035 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston barracks) 4022; (London militia stores) 4022; (Toronto drill hall) 4031 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase of by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 719 (i).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence (Ans.) 4046 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*
Address, The, 19 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6275 (iv).
Athabaska Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. Amos) 6259 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Inquiry for, 703, 992, 658 1470 (i), 2069, 2344 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Bain, J. L., and Campbell, J. O., Apptmt, as Scrutineers in Elections, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6579, 6587 (iv).
Boots and Shoes, and Tanners' Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4589 (iii).
B.C. Judgeship Vacancy, Statement *re* Sale of, Ques. of Order, 580 (i).
Budget Debate and Farm [illegible] (remarks) 238 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1114 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 108 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4656 (iii).
——— B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canada and U. S., Negotiations by Mr. [illegible], &c. (remarks) 5508 (iii).
C.P.Ry. Land Belt, B.C., B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4655 (iii).
Canadian Sealers imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1381 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 804; in Com., 1306 (i), 2018, 2029 (ii); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6774; on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).
Cattle, Tuberculosis, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, Ques. of Privilege, 5666 (iii).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1109 (i).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4085 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes on prop. res. (Mr. Herron) 778 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, on Cor. from Taber Mines (remarks) 6145 (iv).
——— Information *re* Settlement (remarks) 276 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Further Information *re* (remarks) 6909, 7309, 7518, 7543, 7985 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction *re* Control of Mines (remarks) 221 (i).
——— Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Rep. in 'Evening Journal,' Further Information, Inquiry for, 219 (i).
——— Shortage of Fuel, &c., in the N.W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn Hse., 7140 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 1051 (i).
——— Abrogation of, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Black) 1453 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. Edward, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4368 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 702 (i); on M. for 2°, 2450; in Com., 2464 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* discussion, 580 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5847 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, Rumours *re*, M. to adjn., 5260, 5280
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin or Sir Jos. Ward, eliminated from Ret. (remarks) 5525 (iii).
——— Establishment of Imperial Council, on M. for Sup., 5526 (iii).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 2287 (ii).
——— on M. to adopt 5th Rep., 2415 (ii).
——— on M. to sit concurrently with Hse, 6836 (iv).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. B. 85 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 3092 (ii).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7188 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7015 (iv).
Customs Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. res., 4864; in Com., 5510; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5608; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5627, Neg. (Y. 36; N. 84) 5641 (iii).
Distribution (N.W.) Bill and Public Lands Bill, Information asked for, 1471 (i).
Dominion Lands Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 703 (i); on M. for 2°, 4732; in Com., 4740, 4787, 4806, 4865 (iii).
Dom. Lands (surveys and surveyors) B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 3093, 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands Survey B. 172 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7308 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Election Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6791; Amt. Neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 6898 (iv).
Election Act Amts., Inquiry for, 2637 (ii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2267 (ii), 4635, 4655; on M. for 3°, 4669, (amt.) 4947 (iii).
Exchequer Court (Registrar) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7257 (iv).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co.'s of Canada's incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).
Financial Situation (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).
French Clergymen exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6661 (iv).
Fuel Famine in N.W., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2826 (ii).
German Treaties and Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (i).
Gold and Silver Marking Act B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7014 (iv).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c., on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4274 (iii).
——— on M. to take in Wednesdays, 2729 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations (remarks) 6378 (iv).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6677 (iv).
——— (remarks) on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6663 (iv).
G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4803 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., District 'F,' Construction, &c., O.C.'s, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1118 (i).
——— Land Grants in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. for Ways and Means, 2069 (ii).
——— Land Grants in B.C., Inquiries for Papers, &c., 1792 (i).
——— La Tuque Branch, Construction Contract, &c. (M. for copy*) 1068 (i).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1947 (i).
——— Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3140 (ii).
G.T.P. Act (wages) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2479 (ii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3537 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2897 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of (remarks) 2481 (ii).
Hall, Zaccheus, Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act, &c. (Ques.) 1062 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6257 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7314 (iv).
Henderson, Judge Alex., Resignation, O.C. Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Huron (West) Election, Corruption, Ref. to in Debate on Election Act Frauds, 6794 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, Further Information *re*, 581, 1184, 1472 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).
——— Cor. read, &c. (remarks) 2736 (ii).
——— Legality of (remarks) 7 (i).
——— (M.) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 3170 (ii).
——— Original Letter and Witnesses (remarks) 3104 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* Portfolio of Public Works (remarks) 92, 839 (i).
——— Second Resignation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6790 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6205 (iv).
Indian Timber Reserve Lands, Disposal of, &c.: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5464 (iii).
——— Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4385 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, &c., 5666; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5658 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* not in Ret. (remarks) 2346 (ii).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 3844 (ii).
——— Evidence, Inquiry for, 4118 (iii).
——— Evidence and Rep., on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3722 (ii).
——— Printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7005 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6402 (iv).
——— Rep. on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6930 (iv).
——— Rep. *re*, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6349 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1492 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4865 (iii).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Rental Betterments (remarks) 7009 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Purchase of Land at Truro, N.S., from H. W. Yuill, O.C.'s, Valuation, Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
Interior Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 992 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4664 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7475; in Com., 7515 (iv).
——— on M. for Consideration of Res., 4613 (iii).
Jamaica Disaster, Govt. Grant (remarks) 1698 (i).
Judges' Salaries in Man. and B.C., B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7788; on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 7793 (iv).
Judges in Sask. and Alberta Salaries B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for, 3°, 7578 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S. (M.) to adjn., 2206, 2225 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4135 (iii).
Kaien Island Land Grant, O.C., Inquiry for, 1699 (i), 3977 (ii).
Labour Disputes Prevention, (M.) for Special Com., 1150 (i), 3696, Neg. (Y. 40; N. 78) 3696 (ii).
——— Settlement of, Ref. to in Debate on Address, 32 (i).
See 'Coal Strike.'
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 925 (i).
London Election, Ref. to in debate on Address, 26 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).
Manitoba Schools Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Marconi Tel. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (remarks) 1299 (i).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7698; in Com., 7844 (iv).
Martin, T., late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4518 (iii).
Members occupying Seats on Govt Side (remarks) 5890 (iii).
Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c. (M. for copy*) 2295 (ii).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5644 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7191, 7253; on Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7574 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5554 (iii).
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1095 (i).
New Ottawa, Settlers not complying with Settlement Duties (Ques.) 236, 1046 (i).
Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.C.'s. &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for copies, 1441 (i).
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).
Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2479 (ii).
N.S. Bench, Apptmnts. to (remarks) 7009 (iv).
N.S. Supreme Court Judgeship, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 5508 (iii).
——— Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c. (Ques.) 235 (i)
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Orders in Council, Consolidation of (remarks) 4946 (iii).
Peace River District. B.C.. Selection and Locations of Lands (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
——— Rep., Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 3189 (ii).
Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7610 (iv).
Petitions, 5th Rep., of Private Bills, 2480 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).
Postal Act (dead letter branches) Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) on Sen. Amts., 7839 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office B. 7022 (iv).
Post Office Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7022 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa, on M. for Sup., 3731 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1088 (i).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, Repairs, &c. (remarks) 3547 (ii).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3265 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1921 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Private Bills Com., on M. (Mr. D. Ross) to sit concurrently with Hse, 7246 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa), Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3443 (ii).
Probationary System, and Indeterminate Sentences, Observations of Mr. Justice McMahon, &c. (remarks) 3841 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Provincial Premiers Conference, Inquiry for Papers, 703 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158,' 'Petawawa,' &c.
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7738 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) to Reconsideration of, 7703 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7755; on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7777 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock (M.) *re* Sittings, 3840 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Papers (remarks) 3459 (ii).
——— Documents produced at next Session's Meetings, (M.) 7125 (iv).
——— Sittings, &c. (remarks) 5561 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 9 (i).
Public Expenditures, Criticism of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or Grant of to others than Settlers, O.C.'s, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Public Works, Minister of, Resignation of Mr. Hyman, Status as Member of the Hse, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 829 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Discussion *re* (remarks) 7008 (iv).
Quebec County Election, Speech of Mr. Aylesworth, Ref. to in debate on Address, 27 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7554 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Queens-Shelburne Election, Apptmnt. of Lighthouse Keepers as Scrutineers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Queens and Shelburne Election Protest, Interference of Govt Officials, on M. for Sup., 6677, (amt.) Neg. (Y.40; N. 70) 6705 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Debate on Election Act Amt., 6800 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Debate on Address, 23 (i).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2456 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 652 (i); on M. for Com., 3688 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 981 (i).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7418, 7428; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7437 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7800; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7806; (Nicolet) 7808 (iv).
Reports, Inquiry for, 1091, 1184 (i).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2200 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 582, 1856 (i), 2479, 3625 (ii), 5890 (iii), 7519, 7985 (iv).
——— Preparation of (remarks) 1091 (i).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1502 (i).
Revised Statutes, Copy placed in Library (remarks) 1470 (i).
——— Copy to be placed on Table (remarks) 1382 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Grants of Land, &c. to in Alberta, O.C.'s. Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Rougemont Senatorship, Inquiry for Ret., 7011 (iv).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1067 (i).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c. (Ques.) 236, 1046 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4245 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) 841 (i).
——— Inconvenience *re* Vacancy (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve, Negotiations for, O.C. Instructions, &c. *re* Mr. Pedley's Investigation (M. for copies*) 1118 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2663 (ii).
——— Ref. to in debate on Address, 29 (i).
Statutes (Schedule 'A') Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5884 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).
Strikes in Industrial Concerns in the West (remarks) 5862 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3032; in Com., 3802, 3846 (ii), 4458, 4774; on M. for 3°, 4978; (amt.) 4980; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 106) 5008 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6007 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Supply B. 141 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 5396; in Com., 5561 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt (Privy Council) 2764 (ii).
Geological Survey (clerical assistance) 3166; (oil borings) 3162; (specimens) 3165 (ii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6349 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 6972 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. *re* Vacancy, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Complaint from Chief Justice *re* (remarks) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. (read) 3916; (amt.) 3922; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 83) 3949 (ii).
——— Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 840 (i).
See 'N.S.' &c.
Supreme Court Judges in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7442 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (animals, &c.) 1254; (biscuits) 1866 (i); (boots and shoes) 4568; (brass, &c.) 4197; (britannia metal) 4204; (chains) 4265; (coil chains) 4265 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2348 (ii); (crucibles) 4190; (Customs Act Repeal) 4548 (iii); (dumping clause) 1006; (amts.) 1193; amts. (binder twine) 1226 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (excise duty, &c.) 1252 (i); (fire brick) 4190; (glass ware) 4193; (glucose, &c.) 4181; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (molasses) 4180; (monotypes) 4401 (iii); (mould boards) 2134 (ii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1249; (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (rice, sago, &c.) 4143; (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1860 (i); (structural steel) 4208; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4150 (iii); (U.S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1198 (i); (wool) 2373 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4327 (iii).
Tariff Changes, Ref. to Debate on Address, 21 (i).
Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Customs Acts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 525 (i).
Tariff Index, Distribution of (remarks) 424 (i).
Tariff—Intermediate Tariff *re* G. B. and Foreign Countries, in Com. on Ways and Means, 998 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff and Treaties in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (i).
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Tariff, Intermediate and Treaty, Relation to, Ref. to in Budget Speech, 297 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Treaties (commercial) Canadian B. 17 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 1552 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commissioners (prop. res.) 2295; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2328 (ii); agreed to (Y. 96; N. 36) 7576 (iv).
Vancouver Post Office Building, Terms of Contract, Changes *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).
——— Specifications, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1066 (i).
Warships of U.S. on Great Lakes, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 6279 (iv).
——— Information *re*, 6378, 6618, 6910 (iv).
Water Powers of Soulange Canal, Leases by Govt. on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 258 (i).
Winding up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings, O.C.'s, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office, O.C.s' Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1119
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5517 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5016, 5686 (iii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5704 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7544 (iv).
Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, The, 94 (i).
Buckingham Strike Riots (M. for cor. &c.*) 240 (i).
Church Army Immigrants: *See* 'Immigration, Encouragement.'
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5269 (iii).
French Clergy, exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6658 (iv).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3657 (ii).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential.'
G.T.R. 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4376 (iii).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District Conditions *re* (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register 'A,' Disappearance of (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Committee *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4767 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Immigrants, Contracts *re* Bonuses (remarks) 4615 (iii).
Immigration, Encouragement of Eastern Settlers to go to N.W. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' *re* Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Australian Premier, 4667 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).
——— Notice of Motion, 4771, 5259 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers (Amt.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5397; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 109) 5500 (iii).
——— Charges by Mr. Fowler, Notice of Ques. of Privilege, 5509; Question of Privilege, 5657 (iii).
See 'Privilege.'
Insurance Rep., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5176 (iii).
——— Translation and Printing, on M. to conc. in Amended Rep., of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1177 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an English Minister (remarks) 5860 (iii).
Minister of the Crown, Charges *re*: *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5813 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. res. (Mr. Pringle) 3393 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Par. *re* Relationship to Mr. Sifton, 7131 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Prince Albert District, Hay Permits, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Charges against Ministers and Members (Mr. Fowler) 3428 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7725 (iv).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1502; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1543, Neg. (Y. 31; N. 84) 1545 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants: *See* 'Immigration Encouragement.'

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c. (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2722 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3809, 3852 (ii), 4773; on M. for 3°, 4984 (iii).
Supply B. 141 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 5396 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, Que.) 6719 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4010 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts., in Com. on Res., 1186 (i).
——— French Treaty, &c. (remarks) in Com., 1252 (i).
——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1231 (i).
'Women, Wine and Graft, Charges by Mr. Fowler, against Members and Ministers, Ques. of Privilege, 3428 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission.

Bourbonnais, Mr. A., *Soulanges.*
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453 (ii).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Address, The, 123 (i).
Algoma District, Indian Land Sales, Special Terms, &c. (Ques.) 6015 (iv).
Algoma Timber Limits, Sales to Messrs. Wilson, Reesor and Philp, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 3641 (ii).
Blind River Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Tanners Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission (read) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).
Caustic Soda (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Govt. Officials, 6697 (iv).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Instructions to P.O. Inspector, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
——— Charges against Postmaster (Ques.) 4049 (iii).
Election Frauds, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6848 (iv).
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie (Ques.) 483 (i).
Garden River Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 2830 (ii).
'Golspie', Str., Wreck of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1097 (i).
——— Name of Port of Import (Ques.) 1384 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
'Golspie,' Str., Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 2346, 2590 (ii).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c. (Ques.) 4048 (iii).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6693 (iv).
Grand Falls, Mineral Lands, Water Powers, &c., Applications for, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3373 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7377 (iv).
Homestead Entries, in Quarter Section 20, &c. Issue of Patent, &c. (Ques.) 4851 (iii).
Indian Lands in Algoma District, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).
——— (Ques.) 3371 (ii).
——— (M. for ret*) 3373 (ii).
Indian Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Daily Retainer of Mr. Shepley, &c. (Ques.) 3639 (ii).
——— Report, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion by American Fishermen, &c. (Ques.) 4049 (iii).
Life-Saving Stations maintained in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2295 (ii).
Life-saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of (Ques.) 1384 (i).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments to (Ques.) 4048 (iii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Irregularity, &c. (Ques.) 2831 (ii).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7215 (iv).
'Monarch,' SS., Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt. (Ques.) 1384 (i).
N.S. Judiciary, Vacancy (remarks) 6765 (iv).
See 'Supreme,' &c.
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary and Increased Mail Service (Ques.) 4219 (iii).
Patterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp, Compensation *re* Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques.) 5656 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Poaching on Lake Superior, Patrol System *re* (Ques.) 3372 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B.' 'Petawawa.'
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2832 (ii).
Railway Committee, Shirking a Vote, Par. in Toronto 'World,' (personal explanation) 4388 (iii).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Rainy River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6979 (iv).
——— Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 1142 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3371 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4611 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, on M. for Ways and Means, 4234; (amt.) 4240; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 4262 (iii).
'Strathmore,' Str., Investigation *re* Wreck (Ques.) 1383 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3281, 3829 (ii), 3980, 4463 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Indians—B.C. (Babine investigation) 7286 (iv).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 7279; (Mississaguas' claims) 7292; (roads, &c.) 7288 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6437 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt. (litigation) 7274 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 6986 (iv).
Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S. *re* Cor., &c. read, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3934 (ii).
See 'N.S.'
Tariff (boots and shoes) 4558; (coal for smelting) 4434 (iii); (vessels, &c.) 2393 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Govt. Officials, 6696 (iv).
Timber Berths, Nos. 824, 1062, 1107, &c., Bonuses, &c., Applications and Regulations *re* (M. for ret.*) 6010 (iv).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2295 (ii).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Judges, acting as Directors of Stock Cos., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c. (Ques.) 2634 (ii).
Year Book, French Edition, Publication of (Ques.) 1987 (ii).

Brabazon, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Report, Approximate Cost, &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7798 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2245 (ii), 4629 (iii).

Bristol, Mr. E.—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General, &c. (Ques.) 5027 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5055 (iii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3498 (ii).
Justice, Adminstration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4142 (iii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1182 (i).
Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7415, 7425 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 981 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s Transactions, &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. that Com. rise, 3303; in Com., 3811, 3867 (ii).
——— Seconding M. that Com. rise, wthdrwn. 3319 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4365 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1208 (i); (sugar) 4174 (iii).
Toronto, Postal Branch in Centre Toronto (Ques.) 4861 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Address, The, 194 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4073 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4904 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7049 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4629 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Colony Register 'A,' Recovery of (Ques.) 7540 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1485 (i).
Long Sault Rapids, and International Waterways (remarks) 7544 (iv).
Marriages (minor) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7849 (iv).
Tariff—(tinplate) in Com., 4426 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson (Ans.) 480 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bain, J. L. and Campbell, J. O., Apptmnt. as Scrutineers in Elections, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Govt. Aid in Construction (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Brooks, E. L. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1117 (i).
Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1765 (i).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts purchased, &c. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Canadian Sealers, imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c (remarks) 1382 (i).
——— Release, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
Clam Canal, Cape Sable Island, Access to, &c. (Ans.) 3189 (ii).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c. (Ans.) 721 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing, Rep. (remarks) 2288 (ii).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Construction and Cost of of Maintenance (Ans.) 3187 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Fish Breeding and Protection, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Fishery Commission, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 723 (i).
Fishing Privileges, North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted, &c. (Ans.) 1394 (i).
Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
'Golspie,' or 'Osceola,' Str., Name of Port of Entry (Ans.) 1384 (i).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c. (Ans.) 4049 (iii.)
——— Wreck of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1105 (i).
——— Wreck of, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 2590 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 3°, 4795 (iii).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c. (Ans.) 2574 (ii).
Hay Shipments, Claims of P. E. I. for Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 4854 (iii).
Hudson Bay Deep Water Wharf, Govt. Action *re* Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 2574 (ii).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion by American Fishermen (Ans.) 4050 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
Life Saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of (Ans.) 1384 (i).
Life Saving Stations on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c., (Ans.) 479 (i).
Life Savings Stations on P. E. I. Coast, Number, &c. (Ans.) 231 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 904 (i).
See 'Sovinto.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906 (Ans.) 471 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for (Ans.) 724 (i).
'McKeen, G. A.,' Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c. (Ans.) 1146 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Purchasing of Supplies, Auditing of Accounts, &c. (Ans.) 709 (i).
Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Premier McBride, &c. (Ans.) 481 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 602; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 610 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Amount of Goods purchased for Lighthouse Service, &c. (Ans.) 471 (i).
Modus Vivendi Licenses and Fines of U. S. Vessels, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1049
'Monarch' SS., Investigation by Govt., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1384 (i).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3189 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman as per Statute 6, Edward VII., &c. (Ans.) 234 (i).
——— Nominations and Apptmnts, &c. (Ans.) 236, 237 (i).
Montreal Pilots, Tour de Role System (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 511 (i).
'Neptune' Str., Repairs and Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 3638 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office Building, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4656 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collections, &c. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Poaching on St. Mary's River, Patrol System *re* (Ans.) 3372 (ii).
Port Bruce Harbour, Cor. *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4666 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Port Hood Breakwater, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 3181 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Freight Service, &c. (remarks) 1085 (i).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3222 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).
——— Discussion *re* Laying off of Strs. (remarks) 704, 706 (i).
——— Ice-bound steamers, &c. (remarks) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4926 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers (Ans.) 3186 (ii).
——— Res. of Board of Trade, Tunnel, &c. (Ans.) 717 (i).
——— with N. S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c. (Ans.) 1049 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Service, Closing up of Channel by Ice (remarks) 513 (i).
——— Na[illegible] of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c. (Ans.) 613 (i).
——— Total Cost and Subsidies (Ans.) 1986 (ii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulation, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1143 (i).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditure for 1904-6, Amount paid to J. Hurley (Ques.) 3427 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1515 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications (Ans.) 3641 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Widening at Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots, Grounding of SS. Victorian (Ans.) 574 (i).
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service (Ans.) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
——— Dredging at Cap a la Roche, &c. (Ans.) 575 (i).
Sea-weed Industry at Isle Verte, Tax collected *re* (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Rep. *re* Stmnt. by Mr. Girard (remarks) 4658 (iii).
'Sovinto' Wreck on P.E.I., Request to Govt. for Life-saving Boats, (Ans.) 711 (i).
'Stanley' and 'Minto,' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
'Strathmore' Str., Investigation *re* Wreck (Ans.) 1383 (i).
Strubb, Chas., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 473 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5765 (iii).

Marine—Public Works (Cap a la Roche) 5776; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5773; (signal service) 5776 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766; (life-saving stations) 5767; (naval militia) 5773; (patrol vessels) 5772; (wrecking plant) 5771 (iii).

Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1342 (i).

Tariff, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Taxation, 1349 (i).

——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1232 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Stations, &c. (Ans.) 487 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).

Toronto Harbour Wrecks, Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 8 (i).

Wharfingers in Muskoka, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Brown, Mr. James P., *Chateauguay.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay) 6096 (iv).

Bureau, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Grand Trunk Ry. (B. 82) 1°*, 1986 (ii).

Indian River Railway Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 1119 (i).

La Compagnie du chemin de fer Colonization du Nord (B. 13) in Com., and 3° m., 2768 (ii).

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2454 (ii).

St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Machins) 6103; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6112; (Rivière du Loup) 6123; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (St. Maurice River) 6126; (Three Rivers) 6134 (iv).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Fuel Famine in N.W. (personal explanation) *re* Rep. in 'Telegram,' 2824 (ii).

Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1831 (i).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6246 (iv).

Timber Regulations, Number of Permits, &c. (Ques.) 7007 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7507 (iv).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) in Com., 7203, 7311, 7483 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B.—*Con.*

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3991 (iii).

Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1008 (i).

——— Wool, in Com., 2371 (ii).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *W. Middlesex.*

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1923 (i); in Com., 4409, 4557 (iii).

Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

London and St. Clair Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 1120 (i).

Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3892 (ii).

Private Bills, Pets. *re*, M. to receive, 1920 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York, Ont.*

Address, The 175 (i).

Ansley, Selina Kingan, Relief (B. 117) 1°*, 4771 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5204 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) 1°*, 6376 (iv).

Committees, Sel. Standing, (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse, 6833 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief (B. 8) 1°*, 515; in Com., 1750, 1754 (i).

Jordan, Light, Heat and Power, and Erie and Ontario Development Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 115) 1*, 4664 (iii); in Com., 7909 (iv).

Hadley, Geo. Wm., Relief (B. 118) 1°*, 4771 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 158) in Com., 7315, 7912 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 133 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6586 (iv).

Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Co's B. 132 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6585 (iv).

Orders of the Day, Printing in English (remarks) 7838 (iv).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7207, 7311 (iv).

Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.'s incorp. (B. 66) 1°*, 1472 (i); (M.) to wthdrw, 3720 (ii).

Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. Conmee) 2° m., 7212 (iv).

——— on Protest (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455, 2459 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4972 (iii).
Spain, O. G. V., Relief (B. 104) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rondeau) 6985 (iv).
Tariff—Tomatoes, in Com., 1875 (i).
——— Vegetables, in Com., 1885 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) Amt. 4115 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 129 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 6585 (iv).

Carrier, Mr. L. A., *Lévis.*
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c. (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2251 (ii), 4623 (iii), 7050 (iv).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payment on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5118 (iii).
I.C.R. Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3409 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. of Sup., 5434 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5824 (iii).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3260 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers and Members, 3435 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Woodstock, N.B.) in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3833 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John River) 6078 (iv).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor. Papers, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. res. (Mr. Knowles) 3568 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 1119 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Address, The, 69 (i).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c. (Ques.) 1134 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G.B., &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 698 (i); on M. for 2°, 2429 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2860 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7467 (iv).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
McGee, Thomas D'Arcy, Monument, Erection of (Ques.) 7700 (iv).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Cost of repairing (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Report *re* Packing Houses, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Petroleum, Bounties *re*, Total Amount (Ques.) 4052 (iii).
Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and Due (Ques.) 1134 (i).
'Tagish' Charlie, Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property (Ques.) 890 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3246 (ii).
——— N.S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c. (Ques.) 1048 (i).
Tariff—Printing Paper, in Com., 2061 (ii).

Christie, Mr. P., *South Ontario.*
Immigration Agents in Ont., Number and Names, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).
Immigrants, Number of Arrivals, 1906, Location, &c., (Ques.) 571 (i).
Pictou, N.S., Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4854 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7818; (exhibitions) 7818; (experimental farms) 7813 (iv).
Tariff—(chains) 4265; (malleable chains) 4390 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3188 (ii).
Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power (Ques.) 3187 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Hamilton Radial Electric Co. (B. 158) in Com., 7314, 7340, 7484 (iv).

Clarke, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

G. T. P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5070 (iii).

Life Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 931 (i).

Lime Kiln, Lake Erie, Regulations *re* Boats, &c. (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 119) in Com., 5589 (iii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3891 (ii).

Point Pelee Life Saving Crew (remarks) in debate on P. E. I. Life Saving Stations, 931 (i).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Thames river wharf) 6982 (iv).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*

Address, The, 116 (i).

Agricultural Products, Imports and Exports from Can. to U. S., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1149 (i).

Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry. (remarks) 1107 (i).

Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 4048 (iii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2418 (ii).

Cordage Co., Amounts of Fines, &c. (Ques.) 4047 (iii).

Detroit River Tunnel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Dolsen's Burying Ground, Protection of Banks, &c. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).

Fish-breedin, Amounts expended *re* Propagation (Ques.) 1929 (i).

Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c. (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

G. T. P. Ry., Cars, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Steam Shovels (Ques.) 3182 (ii).

——— Number of Miles constructed (Ques.) 5505 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7510 (iv).

Iron or Steel Tubing, in Com., 2132 (ii), 4265 (iii).

Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Cost of Completion, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

See 'Thames.'

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Letter Carrier System, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty Act Amt B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4666 (iii).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

Railway Committee Meetings, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Shirking Vote (personal explanation) 4387 (iii).

St. Ann's Island Lease, Date and Terms *re* (Ques.) 6016 (iv).

St. Antoine's Island, Lake St. Clair District, Lease, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).

San José Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2759 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (post offices) 2807 (ii); (contingencies) 6626 (iv).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 7294 (iv).

Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5923; (hatcheries) 5898 (iii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 7280 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).

Post Office (mail service) 3155 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham) 4020 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6950; (Port Stanley) 6973; (Rondeau) 6984; (Thames river wharf) 6980 (iv).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (brass coils) 2129 (ii), 4198 (iii); Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1220 (i); (malleable chains) 4391; (marble) 4191 (iii); (tomatoes) 1877 (i); (wool) 2369 (ii).

Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i). *See* 'Jeannette's Creek Wharf.'

Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations (remarks) 5861 (iii), 6142 (iv).

Tobacco Interests in Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7294 iv).

Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U. S., 1906 (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

Wire Fencing on Boundary Line between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 111 (i).

Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6263 (iv).

Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4158 (iii).

Binder Twine, Drawbacks *re* Duty up to 1906 (Ques.) 1612 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Brantford Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
Budget, The, 441 (i).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Supply of Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1394 (i).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7798 (iv).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments of Men (Ques.) 4045 (iii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2241 (ii), 4624, 4650; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4964 (iii).
Jamaica Disaster, &c. (remarks) 1613 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1096 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cancellation of, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7028 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlements B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3347, 3813 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (ce... ...066; (Yearbook) 2971 (ii).
Public Works Buildings — Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg immigration) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal mint) 3603 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich) 6950 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (binder twine) 2368 (ii); (brass, &c.) 4199 (iii); (cements) 2121 (ii); (chains) 4268; (clover seeds, &c.) 4144 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (dumping clause amts., binder twine) 1209 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (farm products) 1281 (i); (garden seeds, &c.) 4145; (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (glue, &c.) 2118; (machinery for binder twine) 2135 (ii); (oils) 4187; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4149 (iii).
——— Discussion of Items standing (remarks) 1868 (i).

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2263 (ii), 4626; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4965 (ii).
Electric Light Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7050 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7319, 7489 (iv).
I.C.R. Employes Pension Bund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2955 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7480, 7492 (iv).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7218 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1° m., 7123 (iv).

Conmee, Mr. J.—*Con.*
——— Protest *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on M. for Sup., 7898, 7919 (iv).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. German) for Precedence, 7482 (iv).
—— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
Railway Act (fencing) Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3723 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 3638 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3290, 3802, 3850 (ii), 3980, 4460, 4780 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7537 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 7833; Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7827 (iv).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1731, 1762 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Protection and Preservation, Expenditure of Moneys, Ques. of Privilege *re* Press Reports, 277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 6025 (iv).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*
Alberta R... Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 4839 (iii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7134 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4750, 4791, 4829 (iii).
Election Oaths, Form of, and Protests, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) to Com. of Sup., 7893 (iv).
Midway and Vernon Ry Co.'s (B. 123) 1°*, 4839 (iii).
Tariff (agricultural implements) 1375; (oatmeal) 1374 (i); (wagons) 2397 (ii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Centreville, N.B., Customs Collectorship, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
G.T. Ry. Co., Payments to by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1470 (i).
——— Lands purchased at Moncton (Ques.) 1130 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., N.B. Section, Proposed Routes, Resurveys, &c. (Ques.) 469 (i).
——— Reps., &c. Inquiry for, 4118 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7010 (iv).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 263 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3117 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7670 (iv).
G.T.P., Route from Chipman to Grand Falls, N.B. (Ques.) 2837 (ii).
——— Decision *re* Selection (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1479 (i); in Com., 2910 (ii).
I.C.R., Bridge Strengthening, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1469 (i).
——— Moncton Shops, Land Purchase (M. for ret.) Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2586 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1131 (i).
——— Number of new Apptmnts, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1054 (i).
——— O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stolen Postage Stamps (Ques.) 3181, 3425 (ii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payment to *re* Legal Services (Ques.) 2144, 2292 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2985 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5346 (iii).
Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax (Ques.) 4218 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2178 (ii).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualification, &c. (remarks) 1645 (i).
Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1381, 1473 (i).
Senate Vacancies from N.B., Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers (Ques.) 7542 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2810 (ii).
Customs (collectors' salaries) 5979 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5951 (iii); (Marconi stations) 5877 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 4044 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6074; (Dalhousie) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (St. John tributaries) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Marble Mountain wharf) 6050; (Parker's Cove) 6054 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7670 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (Halifax) 7301; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Newcastle) 7300; (Sackville) 7298 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 5960 (iii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Supreme Court, N.B., Reorganization, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3641 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (cant dogs) 4430; (casket trimmings) 4433 (iii); (cheese) 1351 (i); (cutlery) 4430 (iii); intermediate tariff *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries, 993 (i); (malleable chains) 4393; (matrices) 4398 (iii); (wire fencing) 2133 (ii).

Daniel, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6270 (iv).
Cabinet Vacancy for N.B. (remarks) 6135 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2023 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2475 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4740 (iii).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mails *re* Halifax Route (Ques.) 1059 (i).
Grain exported from Canada and U.S. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 475 (i).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Running Rights, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).
Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports, for 1904-5-6, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Min. of Rys., 5249 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1482 (i); in Com., 2926 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of Issue to Militia, &c. (Ques.) 4452 (iii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 934 (i).
Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 606 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 111 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7068 (iv).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for copies, 3256 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5375, (amt.) 5378 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2157 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Date of Issue to Canadian Militia (Ques.) 4452 (iii).
Ross Rifle Inspection, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1424 (i).

Daniel, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

St. John Harbour Improvements, Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

St. John Harbour Life Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).

Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1650 (i).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6900 (iv); (Year-book) 2971 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2797 (ii).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900; (salaries, &c.) 6762 (iv).
Excise (B. C. officers) 6626 (iv).
Fisheries ('Canada's' ensign) 5972; (dogfish extermination) 5923; (fish curing) 5926; (legal expenses) 5970 (iii)
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3162 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6760; (agents, G.B., &c.) 6708 (iv).
Indians—N. B. (seed grain) 7291 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping) reorganization) 5949 (iii), 7678; (lighthouses) 7678 (iv); (repairs, maintenance, &c.) 5868 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 7108; (St. John and Digby) 7116; (St. John and Yarmouth) 7118 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Marine—Public Works (signal service) 5776 (iii.)
Militia (annual drill) 5736; (clothing) 5742; (pay and allowance) 5733; (properties) 5737; (rifle ranges) 5764 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 5768 (iii); (life saving stations) 7678 (iv); (naval militia) 5773; (wrecking plants) 5772 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 3142 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 4021; (North Bay) 4023 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 4608; (Major's Hill park) 4609; (Rideau Hall conservatory) 4607; (ventilation, H. of C.) 4602 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4009; (Nicolet) 4011; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015; (trachoma hospital) 4012 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cockfish) 6076; (Mispec) 6076. (Quaco pier) 6077; (St. John harbour) 6081 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Glace Bay) 6037; (Yarmouth) 6070 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Quebec harbour) 5979; (St. Mary's current) 6001 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7677 (iv).

Daniel, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (Halifax) 7300; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Truro) 7300 (iv).
Railways—Railway Commission (counsel) 7669 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration) 6903, 7106 (iv).
Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—British Preferential, on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) to Com. on Ways and Means, 4302, 4354 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(axes, scythes, &c.) 4418; (cutlery) 4430; (drawbacks) 4424 (iii); (drugs) 2116 (ii); (Indian corn) 1368 (i); (manila rope, &c.) 2407; (opium) in Com., 2117 (ii).
Tariff Res.—Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).
Trade and Nav. Rets., Misprint as to Years (remarks) 278 (i).

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Exchequer Court, Appmnt. of French Judge (Ques.) 3185 (ii).
Judges, Retired, Practising, Action of Govt. *re* (Ques.) 3370 (ii).
Judges Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov. (Ques.) 3640 (ii).
Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave of Absence (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation of, Health, &c. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Pilots of Montreal, Tour de Role, System (Ques.) 4857 (iii).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications (Ques.) 3641 (ii).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 4856 (iii).
Supreme Court, Appmnt. of Judge from Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 15 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536 (iv).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 1119 (i).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5134 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677 (i).
G.T. Ry. Co., 2-cent a mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).

Derbyshire, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).
Transportation Committee's Rep., &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) 1594 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*
Apples, Hay, Maple Sugar, &c, Exports for 1905-6, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).
Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1145 (i).
Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c. (Ques.) 1143 (i).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

Devlin, Mr. C., *Nicolet.*
Berne Convention, Answer *re* Proclamation (Ques.) 7700 (iv).
Cigarettes, Manufacture, &c., Prohibition, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4081 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7796 (iv).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Pentitentiary, Clemency to (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Election Act Amt., *re* Corruption and Frauds, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6812 (iv).
French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6670 (iv).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3651 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2875 (ii).
I.C.R., Cars, &c., exchanged with U.S. Rys., Number, &c. (Ques.) 2578 (ii).
——— Fire Damage Claims at Manseau and Lemieux (Ques.) 3632 (ii).
——— Passenger Service from Nicolet (Ques.) 3632 (ii).
——— Station at St. Perpetue, Duties of Agent, &c. (Ques.) 2344 (ii).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7842 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Nicolet) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1539 (i).
——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 3°, 4991 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Grand Mechins) 6104 (iv).

Devlin, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Address, The 108 (i).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5486 (iii).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7843 (iv).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Adress to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7747 (iv).
Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1669 (i).

Dubeau, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Speech, Ques. of Privilege, 3843 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. O., *Montcalm.*
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Tobacco Manufactures in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products (Ques.) 1924 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 5084 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 5084 (iii); in Com., 6585 (iv).
Ontario Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 133) 1°*, 5084 (iii).
St. Mary River Bridge Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5084 (iii).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*
Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration (Ques.) 2143 (ii).
Horses imported into Canada, Minimum Value (Ques.) 1055 (i).
London Post Office Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7251 (iv).
New Zealand Flax, Experiment, &c., for Binder Twine (Ques.) 5286 (iii).
St. Louis, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3639 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(agricultural implements) 1352; (agricultural products) 1352 (i); (animals for breeding purposes) 4597 (iii); (butter) 1352; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (Paris green) 2120; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2381 (ii).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service (Ques.) 896 (i)

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Charges *re*, Investigation in 1906, &c. (Ans.) 1389 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Beauharnois Canal, Water Power, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
Campbell, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
C.P.R. and Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
C. P. R. Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c. (Ans.) 2290 (ii).
Canals Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenues &c. (Ans.) 567 (i).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1109 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Black) 1463 (i).
Gibson Creek, P. E. I., Privileges *re* Laying of Water Pipes, &c. (Ans.) 2575 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmnt., Duties, &c (Ans.) 722 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Advertisements for Tenders in Quebec (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
——— and C. N. Ry. Cos., Winnipeg Terminals (B. [illegible]) 1° m., 4929 (iii).
See 'Winnipeg Terminals.'
——— Cars, Number in Operation (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
——— Chipman to Grand Falls Route, &c. (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— Chipman-Grand Falls Route, Decision *re* Selection (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
——— Commissioners' Annual Rep., Delay in Presenting (Ans.) 1045 (i).
——— Commission, Employees at Ottawa, Numbers and Salaries (Ans.) 715, 885 (i).
——— Contracts for Construction, Signing of (denial) 3727 (ii).
——— Contracts *re* Steam Shovels (Ans.) 3182 (ii).
——— Contract for Ties, &c., Prices, &c. (Ans.) 1396, 1559 (i).
——— Lands purchased at Moncton (Ans.) 1131 (i).
——— Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
——— Moncton Route, Surveys, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3125 (ii).
——— N. B. Section, Proposed Route, Resurveys, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).
——— Number of Miles constructed, &c. (Ans.) 5506 (iii).
——— Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2985 (ii).
——— Progress of Work, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).
——— Ry. from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3886 (ii).
——— Surveys, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1394 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Tax Exemption in N. W. Provs., Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1611 (i).
——— Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c. (Ans.) 1800 (i).
——— Western Div., Cost of Construction, Guarantee Bonds, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4443; on M. for 3°, 4846 (iii).
G. T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt. (Ans.) 614 (i).
I.C.R. Employees' Pension Fund (B. 68) prop. Res., 1297; in Com. on Res., 1473; 1°*, 1501 (i); 2°* and in Com., 2907; in Com., 2907; 3°*, 3002 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4865 (iii).
I.C.R., Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 5177, 5205 (iii).
——— Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (remarks)) *re* Question, 1056 (i).
——— Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch (Ans.) 3837 (ii).
——— Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign (Ans.) 3637 (ii).
——— Carpets purchased, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3634 (ii).
——— Cars, &c., Exchanged with U.S. Rys. (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
——— Chaudière Junction Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Drummond Branch, Outlay in Mitchell and St. Leonard (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
——— Drummondville Improvements (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
——— Fire Damage Claims at Manseau and Lemieux Station (Ans.) 3633 (ii).
——— Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 4850 (iii).
——— Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 728 (i).
——— Galena Oil Co., Purchases from, &c. (Ans.) 712 (i).
——— Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Running Rights, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 711 (i).
——— McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 2835 (ii).
——— Mail Service from Halifax and St. John (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).
——— Midnight Train from Montreal to Levis (Ans.) 3181 (ii).
——— Moncton Lands acquired by Govt. (Ans.) 1131 (i), 3885 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. by Mr. Joughins (Ans.) 723 (i).
——— Number of new Apptmnts., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1054 (i).
——— Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Investigation *re* Rep., on M. for Copy (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).
——— O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Sale of Postage Stamps (Ans.) 1130 (i), 3181 (ii).
——— Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock (Ans.) 712 (i).
——— Passenger Service from Nicolet (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
——— Passenger Tariff, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 729 (i).
——— Payments to Geo. Cochrane *re* Supplies, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Ret., 725 (i).
——— Pictou Station, Amount of Contract (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
——— Reps. and Complaints *re* Coal supplied (Ans.) 1810 (i).
——— Roundhouse at Halifax, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— Rivière du Loup, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Ste. Flavie Improvements (Ans.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Rosalie Improvements (Ans.) 1134 (i).
——— Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent (Ans.) 2834 (ii).
——— Scrap Iron, Sale to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).
——— Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of (Ans.) 3838 (ii).
——— Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 2835 (ii).
——— Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delays in Mails, &c. (Ans.) 615 (i).
——— Windsor Branch Lease to Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co., &c. (Ans.) 1141 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 915 (i).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal (Ans.) 5023 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3884 (iii).
McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of (Ans.) 468 (i).
Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Extension, Enforcement of Provisions *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 1064 (i).
Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G.T.R. (Ans.) 950, 1130 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976, 5205 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt. (Ans.) 2985 (ii).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchase by Govt. *re* Rys. (Ans.) 152 (i).
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 1130 (i), 3181 (ii).
Otonabee River Water Power, Lease of, &c. 4612 (iii).
Pictou Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4855 (iii).
Port Colborne, Grain Elevator, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).
——— Improvement, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Injuries on P.E.I. Ry. (Ans) 4456 (iii)
P.E.I. Life-saving Stations *re* Wrecking (explanation) 993 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1087 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Charges *re* Protests *re* Winter time table, &c. (Ans.) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Fire Damages, &c. (Ans.) 1808 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c. (Ans). 1144 (i).
——— Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade (Ans.) 717 (i).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re* (Ans.) 1383 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Branch, Expropriation of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 470 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges (Ans.) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps. Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr Lefurgey) for Copies, 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding, of (Ans.) 1136 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 3000 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453; on M. to ref. back to Com., 2526 (ii); on Sen. Amts. 4412 (iii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 957 (i).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3679 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 980 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Printing and Advertising, &c.. Amounts paid, (Ans.) 1563 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).

——— Minister's Portfolio (resignation) 5555 (iii).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1857 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 2206 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com., 3889 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue, Station on I.C.R., Duties of Agent, (Ans.) 2344 (ii).

St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1659 (i).

"Sovinto", Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train for Life-saving Boats (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Sparks Estate, Claims *re* Ry. Terminals (Ans.) 710 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. John Harbour improvements) 5548 (iii).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope wall), 5548 (iii).
Canals—Quebec (cement) 5551 (iii).
Canals—Soulanges (Clement's Gully Bridge) 5548; (improvements) 5548; (maintenance) 5551; (Manny's gate bars) 5548 (iii).

Transportation Committee's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1595 (i).

Trent Canal, Outlet at Trenton, on M. (Mr. Ward) to adjn. 3628 (ii).

——— Rice Lake, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1935 (i).

——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii).

——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 4635 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 713 (i).

Trent Canal Waters Powers, Leased or Owned by the Govt. (Ans.) 565 (i).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2315, (amt.) 2324 (ii).

Wallberg, A. E., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys. (Ans.) 1052 (i).

Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid *re* (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

Welland Canal, Water Power, amount contracted for, &c. (Ans.) 1924 (i).

Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power, &c. (Ans.) 3187 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5550 (iii).

Winnipeg Terminals, C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. (B. 128) 1° m., 4929; 2° m., 5512; in Com., 5515 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

SUPPLY—

Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7974.

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*

American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897 (Ans.) 885 (i).

American Silver exported by Banks, Commissions paid, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i).

Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest-bearing, Total Amount (Ans.) 3882 (ii).

Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English Newspaper *re* Canadians (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Athabaska Fish Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Service, (remarks) 7186 (iv).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 2480, 2727 (ii).

——— (Vol. II.)—(presented) 4008 (iii).

——— (Vol. III.)—(presented) 1119 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 703, 1044, 1091, 1471 (i), 1991, 2344 (ii).

Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of (remarks) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).

Barges Inspection B. 35 (Mr. Laurence) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties (B. 174) prop. Res. 5887 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7515; 1° m., 7517; on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).

Binder Twine Item, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine, in Com. on Way and Means, 4576 (iii).

Budget Speech, Discussion *re* Tariff Changes (remarks) 238 (i).

Budget Speech and distribution of Public Accounts and Nav. Rets. (remarks) 93 (i).

Budget, The, (financial statement) 278 (i).

——— *See* "Ways and Means."

Cabinet Vacancy for N.B. (remarks) 6135 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4411 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 7694 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 6258 (iv).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4558 (iii).

Chartered Bank Rep. (presented) 7780 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 156) 1°*, 6256; (M.) to dschg, Order, 7793 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).
Civil Service Employees, Ottawa, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 2140 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the West, Further Information *re* (remarks) 7985 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. House, 7176 (iv).
——— location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1461 (i).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. House, 5273 (iii).
Colonial Securities *re* Investment of Trust Funds (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4546 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accounts Com., 5846 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. to sit concurrently with Hse, 6835 (iv).
Contractors Deposits for Security, &c. (remarks) 1386 (i).
Crow's Nest Coal, Assurances of Govt. *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 6905 (iv).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 134) 1° m., 5015 ; 2° and in Com. 5510 ; (M.) to report from Com. 5562 ; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5617 ; 3° m., 5627; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5630 (iii).
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7976 (iv).
Denatured Spirits, Ref. to in debate on Budget, 304 (i).
See 'Spirits.'
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Shortage of Cars in N. W. (remarks) 7252, 7311 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 72 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in French (Ans.) 6015 (iv).
Draper, Mr. P. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6635, 7247 (iv).
Elections Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
Election Oaths, Form of, &c. (remarks) 7944 (iv).
Estimates (1907-8) Presented, 278 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 7213 (iv).
———Further Suppl. (1908) presented, 7837 (iv).
Express Co.'s Rates, Revision of (remarks) 5861 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
"Favoured Nation" Treaties, with Foreign Countries, Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).
Financial Situation—Public Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7856 (iv).
French Language, action by Min. of Railways *re* extending (Ans.) 6014 (iv).
German and Canadian Tariff, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).
German Maximum Tariff, and Fiscal Relations, &c. (Ans.) 1129 (i).
German Tariff Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 ; Memorial from House of Commons and Senate (read) 856 (i).
See 'Tariff,' 'Preferential.'
Gold and Silver Coins, in Com., 2130 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Macpherson) 2° m. and (M.) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com., 6008 ; in Com., 7012 (iv).
'Golspie,' SS. Wreck of, Rep. of Commissioner, on Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2346 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2732 (ii).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amount, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4211 (iii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378, 7410 (iv).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6684 (iv).
——— (remarks) on Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664 (iv).
Govt. Rys., Running Rights, Proposals *re* (Ans.) 5780 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Accounts furnished to Inspector General &c. (Ans.) 5027 (iii).
——— Use of Rolling Stock of G. T. P. &c., Terms and Conditions (Ans.) 5657 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) to Conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5039 (iii).
——— Quebec Bridge Route, Contract &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).
——— Quebec Station Site, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1952 (i).
——— Route in N.B., Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7010 (iv).
——— Route through N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7675 (iv).
——— Steel Rails, Tenders for, &c. (Ans.) 7006 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7186 (iv).
——— Telegram (read) 6790 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies B. No. 2 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 592 (i).
Immigration Legislation in B. C., Assent to by Lt. Gov. (remarks) 7985 (iv).
Inspection and Sales Act Amt. (B. 162) 1°*, 6630 (iv).
I.C.R., Cars in U.S., Return of, &c., (Ans.) 7248 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Land purchased, on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for Ret., 2587 (ii).
——— Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of John Matthews (Ans.) 6905 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock, Number of Cars in U.S. (Ans.) 7007 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 173) prop. Res., 5888; (M.) *re* Com. on Res., 4612 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7444, 7505; 1° m., 7514; in Com., 7515 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Item (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
Iron or Steel Railway Bars, in Com., 2131 (ii).
Insurance Commission, in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).
Insurance Commission Bill, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Ministers of Cabinet, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5470 (iii).
——— Evidence laid on Table (M.) to print, &e., 3722, 3723 (ii).
——— Evidence, Exhibits, &c., Printing of (remarks) 3844 (ii), 4118 (iii).
——— Evidence *re* Printing and Distribution to Members (remarks) 93 (i).
——— Evidence, Printing (explanation) *re* Delay, 3881 (ii).
——— Evidence, Printing in French (remarks) on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7003 (iv).
——— Exhibits, on Inquiry for, 4441, 4616 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 2769 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 4442 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5176 (iii).
——— M. from Senate for Papers (M.) 5258 (iii).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 5859 (iii).
——— Number of Copies distributed (remarks) 3889 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) on M. (Mr. Foster) to have Words taken down, 6403 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Insurance Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6922 (iv).
——— Rep., Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Jamaica Disaster, in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
——— Govt. Grant (announcement) 1698 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1879 (i).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 2220 (ii).
See 'N.S.'
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Long Sault Rapids and International Waterways (remarks) 7544 (iv).
McGee, Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to, &c. (Ans.) 7701 (iv).
McIlwraith, Mr., Charges *re* Halifax Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
Magazines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 6204 (iv).
Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7541 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 4518 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7850 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Bill, Consideration of (remarks) 7517 (iv).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 6633 (iv).
Metals, Tariff Changes (read) in Budget Speech, 313 (i).
Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side (remarks) 5890 (iii).
Militia Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c. (Ans.) 6634, 7700 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7212, 7218; on Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 166) prop. Res, 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7055; in Com., 7569 (iv).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal (Ans.) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amount collected, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 508 (i).
National Transcontinental Ry. Commission's Re. (remarks) 7010 (iv).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5590 (iii).
Northwestern Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com., 4008 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
N. S. Judiciary, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 2220 (ii), 6765 (iv).
Office Specialty Company, Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Meetings, &c. (Ans.) 6906 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Balance Sheet, 3002 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for O. C., 1991 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7210 (iv).
Patent Medicines Bill (remarks) *re* proceeding with, 7439 (iv).
Petawawa Camp (remarks) 6910 (iv).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxes (remarks). 6519 (iv).
——— Confiscation of by Govt., on Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7619, 7650 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3893 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7924 (iv).
Postal Rates, Reduction, &c., on Ques. of Order (remarks) 6631 (iv).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6521 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6647
See 'German,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7097 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Mr. W. Kitchen, Payments to (Ans.) 7984 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 6377 (iv).
——— Winter Communication, Terms of Union, &c. (Ans.) 1927 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Montreal 'Star,' 6908 (iv).
——— Ques. of (Mr. Wm. Roche), 6544 (iv).
Prorogation and Govt. Business, Bill withdrn (statement) 7438 (iv).
Provincial Rights, Tel. from Premier of Ont. (remarks) in Com. on Hamilton Radial Bill, 7382 (iv).
See 'Petawawa.'
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5321 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5367 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr Daniel) 5379 (iii)
——— Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— (M.) to reconsider, 7410 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7705

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies and Boundaries, Additions since Confederation (Ans.) 5286 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Correction *re* (M.) to receive back from Senate, 7052 (iv).
——— Mess. to Senate (M.) 7775 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7750 (iv).
——— Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate (prop. res.) 7701 (iv).
Public Accounts Com. on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6765 (iv).
Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
——— Distribution of (remarks) 9 (i).
Pulp Wood, made and cut in Canada, Export Duty *re* (Ans.) 888 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan (B. 169) prop. Res., 6906; in Com. on Res., 7230; 2° m., 7939; on M. for 2° 7946; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Discussion *re* (remarks) 7009 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners (B. 159) 1° m., 6518; in Com., 7545 (iv).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6256 (iv).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 3° m., 7012 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3688 (ii).
See 'Two-Cent,' &c.
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 7246; in Com., 7808 (iv).
Railways Subsidies (presented) 7126 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7799; (Canadian Northern Ry.) 7807; (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) 7803; (C.P.R., Nicola branch) 7805; (Central Ontario Ry.) 7802; (Dom. Atlantic Ry.) 7805; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton and Woodstock) 7806; (Inverness Ry. Co) 7804; (Nicolet) 7808; (Temiscouata Ry.) 7807; (Woodstock, N.B.) 7802 (iv).
Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 161) 1°*, 6519; in Com., 7014 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2479, 2763 (ii), 5890 (iii).
Rideau Canal Reserve, Lease of, *re* Brick Factory (Ans.) 6904 (iv)
——— (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Rougemont Senatorship, on Inquiry (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 7518 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 7011 (iv).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3371 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6766 (iv).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 7125 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Saturday Sittings (remarks) 7001 (iv).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7780 (iv).
Smith, Lt. Col. H., Medals Board, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7248 (iv).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill (remarks) 7311 (iv).
——— P. E. I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants (Ans.) 7542 (iv).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 223 (i).
See "Tariff".
Supply Bill No. 96 (Jamaica grant) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 2727 (ii).
Supply (B. 141) M. for Com. on Res., 5395; 1°* 5397; 2° m. and in Com., 5561 (iii).
Supply Bill (Interim) Announcement *re* 5284 (iii).
Supply (B. 179) M. for Com., 7990 (iv); 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 7993 (iv).
Supply (M.) for Com., 4657 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Connaught, Prince Arthur of, visit) 6901 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (south bank) 7668; (staff) 7534; (Valleyfield banks) 7539 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7537 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Galops (construction) 7530; (entrance) 7530; (Gilbert contract) 7531; (retaining walls) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Murray (piers, &c.) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (O'Toole, J., claim, &c.) 7538; (tug-boat) 7669 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (Cascades wharf) 7535; (electrical staff) 7535, 7666 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 7667; (Curtis Bros'. claims) 7538; (improvement) 7534; (surveys, &c.) 7531; (tow boat) 7534 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531; (Port Maitland wall) 7534 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Aud. Gen.'s office) 2764 (ii); Finance (increases, &c.) 7690 (iv); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 2763 (ii), 7685; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv); Militia (salaries) 7686 (iv); (Post Office) 2812 (ii).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7295 (iv).
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5922; (fish transportation) 5936; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913; (legal expenses) 5971; (oyster culture) 5912 (iii).
Legislation-H. of C. (debates salaries) 7976; (library books) 6763; (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5948 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and Mexico) 7122; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119; (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G.B. and Canada) 7107; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 7118; (Halifax to Liverpool via Newfoundland) 7116; (Halifax and Yarmouth) 7118; (Magdalen Islands) 7118; (Montreal and Manchester) 7119; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 7122; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 7120; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7118; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7118; (Quebec and Murray Bay) 7121; (St. John and Digby) 7116; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 7116; (St. John and Glasgow) 7116; (St. John, Halifax and London) 7116; (St. John and W. Indies) 7117; (Sydney and Whycocomagh) 7121; (Victoria and San Francisco) 7117 (iv).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 7982; (insurance commission) 6280, 6473; (insurance commission, printing, &c.) 7972 (iv); (Jamaica, grant to sufferers) 2726 (ii); (Pacific cable) 7971 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation *re* accidents) 7837; (pay of force) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974; Ottawa (eastern block) 3951; (tower investigation) 3616 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Marconi stations) in conc., 7987 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7675; (surveys, construction) 7530 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Amherst) 7298; (Antigonish 7300; (bridge strengthening) 7523; (drawbars) 7307; (facilities) 7521; (Halifax) 7300; (Indiantown branch) 7663; (maintenance) 7534; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Mulgrave) 7297; (Newcastle) 7299; (New Glasgow) 7663; (Pictou) 7298; (Pirate harbour, water service) 7300; (rolling stock) 7664; (St. John accommodation) 7663; (Ste. Rosalie) 7522; (Sackville) 7298; (Stellarton) 7298; (Syney) 7298; (Truro) 7300 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Brunet, A. re——ration) 7539, 7669 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 7524; (fire damages) 7666; (Murray Harbour branch) 7526 (iv).
Railways—Railway Commission (counsel) 7669; (maintenance) 7534 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (agents salaries) 7097; (grain trade commission) 7983; (iron and steel bounties) 6903 (iv).
Unprovided Items, (general vote) 6902 (iv).
Tariff British Preference on goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4356 (iii).
Tariff Resolutions (presented) 327 (i); amended Resolutions (M.) for Com., 2986 (ii).
Tariff Resolutions, Clerical Errors (remarks) 513 (i).
——— (statement) 524 (i).
——— Colonial Conference and Offer of Imp. Govt. *re* Preference &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).
——— Customs Act Repeal, in Com., 4547 (iii).
Tariff Index, Distribution of (remarks) 424 (i)
——— on inquiry for, 513 (i).
Tariff—French Treaty (remarks) in Com., 1253 (i).
Tariff, Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Application to Foreign Countries *re* (Ans.) 489 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Tariff, Intermediate, Extension to British or Foreign Countries, in Com. on Ways and Means, 845, 996 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pour Parlers, &c. (remarks) 7938 (iv).
——— Preference and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re* (Ans.) 893 (i).
Tariff Items, Procedure *re* (remarks) 514 (i).
——— Items standing, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1868 (i), 2405 (ii).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re* (Ans.) 891 (i).
Tariff—M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Taxation, 1350 (i).
Tariff Resolutions, Operation, Date of, in Com., 4439 (iii).
Tariff Res., Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).
Tariff, Paper Combines, in Com. on Tariff, 2053 (ii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff, Distinction between G.B. and other Colonies of the Empire, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1230 (i).
Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence (remarks) 423 (i).
——— (Ans.) 709 (i).
Tariff—U.S. Duties, Comparisons, &c. in Com., 1197 (i).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (acetone), 4183 (iii); (agricultural implements) 1355 (i), 4402 (iii); (alum cake) 2115 (ii); (animals, &c.) in Com., 1254; (apples) 1893 (i); (automobiles) 2399 (ii); (barley) 1362; (beeswax) 1332; (berries) 1894 (i), 4148 (iii); (beet root sugar) 4153. (binders) 4427 (iii); (binder twine) 2368 (ii), 4438 (iii); (biscuits) 1865 (i); (books) 2050 (ii); (boots and shoes) 4558; (brass, &c.) 4196 (iii); (brass bars) 2129 (ii); (brass, rolled, &c.) 4555; (breadstuffs) 4143 (iii); (bridging material) 2400 (ii); (britannia metal) 4204 (iii); (British gum) 2121 (ii); (bronze, &c.) 4194 (iii); (brushes, &c.) 2406 (ii); (button blanks) 4550; (casket trimmings) 4432; (caustic soda) 4552 (iii); (cement, &c.) 2122 (ii); (cereals, &c.) 1858 (i); (chains) 4265 (iii); (cheese) 1333; (chickory) 1360 (i); (coal) 2397 (ii); (coal for smelting) 4434 (iii); (cocoa nibs) 1359; (coffee) 1360 (i); (coil chains) 4265 (iii); (collars, &c.) 2406 (ii); (condensed milk) 1361 (i); (confectionery) 4182; (cordage lines, &c.) 4550 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (cream separators) 1192 (i); (crucibles) 4191 (iii); (curling stones) 2123 (ii); (cutlery) 4430; (dates, &c.) 4148 (iii); (denatured alcohol) 2045; (diamond dust) 2130 (ii); (disinfectants) 4185; (drawbacks) 4423 (iii); (drugs) 2115 (ii); (dumping clause) 1000; (dumping clause, amts.) 1186; dumping clause amts. (binder twine) 1207 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (excise duty, &c.) 1252; (farm products) 1260 (i); (fire brick) 4190 (iii); (fish, &c.) 1919 (i); (flax seed) 4144 (iii); (florist stock) 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii); (fruits, &c.) 1908 (i); (fur skins) 2401 (ii); (galvanized iron) 4264; (garden seeds, &c.) 4145, 4389; (german silver) 4389; (glass, raw) 4435; (glassware) 4193 (iii); (glycerines, &c.) 2407; (glue, &c.) 2118; (granite, &c.) 2134; (gypsum) 2123 (ii); (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (horse powers) 4419, 4549; (Indian corn) 1362 (i); (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (iron, &c., pipe) 2133 (ii); (iron scrap) 4207; (iron or steel beams) 4207; (iron or steel billets) 4207 (iii); (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 2134; (iron or steel tubing) 2132 (ii), 4265, 4549 (iii); (lamp black, &c.) 2120 (ii); (lamp springs) 4394 (iii); (lime juice) 2044; (locomotives, &c.) 2134 (ii); (mackintosh clothing) 4432 (iii); (macaroni) 1866 (i); (machinery from G. B., preferential duty, &c.) 4551 (iii); (magazines) 2051 (ii); (malleable chains) 4390; (malt flour) 4182 (iii); (manila rope, &c.) 2407; (marble) 2124 (ii); (matrices) 4396, 4548 (iii); (medicines) 2116 (ii); (melons, &c.) 1909; (metallic trading checks) 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii); (military stores, &c.) 2409 (ii); (mining machinery) 4420; (molasses) 4180 (iii); (mould boards) 2134 (ii); (nuts, &c.) 1919; (oats) 1372 (i); (oils, &c.) 2121 (ii), 4187 (iii); (opium) 2117; (paper) 2051; (Paris green) 2120 (ii); (peas) 1361; (pickles, &c.) 1886 (i); (pig iron) 4427; (plums, &c.) 4148; (portable engines) 4417 (iii); (potash) 2115 (ii); (printing materials) 4548 (iii); (printing paper) 2053 (ii); (proof spirit) 526 (i); (pulp wood) 2064 (ii); (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (rice, sago, &c.) 4143 (iii); (roofing, &c.) 2127 (ii); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (rolled iron and steel) 526; (rye) 1859; (sago, &c.) 1859 (i); (seeds, clover, &c.) 4144 (iii); (settlers' effects) 2408; (spirits) 2110 (ii); (starch) 1361 (i); (steel bars) 4209; (steel shafting) 4209; (stove urns) 4419; (structural steel) 4207; (sugar, 16 Dutch standard) 4149 (iii); (tea) 1360 (i); (time-tables, &c.) 4184 (iii); (tomatoes) 1870 (i), 4148 (iii); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii); (typewriters) 4549 (iii); (unenumerated items) 2411 (ii); (vegetables) 1881 (i); (vessels, &c.) 2389; (wax, &c.) 2117; (whale oil soap) 2117; (whips) 2402 (ii); (white lead) 4186; (wire cables) 4422 (iii); wire fencing)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Tariff, The—*Con.*
2133; (wines) 2048; (wool) 2369; (wool batting) 2347 (ii); (wrought iron) 4264; (wrought iron tubes) 4209 (iii); (zinc dust) 2128 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Return, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7252 (iv).
Temporary Loans since Jan. 1, 1906, Rate of Interest, &c (Ques.) 235 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Tobacco Excise Duties, Changes in, &c. (remarks) 6141 (iv).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. res (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2337 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Borden) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 7575 (iv).
See Ry. B. 6.'
Warships on Great Lakes (remarks) 6279, 6910 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6378, 6618 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Budget (financial statement) 278 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, Customs Act, in Com., 524 (i).
Ways and Means, in Com., 844; (M.) for Com,. 1097 (i).
Winnipeg Terminals (B. 128) 3°. m., 5670 (iii), 6259 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., [illegible] (iii).
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce (Ans.) 4272 (iii).
Yukon—McInnes, Mr. W. B., Resignation of (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., *re* Sittings, 3840 (ii).
St. Leon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 140) 1°, 5441 (iii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Agriculture, Deptl. Changes, &c. (Ans.) 1392 (i).
Agricultural Com., on Inquiry for Evidence, 3001 (ii).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Provs., Population, Details, Copies laid on Table, 1472 (i).
Art Gallery, Committee of Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep (P.O. Dept. and N.W. Police) (presented) 3546 (ii).
Barrel, Legal Size, Recommendation from Dom. Horticultural Council, &c. (Ans.) 1390 (i).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Rep. *re* Extension, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Belleville Harbour Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1398 (i)
Belleville Revetment Wall, Contract, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 1398 (i).
Berne Convention, Answer *re* Proclamation (Ans.) 7700 (iv).
Bowmanville Poultry Station, Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Bracebridge, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Brick, Mr. T. A., Emplymnt. by Govt. *re* Census in Alberta (Ans.) 1135 (i).
Butter Production and Exportation, Quantity, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1145 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection (B. 33) M. for Com. on Res., 523; in Com. on Res., 804; 1°*, 838; 2° m., and in Com., 1300-4; in Com., 1615, 1992 (i); 3° m., 2229 (ii); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6773; on Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).
Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G.B. (Ans.) 1055
Cattle, Contagious Diseases, Treatment of (remarks) in conc., 7989 (iv).
Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re*, by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7991 (iv).
Census Forms for Manufacturing, Distribution and Completion, &c. (Ans.) 4217 (iii).
Census of Man. and Sask. and Alberta (presented) 2727 (ii).
Census Population in N. W. [illegible] presented) 514 (i).
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt (Ans.) 5504 (iii).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1393 (i).
Chatham Armoury. Moneys due Contractors (Ans.) 4048 (iii).
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Officials at Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1612 (i).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Number, Locations, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 947 (i).
Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 4211 (iii).
Cheese produced and exported in Canada, Total Cost, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1144 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Route (Ans.) 2577 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, &c., Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4076 (iii).
Clam Point Canal, Sable Island, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
Coal Famine in N.W., Ref. to in debate on Address, 164 (i).
Cobourg Car Ferry: See "Port Hope", &c.
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plant, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 710 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5169 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses (B. 20), M. for Com. on Res., 515; in Com. on Res., 658 (i); 2° m., 2416; in Com., 2449, 2460 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com., 3001 (ii).
Commercial Treaties with Canada (B. 17) 1°*, 657; 2° m., 1552 (i).
Cross Point Wharf, Purchase of Lumber, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Curry, Mr. S. G., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Dayley, Dr. R., emplymt. by Govt., Rep., &c. (Ans.) 1988 (ii).
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7980 (iv).
Digby Pier Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 6028 (iv).
Dolsen's Burying Ground, Cost of Protection Banks (Ans.) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Eastern Townships, Expenditure of Public Money *re* Public Works, (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Electrical Inspection (B. 111) 1°*, 4610 (iii).
Exhibitions at Sherbrooke and Toronto, Dates of (remarks) 2589 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Labourers' Wages and Working Hours, &c. (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
Experimental Stations in P.E.I., Location, &c. (Ans.) 1391 (i).
Floor Oil, used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3671 (ii).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Galt Post Office, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c. (Ans.) 719, 1124 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Interim Report, Approximate Cost, &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 3548 (ii).
Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 1092 (i).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c. (Ans) 231 (i)
G.T.R. Car Ferry: *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Grosse Isle Yacht, Gasoline Engine, &c. (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3640 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Heraldic Collection of Canada, Item in 'Le Canada' *re* (Ans.) 1058 (i).
House of Commons, Whip's Rooms (remarks) in conc., 7987 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony, Register A, Disappearance of (remarks) 5287 (iii). *See* 'Selkirk,' &c.
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906 (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
Immigration from Ont., Statement of Mr. Southworth (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A Lavergne) 6224 (iv).
Inspection (fruit) and Sale Act Amt. (B. 162) 2°, and (M.) for Com., 6774 (iv).
International Waterways Commission Rep. (presented) 514 (i).
Inverness Public Building, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6011 (iv).
Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Completion, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i).
Lachute Public Building, Delay *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I., Establishment of (Ans.) 723 (i).
Library Bureau Headquarters, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).
London Post Office Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7251 (iv).
Magog Public Building, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 2141 (ii).
Malloy, John P., and Ira Stratton, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Manitoba Public Works, Dredging, &c., Resignation of Hon. Mr. Aylmer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5085 (iii).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1393 (i).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5991 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7192 (iv).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Cost of Repairing (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7059; in Com., 7570 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Dry Docks, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Products, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1989 (ii).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Report *re* Packing Houses, &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to (Ans.) 1395 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
New Zealand Flax, Experiments, *re*, in Canada (Ans.) 5286 (iii)
Niagara Falls and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment of Power, &c. (Ans.) 568 (i).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
North Rustico Breakwater, *re* Extension, &c. (Ans.) 475 (i).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Sussex St., Architects Plans, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Prices and Commissions (Ans.) 235 (i), 3839 (ii).
——— Mr. Riopelle's Commission (explanation) 3627 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1557, 1562 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7312, 7483 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1559 (i).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Pelican Lake Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Petawawa Docks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Total Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 566, 1613 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep. &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 5023 (iii).
Porch in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).
Port Bruce Wharf, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements, Amount Expended, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).
Port Hope Car Ferry to Charlotte, on M. for Sup., 7593 (iv).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* (Ans.) 474, 489 (i).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Poultry Branch, Discontinuation of Stations (Ans.) 1139 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 2958 (ii).
P.E.I. Dredging, Schedule of Plans, &c (Ans.) 481 (i).
P.E.I Fruit Inspector, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1390 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Telegraph Communication, &c. (remarks) 1298 (i), 3547 (ii).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
P.E.I. Telegraph Service and Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 1809 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Investigation, Reps. Plans, &c. (Ans.) 946 (i).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost and Revenue (Ans.) 1387 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1841 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7556 (iv).
Rainy River Nav., Obstructions *re* (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax (Ans.) 4218 (iii).
Red Island, N.S., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i), 1987 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2479 (ii), 7985 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
Rideau Hall Conservatory, Collapse of (remarks) 1092 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1554 (i).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug, Owner's Name, &c. (Ans.) 571 (i).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1927 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Transportation Commission's Work, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i)
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and estimated Cost (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2760 (ii).
Seed Branch, Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1139 (i).
Seedsmen's Report from Dept., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1140 (i).
Selkirk, Lord, Hudson Bay Estate, Land Deeds in Possession of Govt. (Ans.) 5505 (iii).
See 'Hudson Bay.'
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4451 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Erection of, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817 (iv) ; (archives) 2958 ; (census) 2962 (ii); (cold storage) 7815 ; (Dublin exhibition) 6900; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818 ; (exhibitions) 7818 ; (experimental farms) 7811 (iv) ; (fumigating stations) 2974; (Year-book) 2971 (ii).
Civil Govt.—(High Commissioner's Office) 2958 ; (Public Works) 2824 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7980 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary P.O.) 4036; (barracks) 4036; (Edmonton) 4036 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 4042; (Ladysmith) 4042; (New Westminster marine) 4042; (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 4044; (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4035, 4599 (iii); (Dauphin) 7822 (iv); (Neepawa) 4599; (St. Boniface) 4600; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg immigration) 4601; (Winnipeg P. O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 3973; (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria) 4018; (Belleville) 4018 (iii); (Belleville armoury) 7820 (iv); (Brockville) 4020; (Guelph armoury) 4020; (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (Hamilton P. O.) 4022 (iii); (Kingston barracks) 7820 (iv); (London P. O.) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (Owen Sound) 4025 (iii); (Parkhill) 7822 (iv); (Peterborough armoury) 4025 (iii), 7822; (Renfrew) 7822 (iv); (St. Catharines) 4026; (St. Mary's) 4026; (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027; (Simcoe) 4028; (Stratford) 4028; (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4031, 4598; (Toronto postal station 'F') 4035 (iii); (Wingham) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3608; (Eastern block) 3950 (ii); (elevators) 4609 (iii); (furniture) 3588 (ii); (gas and electric lighting) 4609; (heating, &c.) 4608 (iii); (H. of C. additions) 3610 (ii); (maintenance) 4602; (Major's Hill park) 4610 (iii); (museum) 3616; (observatory) 3581; (picture frames) 3972 (ii); (post office fittings) 4608; (Rideau Hall conservatory) 4607 (iii); (Rideau Hall, improvements) 3615; (Royal mint) 3603 (ii); (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3617, 3951 (ii); (telephones) 4609 (iii); (tower investigation) 3972 (ii); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4603 (iii), 7821 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (Lachute) 4010; (Lévis) 4010; (Montreal barracks) 4010 (iii); (Montreal P. O.) 7820 (iv); (Montreal postal station) 4011; (Nicolet) 4011 (iii); (postal station, Point St. Charles) 7820 (iv); (Que. arsenal) 4012; (Que. immigration) 4009; (Que. immigration buildings) 4011; (Que. trachoma hospital) 4011; (Quebec East, building) 4012; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings Saskatchewan (Alameda land office) 4035 (iii); (Battleford) 7823 (iv); (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon P. O.) 4041 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Yukon (commissioner's residence) 7824 (iv); (rents, &c.) 4605 (iii).
Public Works—Dredging—Maritime Provinces (plant) 7000 (iv).
Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta., (Old Man's River) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 6996; (Columbia River) 6996; (Coquitlam) 6996; (Fraser River) 6997; (Victoria) 6997; (Williams Head quarantine) 7000 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Man. (generally) 7000; (Mossy Point) 6995; (Red River banks) 7833 (iv); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6001 (iii); St. Laurent) 6991; (Sandy Point) 6995 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6073; (Caraquet) 6075; (Clifton breakwater) 6076; (Cockfish) 6076; (Dalhousie) 6076; (Dorchester wharf) 7824; (Dover wharf) 7824; Great Salmon) 7824; (Lincoln wharf) 7824; (Mispec) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (Oak Point) 6077; (Petit Rocher) 6077, 7825; (Quaco) 6077; (Richibucto pier) 7825; (Richibucto warf) 7825; (St. Andrew's) 6080; (St. John Harbour) 6081; (St. John river) 6078; (Shippegan) 6082 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6017; (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Bay St. Lawrence) 6020; (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Broad Cove Mines) 6043; (Charlo's Cove) 6020; (Church's Point) 6021; (Cow Bay) 6022; (Culloden breakwater) 6023; (Digby) 6024; (Eskasoni wharf) 6029; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Grand Etang) 6037; (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Hall's Harbour) 6042; (Inverness Mines) 6044; (Jersey Cove) 6048; (Mabou) 6050; (Marble Mountain wharf) 6050; (Middle country) 6051; (Moose) 6053; (New Campbellton Cove) 6053; (Parker's Cove) 6054; (Parrsboro) 6054; (Petite Rivière) 6057; (Phinney's Cove) 6057; (Poirierville pier) 6057; (Porter's Lake) 6057; (Port Hastings) 6059; (Port Hood) 6063; (Round Hill) 6065; (Scotch Cove) 6066; (Tatamagouche wharf) 6066; (West Head wharf) 6067; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 6933; (Blanche River) 6933; (Bronte) 6933; (Colborne wharf) 6933; (Collingwood) 6933; (Goderich) 6950; (Hamilton) 6954; (Kincardine) 6954; (Leamington) 7820; (Little Current) 6954; (Meaford) 6962; (Midland) 6963; (Otonabee) 6980; (Owen Sound) 6964; (Point Edward) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5982 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6965; (Port Stanley) 6967; (Sault Ste. Marie) 6986; (Thames River) 6983; (Toronto) 6986 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 6070; (Point Prim) 6071; (Rustico) 6071; (Summerside) 6071 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Baie St. Paul) 6093; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6095; (Chicoutimi) 6096; (Cross Point) 6096; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Escoumains pier) 6098; (Father Point) 6099; (Grand Mechins) 6101; (Grand Rivière de Beaupré) 6101; (Grosse Isle wharf) 6109; (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7825; (Lake Megantic pier) 7826; (Lake St. Francis) 6111, 7829; (Lake St. John wharfs) 6110; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6113; (Lotbinière,

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. —*Con.*
&c.) 6114; (Magdalen Islands) 6114; (Murray Bay) 6115; (Perce wharf) 6115; (Peribonka) 6121; (Petities Bergeronnes) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Portage wharf) 6115 (iv); (Quebec Harbour) 5979 (iii); (Rimouski) 6120; (Rivière Batiscan 6121; (Rivière du Loup) 6122; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (Rivière Ouelle) 6124; (Rivière à la Pipe) 6121; (Rivière aux Renards) 6121; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128; (St. Charles de Limoilou) 6130; (St. François) 6130; (St. Fulgence) 6132; (St. Jean) 6132 (iv); (St. Mary's Current) 6003 (iii); (St. Maurice River) 6127; (Saguenay) 6124; (Sorel deep water) 6132; (Three Rivers) 6134; (Yamaska) 6134 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain Lake) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 7001 (iv).
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6001 (iii), 7819 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7096 (iv).

Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue (Ans.) 2830 (ii).

Thames River Channel, Deepening of Channel (Ans.) 232 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Changes in Excise Regulations (remarks) 6144 (iv).

Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water (Ans.) 897 (i).

Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).

Transportation Commission, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) 3712 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6086, 6998 (iv).
See 'St. John.'

Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment, &c. (Ans.) 1390 (i).
See 'Cattle.'

Vancouver Post Office Building, Changes in Contract, &c. (Ans.) 894 (i).

Ventilation in House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).
——— Statement *re* Information asked for, 617 (i).

Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Wage-Earners Census, Bulletin 1 (presented) 7780 (iv).

Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, &c., by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 248 (i).

Wharfs and Docks in Ont., Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

Year-book, French Edition, Publication of (Ans.) 1987 (ii).

Yukon—Dawson, Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re*, 1900-6 (Ans.) 1562 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co., &c. (Ans.) 1554 (i).
Yukon Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 714 (i).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E., *North Toronto.*
Address, The, 43 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5674
American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c. (Ques.) 885 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. Inquiry for, 514, 1044 (i), 1991, 3277 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Mail Service, on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) *re*, 7185 (iv).
Australian Papers, Inquiry for, 1699 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4154 (iii).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports (remarks) 1047 (i).
Budget, The, (reply) to Financial Statement, 399 (i).
Budget Speech, and Distribution of Pub. Accounts and Nav. Rets. (remarks) 92 (i).
Budget Debate, and Unopposed Motions, Precedence &c. (remarks) 238 (i).
Business of the House, Delay in Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 1110 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Names of Countries admitted (Ques.) 3369 (ii).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1777 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1856 (i).
Canada Newspaper Syndicate, Matrices Plant (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'
C.P.R. Land Belt, B. C., B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4655 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 108 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 4656 (iii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 811; in Com., 1628 (i), 1993 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4068 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of, (remarks) 7793 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West (remarks) 514 (i), 6909 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7169 (iv).
——— Tel. from Blairmore (remarks) 7092
——— Tel. from Mr. King (read) 7872 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1463 (i).
Cold Storage B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2463 (ii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5267 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* Imperial Council, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
Commercial Travellers Tax, Agreement at Conference with Prov. Premiers (Ques.) 4213 (iii).
Congdon, Mr. F., Inquiry for Rep. *re* Investigation into Charges, 6765 (iv).
Contractors' Deposits for Security, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1386 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1564 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7016 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt. B. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to introduce (remarks) 1608 (i).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5634 (iii).
See "Tariff.'
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in in Com. of Sup., 7976 iv).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Shortage of Cars (remarks), 7252, 7310 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4720 ; in Com., 4744 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7036 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2238 (ii), 4639, 4651 (iii).
Financial Situation, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7865 (iv).
Fish Transhipment on the Western Coast, O.C., Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6666 (iv).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential,' &c.
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7013 (iv).
'Golspie,' Str., Wreck of (remarks) 1106 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2734 (ii).
See 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378 (iv).
See 'Temporary.'
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
G.T.R. Car Ferry : *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
G.T.P., Land Grant in B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2091 (ii).
——— Commission, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. Ques.) 715, 885 (I).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1945 (i).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton (Ques.) 713 (i).
Halifax Drill Hall Property, Inquiry for Ret., 1699 (i).
Halifax Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7315, 7346 (iv).
Hudson Bay Retired Servants, Legal Claims *re* Compensation (Ques.) 6011 (iv).
——— Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 1141 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3574 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Information *re*, 514 (i), 5560 (iii).
——— on Cor., &c., being read, 2740, 2743 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7187 (iv).
——— Resignation as Minister and Member for London (remarks) 1796 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5717 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 714 (i).
Insurance Commission Bill, Inquiry for, 7251 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5659 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5478 (iii).
——— Charges against Members (remarks) on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. on Ways and Means, 4379 (iii).
——— Charges by Mr. Fowler, on Notice of Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 5509 (iii).
——— Cor. with Min. of Jus. and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3910 (ii).
——— Cor. with Mr. Shepley and Mr. Tilley *re* Methods of Investigation, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution to Members (remarks) 93 (i).
——— Exhibits, &c., Inquiry for, 4441, 4615
——— printing of exhibits (remarks) 4118 (iii).
——— Inquiry for further Cor. not in Return, 2345 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 5859 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6400; (M.) that Words (Mr. Martin) be taken down by Dep. Speaker, 6402 (iv).
——— Remuneration to Mr. Shepley (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
——— Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6924 (iv).
——— Total Cost, Communications between Min. of Jus. and Counsel *re* Information supplied (Ques.) 4214 (iii).
——— Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Insurance Commission, Rep. *re*, in Com. of Sup., (statement) 6281; (reply) in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Insurance Commission, on M. from Senate for Papers (remarks) 5258 (iii).
See 'Northwest,' &c.
Intercolonial Conference, Printing of Return (M.) 3277 (ii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 1056 (i).
I.C.R., Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1497 (i); in Com., 2908 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2477 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7458 (iv).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7909 (iv).
Judges' Salaries in Man. and B.C. B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7785 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2215 (ii).
Just, C. F., Suspension and Re-instatement, &c. (Ques.) 228 (i).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, &c., Award, &c. (Ques.) 1385 (i).
'Kestrel,' Str., Cor., &c., *re* Provisioning for Year 1905 (M. for copies*) 5[illegible] (ii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2600 (ii).
See 'Coal Strike,' &c. 'Strikes B. 36.'
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation, &c. (remarks) 4665 (iii).
'Lena M.' Wreck of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5871 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1834 (i).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii).
MacIlreith, T. R., Legal Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to M. for Ret., 2587 (ii).
McGregor, J. D., License Inspector, Yukon, Number of Permits granted, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Marine Supplies, Purchases of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7845 (iv).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 7780 (iv).
Militia Drill Shed Ret., Inquiry for, 4615 (iii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190, 7213; M. to wthdrw., 7212 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7057, 7069 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P.'
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1095 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5816 (iii).
Northwest Land Deals and Insurance Commission, Charges (Mr. Fowler) *re* Members and Ministers, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3428, 3445 (ii).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Orders-in-Council, Commission *re* Codifying (remarks) 4657 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Balance Sheet, Inquiry for, 3002 (ii).
——— O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 1991 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 15' (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7204, 7312 (iv).
Petawawa Military Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7641 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3891 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7902 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 7123; on M. for 2°, 7212 (iv).
Port Hope, Car Ferry to Charlotte, on M. for Sup., 7606 (iv).
Postal Rates Reducton, &c., on Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 6639 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 6631 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7021 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7023 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6649 (iv).
See "Tariff".
Preston, W. T. R., Agents under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7098 (iv).
——— Emplymnt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1981, 2068 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilton Radial B. 158", "Petewawa", &c.

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A.Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5308; on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5368 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7053 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to reconsider, 7410 (iv).
——— Amt. to B. N. A. Act from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7714 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., (M) *re* Sittings, 5561. (iii).
Public Accounts Com. and Delayed Returns (remarks) 2907 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co's Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7231; on M. for 2°, 7950; in Com., 7967 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7546 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7411 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Printing and Advertising, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1563 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 178) in Com. on Res., 7799; (Central Ontario Ry.) 7802; (Woodstock, N.B.) 7802 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2206, 3461 (ii), 4119 (iii).
Revised Statutes of Canada, Names of Persons, &c. for Distribution of (Ques.) 1801 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c. (remarks) 1614 (i).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure on Construction, &. (Ques.) 1554 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co. (remarks) *re* Question, 1061 (i).
Ross Rifles, Imported Parts fom U.S. (remarks) *re* Question, 2834 (ii).
Ross Rifle Inspection, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1422 (i).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6766 (iv).
Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1662 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4251 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1796 (i).
Springhill Coal Strike, (remarks) 5863 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remark) 4759 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 37 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1040 (i); in Com., on M. that Com. rise, 3305 (ii); in Com., 3989, 4470 (iii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Statement of Mr. Hall, 3328 (ii).
Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor. O.Cs., &c., with Militia Dept. &c. (M. for copies) 726 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3091 (ii).
——— (M.) to ref. papers to Com. on Pub. Accounts, 3887, 3977 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys, &c.) 7257; (timber protection) 7265 (iv).
Fisheries (dog-fish extermination) 5920; (fishery commissions) 5942; (fish curing) 5929; (fish transportation) 5934; (protection service) 5906 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7968 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (clerkships) 7972; (debates salaries) 7976 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 5867; (bookkeeping reorganization) 5947; (construction, &c.) 5869; (Marconi stations) 5874; (salaries) 5864; (signals) 5872 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119; (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G.B. and Canada) 7106; (Halifax to Liverpool via Newfoundland) 7116; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 7118; (Quebec and Murray Bay) 7121; (St. John, W. Indies and S. America) 7117; (Sydney and Whycocomagh) 7121 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 7982; (insurance commission) 6281, 6486; (Pacific Cable) 7971 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946; (N.W.M. patrol boat) 5946 (iii).
Penitentiaries—Generally (maintenance) 7971 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii); Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Hall's harbour) 6042 (iv).
Scientific Institution (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7098 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 6765 (iv).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 719 (i).
Tariff—in Com. of Ways and Means (acetone) 4182; (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (biscuits) 1866 (i); (books) 2050 (ii); (boots and shoes, &c.) 4550; (brass, &c.) 4197; (britannia metal) 4204; (casket trimmings) 4432; (coal for smelting) 4434; (confectionery) 4182 (iii); (cotton fabrics) 2351 (ii); (drawbacks) 4426 (iii); (Dumping Clause Amts.) 1188; (Dumping Clause Amts. *re* binder twine) 1209. (florist stock) 1868 (i); (glass, raw) 4435; (glass ware)

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Tariff, The—*Con.*
4194; (glucose, &c.) 4181; (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (lime juice) 2044 (ii); (liquid fillers) 4186; (mackintosh clothing) 4432 (iii); (macaroni) 1866 (i); (machinery from G.B., preferential duty) 4550; (malleable chains) 4391; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (matrices, &c.) 4394, 4549; (molasses) 4180; (oils, &c.) 4187; (pig iron) 4427 (iii); (printing paper) 2055 (ii); (proof spirits) 526; (rolled iron and steel) 526 (i); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1859 (i); (springs and axles) 4429; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4149; (tinplate) 4426 (iii); (tomatoes) 1871 (i); (wines) 2048 (ii); (wire cables) 4421 (iii); (wool) 2384 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4331 (iii).
Tariff Index, Inquiry for, 513 (i).
Tariff, Inquiry *re* Procedure, 3889 (ii).
Tariff—Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pour Parlers, &c. (remarks) 7938 (iv).
Tariff—Paper Combine, 2055 (ii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).
Tariff, Preferential and Intermediate, Effects of, Ref. to in debate on Budget Speech, 296 (i).
Tariff Resolutions, Clerical Errors, &c. (remarks) 513 (i).
Tariff—U.S. Duties compared with Canada in Com., 1196 (i).
Telegraph Lines (Govt.) Number of Miles, &c. Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1469
——— Inquiry for, 7251 (iv).
Temporary Loans since Jan. 1, 1906, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 234 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 582 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).
Winnipeg Terminals B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 5670 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5676, 5683 (iii).
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce (Ques.) 4272 (iii).
Yukon Gold Output, Subsidy, &c. (remarks) on M. to Ways and Means, 4535 (iii).
Yukon, Liquor Permits granted to J. D. McGregor, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Yukon Ordinances, Approval, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7408 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5707 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7545 (iv).
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co. (Ques.) 1554 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 714 (i).
Yukon, Wheat Raising (remarks) 3548 (ii).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names (Ques.) 4212 (iii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
B.C. Elections, Charges against Mr. D. Ross (remarks) in Com. on Strikes Bill, 3316 (ii).
Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iv).
Coal Strikes, &c. in the N.W. on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7157 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i); in Com., 2461 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4751 (iii).
G.T.P. Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., &c., on M. (Mr Crocket) 3131 (ii)
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5661 (iii).
——— on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2909 (ii).
Land Transactions *re* N.W. Co.'s, Insurance Investigation, &c., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. on Strikes Bill, 3314 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 924 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Expenditures *re* Govt. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5964 (iii).
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 1130 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A Martin) for Copies, 3262 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3451 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Lauriver) 5379; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5384 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 178, in Com. on Res., (Canadian Northern Ry) 7807; (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) 7803; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton to Woodstock) 7806; (Nicolet) 7808; (Woodstock, N.B). 7802 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4259 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3311 (ii)
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536; Soulanges (electrical staff) 7535 (iv).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv); Inland Revenue, 2822 (ii); Labour Dep. (private secretary) 7692 (iv); (Militia) 2822; Post Office) 2799 (ii); Post Office (salaries) 7691 (iv); Public Works, 2824 (ii).
Customs (ports, salaries, &c.) 5973 (iii).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6245; (outside service, salaries) 6244 (iv).
Dom. Police (salaries) 6762 (iv).
Fisheries (protection service) 5963 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6739; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (library books) 6763; (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (clothing) 5743; (properties) 5736; (surveys, &s.) 5728 (iii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6397 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 3974 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 3973; (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3954; (tower investigation) 3973 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6073; (Caraquet) 6074; (Dorchester wharf) 7824; (Dover wharf) 7824; (Great Salmon) 7824; (Petit Rocher) 7825; Richibucto wharf) 7825 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Church's Point) 6021; (Digby) 6024; (Glace Bay) 6036; (Grand Etang) 6037; (Hall's harbour) 6042; (Inverness Mines) 6046 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829; (Lake Aylmer (wharf 7826; (St. Francis wharf) 7829 (iv).
Railway Commission (maintenance) 7534 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (Amherst) 7298; (maintenance) 7534; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Sackville) 7298 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6250 (iv).
Sussex, N.B., Customs Port (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1018 (i); (printing paper) 2056; (pulp wood) 2066 (ii.)

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2482 (ii).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1755 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2088 (ii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
Great West Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1923 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5719 (iii).
'Lowrey's Claim,' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
Lyon, Victor Harold, Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Rock Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3311, 3870 (ii), 3979 (iii).
Summers, E. W. and H. H., Patent Relief (B. 9) 1°*, 515 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5699 (iii).

Ganong, Mr. Gilbert W., *Charlotte.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6272 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 836 (i).
Denatured Alcohol, Quantity made and sold, &c. (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Grand Manan Life Savings Station, Establishment of (remarks), 936 (i).
Life Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 936 (i).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and estimated Cost (Ques.) 2576 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish curing) 5928; (hatcheries) 5900; (herring nets) 5916 (iii).
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3160 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi Stations) 5876; (submarine signals) 5872 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Clifton breakwater) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (Oak Point) 6077; (Petit Rocher) 6077; (St. Andrews) 6080; (Shippegan) 6082 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Culloden breakwater) 6023; (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Mabou) 6050 (iv).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4323 (iii).
Tariff in Com. on Ways and Means (biscuits) 1865 (i); (diamond dust) 2130; (gypsum) 2123; (marble), 2126 (ii); (melons, &c.), 1910; (nuts, &c.), 1919; (pickles, &c.), 1888; (sago, &c.), 1859 (i); (zinc dust, &c.), 2128 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2482 (ii) ; in Com., 5204 (iii).
Dube, R. B., Dismissal of, from 'La Canadienne,' Reps. &c. (M. for copy*) 1978 (i).
Express Companies, Control by Railway Commission, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
I.C.R. Roundhouse at Halifax, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 941 (i).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1553 (i); in Com., 4969 (iii) ; on Senate Amts., 6633 (iv).
Red Island, near Rivière du Loup, Loss of Crew (remarks, &c.) 941 (i).
Senate Appointment, Par. in 'L'Evénement' (ques. of privilege), 5889 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. Victor, *Chambly and Verchères.*
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7085, 7090 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5848 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2415 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Sitting of Com. *re* Collingwood Ship Building Co. (M.) 3721 (ii).
——— 11th-24th Reps. (M.) to conc., 6764 (iv).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5608 (iii).
Erie and Ontario Development Co.'s Bill (remarks) *re* Precedence, 7482 (iv).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accounts Com., 5047 (iii).
Jordan, Light, Heat and Power Co.'s (B. 115) Precedence *re* (remarks) 7482 (iv).
——— to place on Order Paper, 7694 (iv).
——— in Com., 7909 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5853 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3823, 3875 (ii).
Tariff—(brass, &c.) 4200 ; (britannia metal) 4204 (iii).
Transportation Commission's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1596 (i).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Criminal Code Amt. Bill, (M.) to Introduce, 1608 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 77) 1°*, 1841 (i).

Gervais, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (exclusive contract clause) Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 3725 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) in Com., 4409, 4482 ; 3° m., 4794 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4844 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv).
Prudential Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 163) in Com., 7312 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(homestead inspectors) 6248 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Helen's wharf) 6001 (iii).
Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 70) 1° m., 1608 (i).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Escoumains) 6098; (Petites Bergeronnes) 6115 (iv).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post office) 2787 (ii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*
McPherson, Arthur Leon Relief (B. 157) 2° m., 6376 (iv).
Standing Orders Sel. Com. (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep., 6376 (iv).
Women's Art Association of Canada incorp. (B. 30) 1°*, 803 (i).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6268 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1314 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4076 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2449 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3895 (ii).
Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3284 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2793 (ii).
Tariff—Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4689 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Construction of a Railway to, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3565 (ii).
Manitoba Boundary Extension, Govt. Policy *re* (Ques.) 1803 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
C.P.Ry. Co. (B. 78), 1°*, 1923 (i).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5204 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6574 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7187 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2241 (ii), 4616; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 4954; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4963 (iii).
G.T.P.Ry. Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3133 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7344 (iv).
I.C.R., Annual Statement of Minister of Rys. (reply) 5227 (iii).
——— Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1489 (i); in Com., 2911 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7447 (iv).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5703 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7194 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7060; in Com., 7570 (iv).
Provincial Rights. *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158."
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7731 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7054 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) Ques. of Order, 7899 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 5 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7566 (iv).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Canadian Northern Ry.) 7807; (C.P.R. Nicola branch) 7805; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton to Woodstock) 7806; (C.P.R. Gagetown branch) 7803; (Nicolet) 7807; (Temiscouata branch) 7807; (Woodstock, N.B.), 7802 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1039 (i); in Com., 3984, 4775; on M. for 3°, 4993 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552; Lachine (slope walls) 5548; Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii).
Civil Govt.—(customs) 2767; Post Office (outside service) 3141 (ii).
Fisheries (fishery commission) 5941; (fish transportation) 5933; (inspectors' salaries) 5892 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 3142 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Glace Bay) 6035; Ont. (Collingwood) 6942 (iv).
Tariff Resolutions (customs Act) in Com., 525 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001; Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1217 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 532 (i).
——— Vessels, &c., in Com., 2390 (ii).
——— Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1934 (i).
Twe-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2332 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5515 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5699 (iii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5707 (iii).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*
Dominion Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1° *, 1119 (i).
Tariff—(agricultural implements) in Com., 4405 (iii).
——— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1217 (i).
Transportation Commission, Mr. J. H. Ashdown's Rep., Considn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1581 (i).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1934 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2339 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agricultural Implements, Total Value of Exports, 1894-6 (Ques.) 1553 (i).
Bronte Lighthouse, Allowance to Keeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1616 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com on Res., 701 (i); on M. for 2°, 2439; in Com., 2474 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5587 (iii).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff; in Com. of Sup., 7980 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, Legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1969 (i).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7048 (iv).
Farming Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected for 1906 (Ques.) 948 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1067 (i).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7314 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Commission, Rep. of (remarks) 7010 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7317 (iv).
House of Commons Post Office. Special Stamps, Postal Notes, &c., on Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 1379 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6780 (iv).
Insurance Rep., French Translation, (remarks) on M. to conc. in Amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7473 (iv).
La Compagnie du chemin de fer Colonisation du Nord B. 13 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for 3°, 2768 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5832 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7210 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7024 (iv).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 2068 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilton Electric Radial B. 158"
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3545 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2460 (ii).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Saturday's Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).
Sugar Duties, No. 16 Dutch Standard, Total Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 1049 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2778 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 6622 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6713 (iv).
Indians, Ont. (Mississaguas' claims) 7292 (iv.)
Interior—Surveys (international boundary) 7272 (iv).
Labour Dept. (printing, &c.) 3580 (ii).
Legislation—H. of C. (debates officials) 7980 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5957; salaries) 5865 (iii).
N. W. T. Govt. (litigation) 7274 (iv).
Poct Office (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 6933 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3590; (H. of C. addition) 3610; (Royal Mint) 3604; (Sussex St. property) 3621, 3958 (ii).
Tariff Res., Customs Act, in Com. on Ways and Means, 525 (i).
Tariff Items, Procedure *re* (remarks) 514 (i).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (alum cake) 2115 (ii); (apples) 1893; (beeswax) 1332; (berries) 1895; (biscuits) 1866; (cheese) 1333; (coffee) 1360 (i); (coins) 2130; (cotton fabrics) 2350 (ii); Dumping Clause, Amts. (binder twine) 1217; Dumping Clause, Amts. (cream separators) 1190; (farm products) 256, 1261 (i); (gloves, &c.) 2406 (ii); (indian corn) 1368; (melons, &c.) 1910 (i); (metallic trading checks) 2413 (ii); (oatmeal) 1372; (pickles, &c.) 1891 (i); (printing paper) 1963; (quebracho) 2115; (steel bowls) 2135 (ii); (tea) 1360; (tomatoes) 1879 (i); (unenumerated items), 2411 (ii); (vegetables) 1881 (i); (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2377 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1612 (i).
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution of (remarks) 6 (i).
Ventilation in Chamber of House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3607 (ii).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6578 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4615 (iii).
Blood Indian Reserve, Opening up (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c., (Ques.) 1131 (i).
Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control and Regulation by Govt. to prevent Famine (prop. res.) 743; Amt. (Mr. Knowles) agreed to (Y. 80; N. 39) 800 (i).
Coal Strike in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7134 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Mines Strike and Labour Disputes Bill (remarks) 6006 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5580 (iii).
Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Game Preservation in Rocky Mountains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Grazing (closed) Leases, Galway Horse and Cattle Co. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).
Hepburn, W. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Hepburn, Mr. W. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
Lethbridge District Water Reserve Lands, Sale of, Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 4216 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Northwest, Charges *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 1816 (i).
Lyon, H. E. v. Malcolm McKenzie, Cor. *re* Exchequer Court Suit (M. for copies*) 2838 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 733 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2652 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3319 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2970 (ii).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2811 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3147 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Edmonton) 4036; Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4039 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Old Man's River) 7834 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2031 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) and Mr. Speaker's ruling, 4088 (iii).
I.C.R. Pension Fund Employees B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2925 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor, 920 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Negligence on part of Govt. (remarks) 3889 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service, &c. (remarks) 1079 (i).
P.E.I Telegraphic Communication, Information *re* (remarks) 1991 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels. &c., on M (Mr A Martin) for Copies, 3198 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Construction of Ice-breakers, &c. (Ques.) 3636 (ii).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4942 (iii).
——— Laying off of Steamers, &c. (remarks) 707 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7745 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act (M.) for Address, 2147 (ii).
'Sovinto,' Wreck of, Rep. *re* Life-Boats (Ques.) 1064 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post offices) 2776 (ii).
Fisheries (fish curing) 5924; (hatcheries) 5916 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6707 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside) 6073 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch) 7530 (iv).
Tariff—British Gum, in Com., 2121 (ii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep. on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4114 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of (remarks) 5859 (iii).
——— Appmnt. of Successor (remarks) 6009 (iv).
——— Retirement of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6136 (iv).
British Soldiers, Honourably Discharged as Settlers in Can. (prop. res.) 736 (i).
Canadian Sealers imprisoned by Uruguay an Govt., Release of, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5668 (iii).
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot (M. for cor.) 501 (i).
Civil Servants, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West (remarks) 6909 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn., 7139 (iv).
——— Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
Coboconk to Gull River Waterway, Construction of Canal (prop. res.) 493 (i).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5270, 5279 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Customs Act, (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5620 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4741, 4826, 4866 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3093 (ii).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products (M. for ret.) 724 (i).
French Clergymen as Immigrants (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6150 (iv).
——— Exiled from France (personal explanation) 6654; (reply) 6673 (iv).
——— Par. in newspaper *re* Criticisms of (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2731 (ii).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).
Grazing (closed) Leases, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between (prop. res.) 2840; Res. wthdrn., 2901-5 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2585 (ii).
Homestead Rights on Quarter Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c. (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Insurance Commission's Rep., in Com. of Sup., 6517 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6923 (iv).
Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c. (Ques.) 223 (i).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal (Ques.) 5023 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3884 (ii).
McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of (Ques.) 468 (i).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Militia, Cost *re* aiding Civil Powers, Collection, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5045 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5803 (iii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Caring for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Confiscation of by Govt., Inquiry for Papers, 6765 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6910 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Petawawa Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).
Postal Rates between G. B. and Canada, Reduction (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Collusion with Militia Dept., 6907 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7233; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2526 (ii).
Ry. Rates on Commodities through Canada or to Foreign Countries or G. B., on all Transportation Lines (M. for ret.) 742 (i).
Railway Tariffs upon Commodities, &c. (M. for ret.) 503 (i).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt. to Rifle Matches (prop. res.) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Ross Rifle, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3732 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5026 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re* (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).
St. Johns, Que., Military Barracks, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 4215 (iii).
Sago Flour (remarks) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants (prop. res.) 730 (i).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 223 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 4482 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6900; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818; (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 7668; (McLaren's Creek) 7669 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (asst. dep. P. M. G.) 7691 (iv).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspector) 6248: (surveys) 7258 (iv).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900; (salaries) 6763 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7296 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6736; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (library books) 6763; (stationery, &c.) 6900 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (accountants, &c.) 7681; (salaries) 5865 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (Champlain Memorial) 5736; (clothing) 5740; (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5649; (surveys, &c.) 5727; (training schools) 5733 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (compensation to R. Wainwright) 6901; (Connaught, Prince Arthur, visit) 6901; (insurance commission) 6517 (iv); (Jamaica disaster, grant) 2726 (ii). (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt.—(litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation *re* accidents) 7837; (pay of force) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Buildngs — Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4599; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg immigration) 4601; (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Peterborough armoury) 7822 (iv); (Toronto drill hall) 4598 (iii); (Wingham) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (gas, &c.) 4609; (heating, &c.) 4608; (maintenance) 4602; (post office fittings) 4608; (rents, &c.) 4605; (telephones) 4609 (iii); (ventilation) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings — Sask. (Battleford) 7823; (Humboldt) 7823 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 7824 (iv); (rents, &c.) 4605 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Last Mountain Lake) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6030; (Parrsboro) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7826; (Peribonka) 6121; (St. François) 6131; (St. Francis wharf) 7829; (Sorel deep water) 6133 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Indiantown branch) 7663; (New Glasgow) 7663; (rolling stock) 7664 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1933 (i).
See 'Cobokonk,' 'McLaren's Creek,' &c.
Trent Canal Water Powers, Leased, Owned, &c. by Govt. (Ques.) 565 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5676; Res. of Board of Citizens of Dawson *re* Political Interference of Govt. Officials (read) 5676 (iii).

Hunt, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp (Ques.) 1050 (i).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Postmasters Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B., 7027 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys) 7259 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging) 6993 (iv).

Jackson, Mr. W., *West Elgin.*
Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5173 (iii).

Jackson, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Express Cos.' Rates, Revision of (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Port Bruce Wharf Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).
Port Stanley Customs Collection, for 1900-6 (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5864 (iii).
Miscellaneous—(insurance commission) 6419 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Burwell) 6966; (Port Stanley) 6967 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 6627 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
Accident and Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 106) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Address, The, 144 (i).
Adjournment for Christmas, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 992 (i).
Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6014 (iv).
Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6013 (iv).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1116 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1790; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1792 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2037 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale &c., Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain)—(amt.) 4084 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Ques. of Order, Reference to Proceedings in Pub. Accts. Com., 5845 (iii).
Customs Commissioner, Charges *re* sending Official Documents out of Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5721 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Election Frauds and Corruption, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 6764; in Com., 7313 (iv).
Financial Situation, Public Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2731 (ii).
G.T.Ry. Bill 82, on M. for 3°, 4849 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation, Payments *re* Construction on M. to Conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5113, (amt.) 5114, agreed to (Y. 114; N. 49) 5120 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7472, 7502, (iv).
Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden), 2624 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 932 (i).
MacIlreith, T. R., Payments to for Legal Services, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor. (amt.) 2587 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., on M. that Com. rise, 3304 (ii); in Com., 3822, 3850, 3982, 4510 (iii).
——— Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 4531 (i).

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6746 (iv).
Legislation (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto drill hall) 4033 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 6022; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Jersey Cove) 6049 (iv).

Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4361 (iii).
——— Matrices, in Com., 4399 (iii).
——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2055 (ii).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Traders Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 4518; in Com., 5285 (iii).
United Baptists' Woman's Missionary Union incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Wilson, Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6013 (iv).

Kemp, Mr. Albert E., *East Toronto.*

Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English newspapers (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 821; in Com., 1305, 1627 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6788 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4633 (iii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7013 (iv).
Imports via Canadian Ports, Value of for 1906, &c. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 934 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Manufacturers' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 803 (i).
'Resolute' Wreck, and Life-Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re* (remarks) on debate *re* P.E.I. Life-Saving Stations, 934 (i).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 7109 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto drill hall) 4598 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 4609; (maintenance) 4603 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 6987 (iv).
Tariff—British Preferential, applicable to Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4294 (iii).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1268 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 556 (i).
———Oils, in Com., 4187 (iii).
——— Structural Steel, in Com., 4208 (iii).
Walker, Mr. Bruce Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Year-book, Omissions from, (M. for ret.*) 3641 (ii).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

Canada and Japan Treaty B. 23 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 1548 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1764 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4074 (iii).
'Kestrel,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1818 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7240 (iv).
Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 62) 1° m., 1380 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (protection service) 5969 (iii).

Knowles, Mr. W. E., *West Assiniboia.*

Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 761; (amt.) 766 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., Shortage of Fuel, &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5597 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4694 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Construction of Railway to, &c. (prop. res.) 3548 (ii).

Knowles, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 163 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 6630 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co. &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2522, 2527 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (post offices) 2791 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 3156 (ii).
Tariff—Fruit, &c., in Com., 1903 (i).
——— Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).

Lachance, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
La Banque Nationale (B. 27) 1°*, 803 (i).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Address, The, 162 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5670 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, Patents *re*, Charges, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
C. P. R. Coal Lands, Selection by Govt., Conditions *re* Sale of Coal to Public (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
C. P. R. Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal, &c. (Ques.) 4666 (iii).
C. P. Ry. Lands Taxation, Appeal to Judicial Com. of Privy Council (Ques.) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
Coal Famine in N. W., Ref. to in debate on Address, 162 (i).
Coal Lands, Leases, &c., Areas, Dates of Purchases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 754 (i).
Coal Strike in N. W., Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 8 (i).
Crooked Lakes Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4856 (iii).
Crow's Nest Coal, Action by Govt. *re* Price, &c. (Ques.) 6905 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5576 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4696; in Com., 4740, 4789, 4807, 4884 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3094, 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Man., &c., Sales for 1905 (M. for ret.*) 1978 (i).
Doukhobors, Dom. Land Grants to (Ques.) 5780 (iii).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6689 (iv).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3516 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2890 (ii).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Section 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c., *re* Patents (Ques.) 2141 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3559 (ii).
Immigration to Canada, Total Number for 1901 to 1903, &c. (Ques.) 1382 (i).
——— Total Number since 1904, Distribution of, &c. (Ques.) 1053 (i).
Interior Dept., Employees in N. W., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1804 (i).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of (Ques.) 4857 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1827 (i).
McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).
Muscowequan Indians Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty Money, Names, Ages, &c., of Pupils (M. for ret.*) 1068 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5380; (amt.) 5382 (iii).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation (Ques.) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entry, &c. (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 731 (i).
——— Terms and Conditions, &c., (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2638 (ii).
Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4455 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2962 (ii).
Civil govt. (post office) 2797 (ii); (contingencies) 6623 (iv).
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3160; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3164 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6756 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3143 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4033; (Calgary) 4036 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Neepawa) 4600 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Saskn. (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 1375 (i), 4405, (iii); (cocoa nibs) 1359; (Dumping Clause) 1004; (fruit) 1916; (hops) 1360 (i); (horse powers) 4419 (iii); (military stores, &c.) 2410 (ii); (oats) 1372 (i); (oils, &c.) 4186 ;(portable engines) 4407, 4414 (iii); (stallions, &c.) 2413 (ii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5675 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6268 (iv).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 818; in Com., 1622 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670, 683 (i); on M. for 2°, 2423 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).

Dunnville Drill Hall, Erection of (Ques.) 474 (i).

Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).

Germany, Export Trade with Canada during years 1900-6, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Public Accts. Com., 5050 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation (remarks) 3116 (ii).

Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6779 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7470 (iv).

Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G.B. (Ques.) 724 (i).

Militia Arms, 13th Haldimand Battalion, Amounts paid for Storage (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7197 (iv).

Port Maitland Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 474, 489 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7025 (iv).

Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. (Mississaguas' claims) 7292; Que. (schools) 7281 (iv).

Militia (clothing) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3965 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6947; (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).

Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001 (i).

——— Intermediate and German Treaties, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 874 (i).

———Matrices, in Com., 4399 (iii).

——— Wool, in Com., 2372 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4411 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 835; 1319 (i); 2036 (ii)

Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. Macpherson) on Senate Amts., 4409 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2247 (ii), 4617; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4957, neg. (Y. 38; N. 102) 4968 (iii).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4409 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) 7484 (iv).

Harbour-au-Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 486 (i).

Immigration in Quebec, Ques. of Order, 6726

I. C. R., Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3423 (ii).

Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7909 (iv).

Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. 2225 (ii).

See 'Supreme.'

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7848 (iv).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 595 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Delay of Special Com., 1185 (i).

——— Consideration of (remarks) 7517 (iv).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190 (iv).

National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re*, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).

——— Water Power and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment to Can. and U. S. (Ques.) 567 (i).

——— Rep., O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies) 1426 (i).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7204 (iv).

Port Arthur Development Co.'s B. 167, Protest, on M. (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on Sen. Amts., 4413 (iii).

Ry. Act (arbitrations) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 90; 2° m, 594 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 595, 951 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3278, 3329 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (fumigating stations) 2975 (ii).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., *re* Cor., &c., read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3925 (ii).

See 'Judicial.'

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (apples) 1893; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1207; (fruit, &c.) 1904; (Indian corn) 1362; (tomatoes) 1874; (U. S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1200 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2324 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5520 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5020 (iii).

Lanctot, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 6518 (iv).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5504 (iii).
I. C. R., Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
Barges Inspection (B. 35) 1° m., 1035 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1450 (i).
I. C. R., Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).
——— (M. for ret.) 3396 (ii).
——— (notices of motion) 1077 (i).
I. C. R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2933 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 33 (i).
——— (M.) for Precedence, 89 (i).
——— (M.) to present, 218 (i).
——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1044 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan (readjustment) Representation Act Amt. (B. 51) 1° m., 1120 (i); in Com., 5670 (iii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment (M.) 2728 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 658, 992 (i).
Beauharnois Canal Water Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation (remarks) 2999 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1118 (i).
Binder Twine, Drawbacks up to 1906, &c. (Ans.) 1613 (i).
——— Seizures in 1906, &c. (Ans.) 2140 (ii).
Budget Speech, Prop. Motion *re* Precedence in Debate, 237 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1312 (i).
——— Procedure (remarks) 3728 (ii). *See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Canada and Japan Treaty (B. 23) 1°*, 803; 2° m., 1546 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Canada and U.S., Negotiations by Mr. Bryce (remarks) 5508 (iii).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5667 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment (M.) 991, 1077 (i).
Cigarette Manufacture, &c., Legislation *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 1801 (i).
——— on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4066; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Ques. of Order, 4088; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 4088 (iii).
Civil Service Employees, Salaries, &c. at Ottawa (Ans.) 2634 (ii).
Coal Strike in N.W., Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 9 (i).
——— Tel. from Mr. King and Jurisdiction of Govt. (remarks) 220 (i).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
Coboconk and Gull River Waterway, Construction of Canal, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 495 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. Edward, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4367 (iii).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) Ques. of Order, 5122 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister (remarks) 5260; on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5265 (iii).
——— Canadian Representatives, &c. (Ans.) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin and Sir Jos. Ward (remarks) 5525 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt., on Inquiry for, 3002 (ii).
——— Discussions *re* Imperial Council, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 5535 (iii).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c. (Ans.) 2634 (ii). *See* 'Imperial.'
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).
Commercial Travellers' Tax, Agreement *re*, with Provincial Premiers (Ans.) 4213 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), 6 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 558 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 4440 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4728 (iii).
Easter Adjournment, (M.) 5177 (iii).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 4947 (iii).
Emmerson, Hon. H. R., Resignation as Minister of Railways (announcement) 5554 (iii).
Express Companies, Control by Ry. Commission, &c. (Ans.) 473 (i).
Farm Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 948 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Freight Rates, Tariff, Local and General, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 724 (i).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3654 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2728 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays, &c. (M.) 3545 (ii), 4274 (iii).
See 'Business.'
Govtl. and Parliamentary Printing, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 4851 (iii).
Gowan, Hon. Sir James, Resignation as Senator (remarks) 3626 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Surveys, &c. on M. for Copies (Mr. Crocket) 269 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3139 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 4118 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Station on Champlain Market, Quebec (Ans.) 276 (i).
——— Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1942 (i).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2892 (ii).
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of (remarks) 2480 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3577 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of Portfolio of Public Works (remarks) 92 (i).
——— on Notice (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. (read) 2735 (ii).
——— Date and Witnessing of Letter (remarks) 3106 (ii).
——— Information *re* Resignation, 514, 1797 (i).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 581, 1185 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).
——— Legality of Form (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Letter *re* Resignation (remarks) 3627 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 3171 (ii).
——— Status as a member of the House, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 842 (i).
Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Cor. *re* (remarks) 4667 (iii.)
See 'Colonial, 'Intercolonial,' &c.
Insurance Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges against Cabinet Ministers, 5457 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5663 (iii).
——— Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4384; on Notice of Ques. of Privilege (remarks) 5509

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Insurance Commission (remarks) *re* Rep., 992 (i).
——— Cor. with Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3908 (ii).
——— Evidence and Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 2997 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 4092 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5177 (iii).
Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c. (Ans.) 3182 (ii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 614 (i).
——— Windsor Branch of Dom. Atlantic Ry., Expiration of Lease, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 219 (i).
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Jamaica Disaster, &c. (remarks) 1613 (i).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4140 (iii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation of as Canadian Agent in South Africa (Ans.) 1140 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Labour Troubles, *See* 'Coal.'
Lamontagne and 'Le Soleil' Cos., Amount paid in 1906-7 (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
——— Payments to by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 3727 (ii).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 611 (i).
Lime Kiln, Lake Erie Channel, Regulation *re* Steamboats Racing, (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments, to (Ans.) 3048 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W. (M.) for Com., 2585 (ii).
——— (M.) to add Names, 4117 (iii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payments for Legal Services, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to M. for Ret., 2588 (ii).
McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3633 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. E. Brown (Ans.) 3340 (ii).
——— Govt. Policy, (Ans.) 1803 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Martin, Thos., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 4518 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c., Reps, in Press (remarks) 2229 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 5553 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 22) 1°*, 803; 2° m., and in Com., 1092 (i).
Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O. Cs. &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for Copies, 1439 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police Report presented, 3546 (ii).
N.S. Supreme Court: *See* 'Supreme.'
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3385 (ii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Covering of Steps, &c. (remarks) 174 (i).
Paterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
Patrick, Mr. J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Answer to Question (remarks) 576 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. (remarks) 4666 (iii).
Pilots at Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route (Ans.) 3885 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to South Africa, on M. for Sup., 3731 (ii).
P. E. I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Freight Service, &c., Ques. of Order, 1078 (i).
P. E. I. Mail Service, Negligence of Govt. *re* (remarks) 3888 (ii).
P. E. I. Provincial Subsidy, Basis of Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
——— Claims of Delegates, Memo. *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1800 (i).
P. E. I. Telegraph Communication, and Marconi Co. (remarks) 1858 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Construction of Ice-breakers, &c. (Ans.) 3636 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Tunnel, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Lefurgey) 4371 (iii).
Printing Bureau, Names of Employees (Ans.) 3887 (ii).
Printing of Parlt. Com. (M.) 611 (i).
Private Bills, Pets., on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1920 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive 1981 (ii).
——— Rules respecting, Fines, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3441 (ii).
Provincial Premiers, Conference, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 703 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. Res., Notice of Motion, 4861 (iii).
——— (M.) for Res., 5177, 5288 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Amt.. to B. N. A. Act, on Ques. of Order, Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Member (Mr. Crocket) speaking on Main Motion, 5346 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5378; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in bringing down Papers (remarks) 3460 (ii).
——— (M.) to add name, 4440 (iii).
——— 6th Rep., on M. (Mr. Barker) to consider, 4771 (iii).
——— (M.) *re* sitting concurrently with Hse., 5561 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649; (M.) to refer to Ry. Com., 657 (i); on M. for Com., 3685 (ii).
Ry. Rates on Commodities passing through or from Canada on Transportation Lines, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 743 (i).
Railways, Minister of (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) Resignation of (announcement) 5554 (iii).
Railway Tariffs, upon Commodities, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 503 (i).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2194 (ii).
Reports, on Inquiry for, 1184 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 3626 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1528 (i).
Ross Rifle Factory, Cor. *re*, on Inquiry for (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3277 (ii).
Ross Rifles and N. W. Mounted Police, Abandonment of, &c. (Ans.) 614 (i).
——— (remarks) 573 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Judge, Apptmnt. *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, Representation (B. 51) 2° m., 1614; M. to refer to Special Com., 1615 (i); M. to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 4928 (iii); in Com., 6766; 3°*, 6766 (iv).
Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (announcement) 1564 (i).
——— (remarks) 1473 (i).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N. B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1651 (i).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893 (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Senate Vacancies from N. B., Applications *re* (Ans.) 708 (i).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Statement of Mr. Girard, 4664 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4248 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) 843 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Sol. Gen., Inconvenience *re* Delay of Apptmnt. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 736 (i).
Speech from Throne (M.) for considn., 5 (i).
——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 6 (i).
Spohn, Dr., Apptmnt. *re* Senatorship (remarks) 4660 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4757 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1042 (i); in Com., 3298, 3339 (ii).
Supply (M.) 218 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 2764 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (patrol boats) 5772 (iii).
Supreme Court, N. S., Delay in Apptmnt., &c. (remarks) 843 (i).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4324 (iii).
Tariff Res.—Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 549 (i).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1242 (i).
Telephone Cos., Expropriation by Provincial Authorities, &c. (Ans.) 3180 (ii).
Trade and Nav. Rets. (presented) 219 (i).
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 256 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 219 (i).
Yukon Boundaries Delimitation, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 3102 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances (presented) 274 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Dion, Ulric., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in French (Ques.) 6015 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7049 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1141 (i).
French Language, Action by P. M. G. *re* Extending (Ques.) 6012 (iv).
——— Action of Min. of Rys. *re* Extending (Ques.) 6014 (iv).
——— Use of in Coinage and Postal Notes, &c. (prop. res.) 3641 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2733 (ii).
G. T. P., Advertisement for Tenders in Quebec (Ques.) 3183 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Progress of Work, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 468 (i).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1938 (i).
——— (Ques.) 276 (i).
Heraldic Collection of Can., Item in 'Le Canada' *re* (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 4759 (iii).
Immigration, Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4519 (iii).
Immigration from France to Canada, Propaganda *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1556 (i).
Immigration Legislation in B. C., Refusal of Lt. Gov. to assent to (remarks) 7985 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6145, (amt.) 6156 (iv).
Inland Navigation Companies (B. 34) 1° m., 884 (i).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5473; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5662 (iii).
——— French Translation (remarks) 7984 (iv).
——— Rep. and Evidence (M.) to have printed, 5176 (iii)
Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c. (Ques.) 3182 (ii).
I. C. R. Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of Mr. John Matthews (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Abuse of Mr. Fielding, Ques. of Privilege, 4052 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Speech, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Dubeau) 3844 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7698 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5805 (iii).
Personal Explanation, *re* Montmagny Patronage, 2482 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4656 (iii).
Printing Bureau, Chief Foreman, P. M. Draper, Apptmnt. of (Ques.) 6635 (iv).
Printing of Parlt. (M.) that 3rd Rep. be considered, 5176 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3455 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7712; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7707 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 7719, 7751 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 6256 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3690 (ii).
Ry. Fares to N.W., Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 1517 (i).
Revised Statutes, Errors in Printing (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
——— French Translation, Delay, Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3183 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Erection of, &c., Cor. (M. for copies*) 1977 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 3277, 3546 (ii).
St. Charles de Caplin, Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezer (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893 (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Apptmnt. of Mr. Dessaulles, Rep. *re* Stmnt. by Mr. Girard, on M. for Sup., 4657 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3088; in Com., 3280, 3867 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. Louis, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 42) 1°*, 1119 (i).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7040 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7841 (iv).
Postal Rates Reduction, &c. (remarks) 6632
Postmaster's Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B. 7029 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co's B. 56 (Mr. McCool) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 2526 (ii).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.,*
Lurcher Lightship, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5863 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 2° m., 6376 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 5868 (iii).
Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1636 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2446 (ii).
Farm Wagons, Duty, &c. collected *re* Dumping Clause (Ques.) 2138 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Circulars issued to *re* Bonuses, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).
——— Issued to Officers or Agents, &c. (M. for copies*) 580 (i).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6474 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2941 (ii).
I.C.R., McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).
——— Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. by Mr. Joughins (Ques.) 722 (i).
Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I. Establishment of (Ques.) 723 (i).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Cor. &c. *re* Wrecked Vessels, (M. for copy) 598 (i).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for (Mr. Ames) 724 (i).
"McKeen, G.A.", Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c. (Ques.) 1146 (i).
Northwest Land Transactions, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3458 (ii).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1808 (i).
P.E.I., Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Services, &c. (remarks) 1081 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Change in Winter Time-Table, Protests *re* (Ques.) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Fire Damages to Mrs. Wiggins and Charles Malley (Ques.) 1808 (i).
——— *See* 'Wiggins,' &c.
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c. (Ques.) 1144 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges against (Ques.) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps. Surveys, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 1136 (i).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication, Marconi Co., &c. (remarks) 1858 (i).
P.E.I Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies, 3209 (ii).
——— Investigation, Reports, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 945 (i).
——— Surveys, &c. (remarks) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Winter Communication, 'Empress' and 'Stanley,' Strs., laying off for Season (remarks) 703 (i).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4939 (iii).
——— Prime Minister's remarks *re* Tunnel (personal explanation) 4370 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Names of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c. (Ques.) 612 (i).
——— Tel. (read) *re* Closing of Channel, 512
——— Total Cost and Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1986 (ii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Negligence on Part of Govt. (remarks) 3887 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5335, (amt.) 5343, Neg. (Y. 34; N. 96) 5373 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7715; in Com. on Res., 7757 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies and Boundaries, Additions since Confederation (Ques.) 5285 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Basis of Arrangement, &c. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P.E.I. (Ques.) 1143 (i).
Revised Statutes, Distribution to P.E.I. Libraries, &c. (Ques.) 2138 (ii).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 734 (i).
'Sovinto' Wreck, P.E.I., Request to Govt. for Lifeboats of Govt. Strs. (Ques.) 711 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5920; (hatcheries) 5902; (oyster culture) 5914 (iii).
Geological Survey (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (oil borings) 3162 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7118 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6474 (iv.)
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii); B.C. (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 6070; (Miminegash) 6070; (Summerside) 6071 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (fire damages) 7665 (iv).
Warburton Property, Purchase for Rifle Range, &c., Cor. Tels. &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).
Wiggins, Widow James, and Charles Malley, Property burned, Cor. with Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 1808 (i).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé*,
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary (remarks) 6633 (iv).
Atlantic Fast Mail Service (statement) 7185 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone Strike, Toronto Investigation, Tel from W. L. Mackenzie King (read) *re* Settlement, 3276 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Civil Service Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 1990 (ii).
Bethany Asst. Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 723, 1147 (i).
Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Apptmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3426 (ii).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c. (Ans.) 1135 (i).
Canada and G.B. Mail Service (statement) 7185 (iv).
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 502 (i).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination, &c. (Ans.) 573 (i).
Centreville Postmaster, Absence, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
——— Removad of from Belleville (remarks) 7781 (iv).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1110 (i).
City Post Offices, Civil Service Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
Coal Famine in N.W. (remarks) in debate on Address, 166 (i).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 793 (i).
Coal Strikes in N.W., Statement *re* Settlement, 174 (i).
——— Information *re* Settlement (remarks) 276 (i).
——— Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell (Ans.) 488 (i).
——— Terms of Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7136 (iv).
——— Telegram from Blairmore (remarks) 7092 (iv).
——— Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Telegrams from C.P.R. (read) 424 (i).
——— Tel. *re* Conference (read) 7543 (iv).
——— Tel. from Dep. Min. of Labour (read) 514 (i).
——— Tel. from Fernie, B.C. (read) 7838 (iv).
——— Tel. from Mr. King (read) 7871 (iv).
——— Tel. from Mr. A. F. Sherman (read) 7310 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) for further Information, 7518 (iv).
——— Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Taber Mines (read) 6144 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges (Ans.) 4049 (iii).
Crow's Nest Pass Mines, Settlement of Strike by Dispute Bill (remarks) 6007 (iv).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co., Settlement under Disputes Bill (remarks) 6005 (iv).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7978 (iv).
Eastern Townships, Applications for new Offices, Grants, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
'Empress of Britain,' Str., Arrival in Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 951 (i).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mail *re* Halifax Route (Ans.) 1059 (i).
French Clergy, Exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6665 (iv).
French Language, Action by P.M.G., Extending of (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
——— Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3662 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Speech of P.M.G., Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 572
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6689 (iv).
Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practice *re* Elections (Ans.) 231 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6257 (iv).
——— Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act (Ans.) 1062 (i).
Harbour au Bouche, Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 487 (i).
House of Commons Postal Facilities, Special Stamps and Postal Orders (explanation) 1378 (i).
Immigration, Encouragement of Eastern Citizens to go to N.W. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6193 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies B. No. 2 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 594 (i).
——— Rep. of Com., 7309 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7005 (iv).
I.C.R., O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stealing Postage Stamps (Ans.) 3425 (ii).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1166 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (explanation) 1378 (i).
See "Coal Strikes", "Bell Telephone", "Strikes Bill 36," &c.
Lakeville P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location, &c. (Ans.) 7250 (iv).
Lansdowne, Mail Delivery by Night Trains, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and Immigration of skilled Labour (Ans.) 4217 (iii).
Letter Carrier Service, Extension to Edmonton and Calgary, (Ans.) 615 (i).
Letter Carriers, in Quebec City, Increase in (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Mail Service to G.B.: *See* "Empress", &c.
Mail Service, to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition (Ans.) 2982 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman, (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Irregularity, &c. (Ans.) 2831 (ii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7220 (iv).
Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor (Ans.) 1387 (i).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service Contract *re* (Ans.) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Vacancy, (statement) 513 (i).
North Lake P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location (Ans.) 7249 (iv).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3388 (ii).
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary and Increased Mail Service (Ans.) 4219 (iii).
Orangeville, P.O., Vacancy *re* (Ans.) 7249 (iv).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2344 (ii).
Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, Apptmnt. of Successor (Ans.) 897 (i).
Postal Arrangements, between Canada and United States, Cancellation of, &c. (Ans.) 473 (i).
——— Ref. to in Speech on Address (Ans.) 613 (i).
Post Cards, Coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of (remarks) 5284 (iii).
Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Paper (Ans.) 572 (i).
Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, Inauguration of (Ans.) 3425 (ii).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 2636 (ii).
Postal Parcel System, Protests *re* Extension in Man. (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Postal Rates between G. B. and Canada, Reduction of (announcement) 6630 (iv).
——— (explanation) 6636 (iv).
Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and due (Ans.) 1134 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) 7024, 7780 (iv).
——— Compensation *re* &c. (Ans.) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 113) 1°*, 4610 (iii); in Com., 7020; on Senate Amts., 7839 (iv)
Post Offices in Cities, Employees' Salaries (Ans.) 5779 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Salaries, (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Post Office, Registered Letters, System *re* (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1555 (i).
P.E.I.Ry., Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1389 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Carrying Mails, &c. (Ans.) 948 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., *re* Amt. to B.N.A.Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7719 (iv).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change in Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6624 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7421 (iv).
Railway Blockade in N.W., Delays in Mails, &c. (remarks) 6521 (iv).
Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3188 (ii).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1555 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carried in 1907 (Ans.) 3186 (ii).
See 'Post Office, Registered,' 'Southport,' &c.
Registration Fee, Increase of (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
St. Charles Postmistress, Compensation *re* Loss by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 1612 (i).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement, &c., (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4612 (iii).
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age of, Loss of Registered Letter, &c. (Ans.) 7251 (iv).
Stanley, N.B. Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers (Ans.) 7542 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1125 (i).
Stratton, Ira, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention (B. 36) 1° m., 1036 (i); 2° m., 3002; in Com., 3091, 3278, 3367, 3802; in Com., Memorandum of Dep. Min. of Justice (read) 3844 (ii); in Com., 3978, 4458, 4772; 3° m., 4978; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6007 (iv).
Strikes in Industrial Concerns (remarks) 5862 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept., 2958 (ii); (Acland, F. A.) 6619; (McNiven, J. A.) 6619; (private secretary) 7692; Post Office (asst. dep. P.M.G.) 7691 (iv); (outside service) 3141; (post office) 2770 (ii).
Excise (B.C. officers) 6626; (wood alcohol) 6626 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6742 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Bell Telephone commission) 6620; (printing, &c.) 6618 (iv); (printing 'Gazette') 3579 (ii).
Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7978 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G. B. and Canada) 7116 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7836 (iv).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 3158; (mail service) 3141 (ii); (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv); (Yukon mail service) 3158 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Doucet's Landing) 6098; (Father Point) 6100; (Magdalen Islands) 6114; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128 (iv).
Toronto, Mails to the East, Cost of Carrying (Ans.) 1121 (i).
——— Postal Stations in Centre Toronto (Ans.) 4861 (iii).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 224 (i).
Vaulvagnas, Pet. *re* Post Office (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service (Ans.) 896 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence of Postmaster (remarks) 888 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 890 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1328 (i).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4557 (iii).
Coboconk and Gull River Canal Construction, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 497 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2460 (ii).
Collingwood Ship Building Co., Sitting of Pub. Accounts Com. (objection) 3721 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4741, 4785, 4804, 4868 (iii).
Election Act, Amts. *re* Corruption and Frauds, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6824, 6836 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7035 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2242 (ii).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) *719 (i).
——— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4445; on M. for 3°, 4794; (amt.) 4798; neg. (Y. 22, N. 48) 4800; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4802 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co., Use of G.T.P. Rolling Stock, Terms and Conditions (Ques.) 5656 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts., 5114 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7344, 7395 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Inquiry for further Information, 7186 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Cor. beween Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 3899 (ii).
——— on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).
Insurance Commission Rep., (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6913, Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 92) 6931 (iv).
——— French Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1485 (i), 2913 (ii).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7910 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 61) 1° m., 1380 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts, and Extra-Judicial Work, Cor. (M. for copies*) 1978 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3461 (ii).
Kelly, John, Compensation for Slaughter of Animal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Senate Amts., 5205 (iii), 6205 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7841 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7203, 7217, 7253 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7067 (iv).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7311, 7483 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 7212 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 5779 (iii).
——— Inquiry *re*, 7780 (iv).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. to English Press *re* Immigration to S. Africa (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
——— Delay in Answering Question (Ques.) 5506 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Paper, 3728 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2958 (ii).
Private Bills, Precedence *re* (remarks) 7482 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7707; in Com. on Res., 7750 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock on (M.) *re* Sittings, 3841 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7245, 7960 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4970 (iii).
Queens and Shelburne Election Trial, Ref. to in debate, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Election Frauds, 6824 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2457 (ii).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) B. 6 on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Com., 3681 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7434 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 5175 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A,' Amt. (B. 148) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Simcoe County Judgeship, Par. in 'Northern Advance,' on Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4369 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4228 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3278, 3320, 3816, 3847 (ii), 4462, 4772; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5012, neg. (Y. 44; N. 104) 5014 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7815 (iv); (archives) 2960; (census) 2967 (ii); (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. Johns conduit) 7536 (iv); Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii); Trent (construction) 7667; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7532 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Aud. Gen.) 2765; Post Office (post office) 2770 (ii); (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5955 (iii), 7682 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6379 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7678 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton car shops) 7303 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Brunet, A., remuneration) 7539 (iv).
Scientific Institutions—Meteorological Service (Found, A. W., allowance, &c.) 7684; (surveys) 7684 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (inspections) 6626 (iv).
Tariff—(beeswax) in Com., 1332 (i); (clover seeds, &c.) in Com., 4145 (iii).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1931 (i).
——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii).
See 'Coboconk.'
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5020 (iii).
Yukon, Charges *re* Administration of Hon. Mr. McInnes (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*
G.T.P., Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of (Ques.) 4855 (iii).

Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*
Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Par. in London "Free Press", (remarks) 6258 (iv).
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington (remarks) 2751 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2772 (ii).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*
Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 5504 (iii).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
British Preference, &c. (reply) 4352 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) *re* debate, 467 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1495 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Minister of Rys., 5237 (iii).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2610 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3080; in Com., 3353, 3823, 3848 (ii), 3981, 3998; on M. for 3°, 5005 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2774 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference, applicable to Goods shipped direct to Canadian Ports, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4276, (amt.) 4291 (iii).
Tariff—(chains) in Com., 4276 (iii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Com., 1252 (i).
United Baptist Womens' Missionary Union (M.) to remit Fees, 5504 (iii).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2024 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6772 (iv).
I.C.Ry. Accidents, Deaths, Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3411 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish transportation) 5933; hatcheries) 5916; (herring nets) 5916 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Oak Point) 6077 (iv).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, Amts. in Com., 1029, 1201; Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1222 (i).
Tariff—Pulp Wood, in Com., 2067 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6610 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2028 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4064 (iii).
Civil Servants' Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1457 (i).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1760 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5118 (iii).
I.C.Ry., Accidents, Deaths, Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3404 (ii).
——— Employees Annuities System, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 1469 (i).
——— Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2911 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 916 (i).

Petawawa Military Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office B., 7022 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7022 (iv).

P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1083 (i).

P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3272 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3546 (ii).

Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3694, (amt.) 3695, 6 m.h., agreed to (Y. 80; N. 37) 3695 (ii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 98) 1° m., 3424 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2181 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3758 (ii).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3045; in Com., 3300 (ii).

SUPPLY—

High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv).

Legislation—H. of C. (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. *re*, Read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3938 (ii).

Tariff—Intermediate and German Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 869 (i).

——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2062 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1248 (i).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2333 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest bearing, Total Amount (Ques.) 3882 (ii).

Australia and Canadian Export Trade, Application *re* Subventions, &c. (Ques.) 4271 (iii).

Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6540 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, 6563 (iv).

Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2146 (ii).

Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 2147 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7797 (iv).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 83) 1° m., 1985 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 612 (i).

Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2276 (ii).

Exhibitions at Toronto and Sherbrooke, Dates *re* (remarks) 2589 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4275 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed)to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3527 (ii).

Halifax Naval Dockyards, Relinquishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (M. for copy*) 241 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7318, 7489 (iv).

Hudson Bay Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation (Ques.) 2574 (ii).

Immigration from Ont., Rep. of Mr. Southworth, 4667; (remarks) 4661 (iii).

Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c. (M. for ret.*) 249 (i).

I.C.R., Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign (Ques.) 3637 (ii).

Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2590 (ii).

Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7631 (iv).

Post Office Employees, Legislation *re* Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).

——— (remarks) 6519 (iv).

Private Bills on Order Paper (M.) to take precedence on Monday, 7919 (iv).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158,' 'Petawawa,' &c.

Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 803 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3890 (ii).

Statutes, Revised 'Schedule 'A' Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5884 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3076; in Com., 3282 (ii), 3981, 4503, 4775; on M. for 3°, 5003 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (clothing) 5740; (properties) 5738 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 5768 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 6986 (iv).

Tariff—Fur Skins, in Com., 2400 (ii).

——— Marble, in Com., 2123 (ii).

——— Melons, in Com., 1909 (i).

——— Vessels, &c., in Com., 2389 (ii).

Temiscaming and Northern Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Fort, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Reps. *re* Depth of Water (Ques.) 897 (i).
——— Life-Saving Stations, *re* Marine Disasters, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
——— Wrecks, Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 7 (i).
Toronto, Mails to the East, Cost of Carrying, &c. (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Repairs, Completion of (Ques.) 224 (i).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 2342 (ii).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1304 (i).
Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1350 (i).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenberg.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c. (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 1670 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Ques. of Order, Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accts. Com., 5846 (iii).
Election Frauds, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3532 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 608 (i).
——— Evidence and Papers of Sel. Com. (M.) to place on Table, 1985 (ii).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen, Notice of Discussion, 1379 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Audit of Books (Ques.) 3884 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7101 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Petite Riviere) 6057 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7101 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, The, 61 (i).
Budget Speech, and Deputations *re* Tariff (remarks) 238 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
C. P. Ry. Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4064 (iii).
Coal Strikes, &c., in the N. W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7146 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7310 (iv).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. B. 85 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 1°, 2068 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) Res. prop., 4864 (iii); in Com., 6786 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 1906 (i); in Com., 2229 (ii).
Federal Laws, Enforcement of : *See* 'Justice.'
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4274 (iii).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2729 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378, 7409 (iv).
Govt. Rys., Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re* (Ques.) 5780 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Bureau) on Order for 2°, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4442; on M. for 3°, 4844 (iii).
G. T. P. Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for copies, 1951 (i).
G. T. R. 2-cent a Mile Rate (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).
See 'Two-cent,' &c.
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2888 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7327 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, on Notice by Mr. Speaker, 2728 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Insurance Commission and Evidence, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3722 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4442 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*, on Notice of Motion (Mr. Bourassa) 5259 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 4091 (iii).
I. C. R. Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2909 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4865 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7453, 7500 (iv).
Jamaica Earthquake, Imperial Prestige, &c. (remarks) 1842 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Marconi Tel. Co., &c. (remarks) 1299 (i).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7224 (iv).
Northwestern Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com., 4008 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3387 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7211, 7484 (iv).
Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 66 on M. (Mr. Campbell) to wthdr., 3720 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication with Mainland (remarks) 3547 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1922 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, prop Res., on M. for Address to His Maj., 4862 (iii).
Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 163 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7312 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 2110, 2525 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2527 (ii).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. Bill (remarks) 222 (i).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. (B. 7) 1°, m., 2° m., 961 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraph cos.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 274; 2° m., 618 (i); (M.) for Com., 3674 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7412, 7422; (amt.) to 3°, 7435, Neg. (Y. 38; N. 80) 7435 (iv).
Railway Grievances (remarks) on M. for 3° of G. T. Ry. Bill, 4847 (iii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets, Change in Revised Statutes (remarks) 7309 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2188 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com., 3889 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1523 (i).
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A,' Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (eliminations, &c.) 6766 (iv).
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2769 (ii).
San Jose Scale, &c., Suppression of (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Scalping Ry. Tickets: *See* 'Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 7.'
Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S. (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i), in Com., 3279 (ii), 3996, 4479 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2771; (privy council) 2764 (ii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6462 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4031 (iii).
Supreme Court Judges, Sask. and Alberta Salaries B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7441 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (animals, &c.) 1254 (i); (automobiles) 2398 (ii); (beeswax) 1332 (i); (coal) 2397 (ii); dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1208; (farm products) 1257; (fruit) 1914; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (marble) 2124 (ii); (portable engines) 4418 (iii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1230; (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (spirits, &c.) 2106 (ii); (tomatoes) 1870; (vegetables) 1882 (i); (wool) 2373 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4319 (iii).
Telephone Cos. Expropriation by Provincial Authorities (Ques.) 3180 (ii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2300; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2330 (ii).
See 'G.T.R.'
Water Powers, of Dom., Public Ownership of, on M. (Mr. Monk) *re* Soulanges Canal Power, 250 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power, Amount contracted for, &c. by Cataract Power Co. (Ques.) 1923 (i).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6264 (iv).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Burrard, Westminster and Boundary Ry & Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 1794 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1726 (i).
C.P.R. and B.C. Electric Rys. Agreement (B. 52) 1°*, 1293 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 810, 822; in Com., 1313 (i).
Cigarettes, Sale of, &c., Prohibition of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 4088 (iii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*
Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1293(i) ; on Senate Amts., 4409 (iii).
Financial Situation—Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851 (iv).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 5258 (iii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2096 (ii).
G.T.Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4375 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1826 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 599 (i).
Prudential Savings Society, (B. 80) 1°*, 1923 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (C.P.R. Nicola branch) in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3737 (ii).
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s (B. 131) M. for 2°, 5258 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (protection service) 5906, 5963 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 4042 ; Ontario (Toronto drill hall) 4034 (iii).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Yukon Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. Leighton Goldie, *North Simcoe.*
Collingwood Ship Building Co. and Pub. Accounts Com., on Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Green, Hunt, McMurrich, Messrs., Patent Relief (B. 155) 1°*, 6135 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5487 (iii).
Macpherson, Arthur Leon, Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 6256 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 598 (i).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1921 (i).
Private Bills Pets., (M.) to receive, 1981 ; 2063 (ii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 4838 (iii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 987 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2203 ; (M.) to adjn. debate, 2204, agreed to (Y. 78 ; N. 48) 2204 (ii).
Simcoe, County Judgeship, Par. in "Northern Advance" (personal explanation) 4368 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 18) 1°m., 657 (i); 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com. on Masters and Mates Bill, 4838 (iii).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Ques. of Order, 6143 (iv).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps. &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. Ward) 1932 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par. in Toronto "Globe" (remarks) 4839 (iii).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1264 (i).
Wharfs and Docks in Ont. Govt Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
B.C. Railway Belt., Sales or Leases of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1149 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s System, Land Grants, Subsidies, &c. O.Cs., &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C. (Ques.) 1056 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade (read) 6908 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4700; in Com., 4739, 4901 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c., Applications for Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 1810 (i).
Grazing Lands in Sask., Applications for Leases, 1905 (M. for copies*) 1978 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigations *re* Conservations of Water Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 4453 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1820 (i).
North Western Trusts & Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 31) 1°*, 803 (i); in Com., 4008 (iii).
S. A. Veterans' Land Grants Bill (remarks) 7311 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2491, Neg. (Y. 53, N. 86) 2725 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3300, 3308, 3807 (ii), 3992 (iii).
SUPPLY—
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835 (iv).
Tariff—Wool, in Com., 2369 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1125 (i).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7639, 7660 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1293 (i); in Com., 2453 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4412 (iii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4112 (iii).

McCraney, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7175 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4788, 4818, 4914 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner, Method of Extinguishing Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4457 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number and Name of Commissioner (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3570 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1555 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); on M. to rep. for 3° (amt.) 3172 (ii).
Railway Blockade in N. W., Delays of Mals, &c. (letters read) 6521 (iv).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1555 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 11) 1°*, 515 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4227 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5084 (iii); in Com., 6585 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2420; in Com., 2463 (ii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3650 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7350 (iv).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2597 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7206 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649 (i).
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1293 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Tariff, Flax-seed, Ques. of Order, 1348 (i).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1364 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*
Athabaska Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 4045 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) in Com., 7911 (iv).
Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 782 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4816, 4875 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6187 (iv).
Letter Carrier Service, N. W. T., Extension to Calgary and Edmonton (Ques.) 615 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 803; 2° m., 1045 (i); in Com., 2110; (M.) for Com., 2525; (M.) to report for 3°, 3172 (ii).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s Transactions, on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2551 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2424 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5164 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5897 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6756 (iv).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1280 (i).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1365 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Canals Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 567 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1619 (i), 2035 (ii).
Civil Servants Employees at Ottawa, Total Amount of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2140; 2289, 2634 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii)
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2431 (ii).
"Fielding" Dredge, Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c. (Ques.) 1798 (i).
G.T.P. Steel Rails, Tenders for &c. (Ques.) 7006 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 614 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2946 (ii).
I.C.R., Pictou Station, Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4857 (iii).
——— Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii).
Lakeville P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location, &c. (Ques.) 7250 (iv).
North Lake P.O., P.E.I., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 7249 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 6905 (iv).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1613 (i).
Point Prim, P.E.I. Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 5023 (iii).
Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, P.E.I. Inauguration of (Ques.) 3425 (ii).
P.E.I., Claims *re* Additional Subsidy, Delegates' Memo *re* (Ques.) 1800 (i).
——— Claims for Refund *re* Hay Shipment (Ques.) 4854 (iii).
——— Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
——— Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3547 (ii).
——— Telegraph Service, Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
——— Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3231 (ii).
——— Winter Communication, Inefficient Service (remarks) 4941 (iii).
Private Bills, Rule Respecting Fines, &c. (Ques.) 717 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5385; (amt.) 5395 (iii).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7717; in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, and Quebec Resolutions, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Inquiry for Cor., 5086 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2190 (ii).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Name, &c. (Ques.) 571 (i).
S.A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants (Ques.) 7542 (iv).
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age of, Loss of Registered Letter, &c. (Ques.) 7250 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post office) 2811 (ii).
Fisheries (fish curing) 5924; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913; (oyster culture) 5909; (protection service) 5905, 5963 (iii).
Geological Survey (boring for gas, &c.) 3159; (maps, &c.) 3163 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6750 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 5875 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 7122 (iv).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (life-saving stations) 5770 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3610 (ii); (experimental farms) 4044 (iii); (furniture, &c.) 3602 (ii); (picture frames) 3971; (Sussex St., property) 3958 (ii).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (plant) 7000 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 6071; (Summerside) 6072 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7524 (iv).
Ventilation in Chamber, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done (Ques.) 2979 (ii).
Wallace Quarries, Cumberland Co., N.S., Branch Ry., Govt Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 2582 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Port Hawkesbury Ry. Station, Papers and Cor. with Ry. Dept. *re* (M. for copies*) 3373 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2800 (ii).
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5902; (herring nets) 5919 (iii).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5881 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 3154; (Yukon mail service) 3158 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Grand Etang) 6038; (Inverness Mines) 6044; (Mabou) 6050; (Marble Mountain wharf) 6051; (Port Hastings) 6060 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Co.'s incorp. (B. 126) 1°*, 4928 (iii).
See Speaker, Mr. Dep.'

Marshall, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809 (i); in Com., 1306, 1638 (i), 2015 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2448 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6785 (iv).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6779 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies, &c. (Ques.) 2979 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Sunday School Papers (Ques.) 5023 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7087 (iv).

Marshall, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Port Bruce Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 4666 (iii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
Port Stanley and Port Burwell, Port Bruce Harbours, Expenditure *re*, Inquiry for Ret., 3277 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7029 (iv).
Slate Quarries, Location, Quantity imported, &c. (Ques.) 1053 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6747 (iv).
Justice, Administration of Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7970 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7820 (iv); Ottawa (maintenance) 4604 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6019 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Bruce) 6979; (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6254 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (fruit) 1917; (horses, &c.) 2414 (ii); (pease) 1362; (pickles) 1886; (tomatoes) 1880 (vegetables) 1884 (i).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Agriculture Deptl. Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
Barrel, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c. Rep. *re* (Ques.) 484 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1622 (i), 2038 (ii).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination of, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount contributed (Ques.) 1393 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i); on M. for 2°, 2437 (ii).
Experimental Station in P.E.I., Location, &c. (Ques.) 1391 (i).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Privileges *re* Laying of Water Pipes, &c. (Ques.) 2575 (ii).
House of Commons, Members' Accommodation (remarks) in Conc., 7987 (iv).
Immigration, Promotion *re* Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 716 (i).
I.C.R. Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1487 (i); in Com., 2943 (ii).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 913 (i).
——— Number, &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).
McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid East Post Office, Apptmnt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Amount for Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3189 (ii).
North Rustico Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, (Ques.) 475 (i).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1559 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep., &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies) 726 (i).
Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Paper (Ques.) 572 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* P .E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Freight Service, Accumulation of (remarks) 1078, 1089 (i).
P. E. I. Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 717 (i).
P. E. I. Fruit Inspector, Applications *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Kitchen, Mr. W., Payments to (Ques.) 7984 (iv).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re* (Ques.) 1382 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Bridge Branches, Expropriation of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).
——— Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Telegraph Communication, Complaints *re* (remarks) 1297 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. ,Tels., &c. (M. for copies) 3189 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Res. of Board of Trade, Tunnel, &c. (Ques.) 716 (i).
——— Contract *re* Carrying Mails, &c. (Ques.) 947 (i).
——— Ice-bound Steamers (remarks) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service, &c. (remarks) 4929 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers (Ques.) 3186 (ii).
——— Terms of Union *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr Lefurgey) 5344, 5352; (amt.) 5358 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7764 (iv).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7948 (iv).
Representation in H. of C., Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J Hughes) 2153 (ii)
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2773, 2816 (ii).
Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 7524; (Murray Harbour branch) 7526 (iv).
Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1256 (i).
——— Whale Oil Soaps, in Com., 2117 (ii).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N. S., Treatment, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).

Martin, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members *re* Investment Moneys, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6399 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7843 (iv).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4065 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2819 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (farm products) 1286 (i); (gypsum) 2123 (ii); (Indian corn) 1366 (i); (marble) 2126 (ii); (oatmeal) 1373 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*
Campbell, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Michaud, Mr. P., *Victoria, B.C.*
Allegash River, Diversion of Water (Ques.) 6635 (iv).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*
Budget, The, 425 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2009 (ii).
Central Canada Manufacturers Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4409 (iii).
Civil Servants Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture, &c., Legislation *re* (prop. res.) 1956 (i).
Desks, Furniture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4900 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation, &c. (remarks) 3115 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5494 (iii).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7467 (iv).
National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp., B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5796 (iii).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1669 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3834 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2809 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (fittings, &c.) 3598 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4322 (iii).
——— Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2046 (ii).
——— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1210; Amts. (cream separators) 1196 (i).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1256, 1267 (i).
——— Fire Brick, in Com., 4190 (iii).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1369 (i).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5285 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Beauharnois Canal Water Power, O.C. *re* Alienation of (inquiry for) 1473 (i).
——— Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports, &c. (Ques.) 1047 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 812 (i); in Com., 2002 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4066; (amt.) 4083 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 4088 (iii).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell, &c. (Ques.) 488 (i).
Colonial Conference, Canadian Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
——— Offer from Imp. Govt. *re* Preferential Tariff (Ques.) 893 (i).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c. (Ques.) 2634 (ii). *See* 'Tariff' &c.
Contracts in Ottawa, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6107 (iv).
Co-operative and Industrial Societies (B. 2) (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 945 (i).
See 'Industrial.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
"Favoured Nation" Treaties, Between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy. &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).
"Galveston" Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transference, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Glass imported from G.B., Increase in, &c. 1048 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Location of Line between Quebec and Lake Pohenegamook, Rep., Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant (Ques.) 5288 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amts. expended, &c. (Ques.) 894 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6213 (iv).
Industrial and Co-Operative Societies (B. 2) 1°m., 89; 2°m., 582 (i).
——— (remarks) 7308 (iv).
See Co-operative.'
Inland Revenue, Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c. employed by Govt. (Ques.) 916 (i).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4137 (iii).
Lamontagne and "Le Soleil" Cos., Amounts paid for 1906-7 (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Leather Goods Shipments to U.S., Increase in, &c. (Ques.) 1048 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman as per Statute 6 Edward VII., &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Purchase of Site, Rep. in Press (remarks) 2228 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c. (M. for ret.) 503 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Refusal of Mr. Beddoe to give Evidence, Notice of Motion, 5502 (iii).
——— Amt., 5782, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 99) 5857 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims, Amounts paid by Govt., Cor. *re* (M. for ret.) 1038 (i).
Pilots, of Montreal, Investigation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route (Ques.) 3885 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to (Ques.) 5779 (iii).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4975 (iii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1525 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service &c. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging at Cap à la Roche, &c. (Ques.) 575 (i).
——— Widening of Channel at Cap. Charles, Pet. from Pilots, and Grounding of SS. Victorian (Ques.) 573 (i).
Sea-Weed Industry at Isle Verte, Collection of Tax *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Seven Islands Bay Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4451 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3062; in Com., 3287 3342, 3859 (ii), 3991 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4036; (Edmonton) 4037 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 4042; (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4035 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brockville) 4020; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027; (Simcoe) 4028; (Toronto customs) 4030; (Toronto drill hall) 4032; (Toronto postal station 'F') 4035 (iii).
Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (steel shelves) 4024; (Sussex St. property) 3952 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. arsenal) 4012; (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (immigration) 4009; (immigrant buildings) 4011; (Lachute) 4010; (Montreal barracks) 4010; (Nicolet) 4011; (Quebec East, building) 4012; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015; (trachoma hospital) 4011 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4040; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a L'Ilot) 6083; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6096; (Grand Mechins) 6107; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6112; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6114; (Lotbinière, &c.) 6114; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Rivière Batiscan) 6122; (St. Maurice River) 6126; (Saguenay) 6125; (Sorel deep water) 6132 (iv).
Tariff—Inter-Imperial Preference, and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re* (Ques.) 892 (i).
Tariff, Intermediate, Application of Foreign Countries *re* (Ques.) 489 (i).
——— Intermediate and German Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 879 (i).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re* (Ques.) 891 (i).
Tariff: *See* 'Colonial.'
Tobacco Excise Duty, Changes in Regulations (remarks) 6140 (iv).
Transportation Commissioner's Report, Suggestions adopted by Govt (remark) in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, Transfers, &c. by Govt., Contracts, Cor. &c. (M. for copies) 241 (i).
Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. Johns Collectorship, &c. (Ques.) 3636 (ii).
Yukon Placer Mines owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations *re* (Ques.) 892 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c. on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7168 (iv).
Drummond Counties Ry., Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Route from Quebec Bridge East, &c. (M. for papers*) 1978 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).
——— Route from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost of Construction (Ques.) 3886 (ii).
——— Surveys, Quebec-Moncton Section, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 271 (i).
I.C.R., Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c. (Ques.) 5086 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1489 (i); in Com., 2948 (ii).
Mail Carriers, Salary Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv).
Sussex St. and Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
——— Properties, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 235 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6623 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3955 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829; (Grande Rivière de Beaupré) 6101; (St. François) 6130; (St. Johns) 6132; (St. Maurice River) 6127 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 7524 (iv).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Coal from Canadian Mines, Quantity transported in British and Foreign Vessels to the Port of Montreal (Ques.) 1388 (i).
Estimates, Protest against bringing down at close of Session, 7831 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7257 (iv).
G. T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt. (Ques.) 614 (i).
——— Subsidies granted to, &c. (Ques.) 950, 1064, 1130 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7324 (iv).

Northrup, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*
'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3633 (ii).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 6633 (iv).
See 'Smith,' &c.
Military Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5835 (iii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Ry. B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His. Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7708; on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7720; in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).
Returns, Delay in bringing down, *re* Public Accounts (remarks) 2762 (ii).
Ross Rifle Co., Amounts paid for Extras (Ques.) 4213 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Amounts paid to Sir Chas. Ross or Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 5025 (iii).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3770 (ii).
Smith, Lt.-Col., and Medals Board, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7248 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Sales of Lands, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4219; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4260 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).
Tariff (disinfectants) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2336 (ii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Agents and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
Algoma District, Indian Land Sales, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 6015 (iv).
Baxter Island No. 136, Sale of (Ans.) 2833 (ii).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6560 (iv).
Blood Indian Reserve, Opening for Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 1131 (i).
Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
B. C. Millls, Timber and Trading Co.'s Lands, Applications *re* Cancellation of Lease (Ans.) 2145 (ii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c. (Ans.) 6011 (iv).
C. P. R. Coal Lands, Selection of, Conditions *re* Sale of Coal to Public (Ans.) 3884 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Land Belt, B. C. (B. 102) 1° m., 3977; 2°* and in Com., 4655 (iii).
Coal Lands in Western Provinces, Control, &c., by Govt., *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 750 (i).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7158 (iv).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserves, Sale of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4856 (iii).
Dominion Lands Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 703 (i); 2° m., 4669; in Com., 4739, 4785, 4804, 4865 (iii).
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5864 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4615 (iii).
Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors (B. 59) 1° m., 1293 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 3091; in Com., 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys (B. 172) 1° m., 7308; in Com., 7437 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers (Ans.) 889 (i).
——— Dom. Land Grants to (Ans.) 5780 (iii).
Dugas Indian Reserve, Land Sales, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c. (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Garden River Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement (Ans.) 2830 (ii).
Govt. Lands in Sec. 14, Two. 14, &c. (Ans.) 1810 (i).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 950 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Coal Lands Pre-emption (Ans.) 6257 (iv).
——— Land Grant, B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. on Ways and Means, 2074 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent over due Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 1557 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3519 (ii).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c. (Ans.) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt of Twps. 32, 33 (Ans.) 485 (i).
Grazing Leases, Original Applicants, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 1062 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner, Method of Extinguishing Claims, &c. (Ans.) 4457 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number, Names of Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 4457 (iii).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 7541 (iv).
——— Additional Answer, 7701 (iv).
Hepburn, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1558 (i), 2294 (ii).
Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 234 (i).
Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter Section 2, &c., Entries, &c. (Ans.) 1924 (i).
Homestead Entries issued on Quarter Sections, 20, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 4851 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Section 24, Two. 21, &c., Extension *re* Residence, Patents, &c. (Ans.) 2141 (ii).
Homestead Entry of Township 51, Alberta, Application *re* (Ans.) 1137 (i).
Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference with Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Hudson's Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register A., Disappearace of (Ans.) 5287 (iii), 7541 (iv).
Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation of, on M. for Copy (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 143) 1° m., 5504; in Com., 5717 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Belgium, Names, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1805 (i).
Immigration Agents, Circular issued *re* Bonuses, &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 714 (i).
Immigration Agents in Germany, Number and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (ii).
Immigration Agents in Eastern Townships &c. (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Immigration Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).
Immigration Agents in Ont., Number and Names (Ans.) 713 (i).
Immigration Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., dismissal of (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
Immigrants' Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 4519 (iii).
Immigrants, Contract *re* Bonuses (remarks) 4615 (iii).
——— Number of Arrivals for 1906, Location, &c. (Ans.) 571 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigrants, Total Number since 1904, Distribution of (Ans.) 1053 (i).
Immigration to Canada, Total Number from 1901 to 1903, &c. (Ans.) 1382 (i).
Immigration to the Eastern Townships, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 1395 (i), 2580 (ii).
Immigration Employment Agents (Ans.) 4861 (iii).
Immigration from France to Canada, Propaganda *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1556 (i).
Immigration from Ont., Rep. of Mr. Southworth (remarks) 4668 (iii).
Immigration Policy of the Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6156 (iv).
——— Promotion *re* Mar. Provinces, &c. (Ans.) 716 (i).
Indian Boarding Schools, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4210 (iii).
——— Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ans.) 2582 (ii).
——— Average Salaries (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
Indian Lands, Algoma District, Sales and Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 3371 (ii).
Indian Lands sold or leased, Number of Acres, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 492 (i).
Indian Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
——— Total Acres sold, &c. (Ans.) 2835, 2980
Indian Timber Lands on Reserves, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Interior, Deptl. Employees in N.W., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1805 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 174, 658, 992 (i).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. (Ans.) 1806 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigation *re* Water Supplies (Ans.) 4453 (iii).
Just, C. F., Suspension and Reinstatement, &c. &c. (Ans.) 228; (explanation) 489 (i).
Kaien Island Title Papers, Ret. (remarks) 1699 (i), 3977 (iii).
King and H. E. Lyon, Papers *re*, laid on Table, 4839 (iii).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Lands: *See* Govt.', Dom.', 'Robbins,' 'Saskn.', 'Southern,' 'Homestead,' &c.
Leech, R. E., McLean, Mr., and Others, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2986 (ii).
Lees, Mr. W. A. D., Contract *re* Fencing (Ans.) 710 (i).
Little Beausoleil Island, Georgian Bay, Sale to Mr. Pratt, &c. (Ans.) 2833, 2984 (ii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1819 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
New Ottawa, Settlers not complying with Settlement Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1046 (i).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Purchase, &c. (Ans.) 2832 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Applications *re* Water Power, &c. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
——— Audit of Books (Ans.) 3885 (ii).
——— Claims and Amounts paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1071 (i).
——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv.)
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5788 (iii).
N. W. Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6747 (iv).
Patrick, J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Answer to Question, 576 (i).
Peace River District, B. C., Selection and Location of Lands (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 3728 (ii).
——— Rep. to English Papers *re* Immigration to S. Africa (Ans.) 2984 (ii).
——— Delay in answering Question (Ans.) 5506 (iii).
——— Evidence *re* Investigation into misconduct, &c., on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 578 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 2999 (ii).
Railway Fares to N. W., Rate to Immigrants from Quebec (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1058 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 4119 (iii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries (Ans.) 223 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application of C.P.R. for Lands (Ans.) 1138 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of (Ans.) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization (Ans.) 1060 (i).
——— Plans, Examination of (Ans.) 1137 (i).
——— Rep. of J. Stewart *re* Character of Land (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
St. Ann's Island Lease, Date and Terms, &c. (Ans.) 6017 (iv).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of, &c. (Ans.) 4855 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Salvation Army Immigrants, Circular Letters *re* (Ans.) 4454 (iii).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
——— Section 2 of Twp. 25 &c. (Ans.) 485 (i).
School Lands, Man., Exchange with Winnipeg Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 4610; in Com., 5701 (iii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c. (Ans.) 5287 (iii).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).
Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Six Nations Schools Reserve, Changes in Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 478 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4240 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2498 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—(Indian Affairs) 2957; (Interior) 2957 (ii).
Dom. Lands (gratuity to Mrs. Young) 6245; homestead inspectors) 6246; (outside service, salaries) 6244; (surveys) 7257; (timber protection) 7265 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Ont.) 6711; (agents, Que.) 6717; (bonuses) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278; (Just, Mr. C. F., salary) 6242; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (Babines) 7293; (Babine investigation) 7286; (industrial schools) 7291 (iv).
Indians—N.B. (seed grain) 7291 (iv).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).
Indians, Ont. and Que.—(agents) 7284; (Giant's Tomb) 7288; (Mississaguas's claims) 7292; (roads, &c.) 7288 (iv).
Indians—Que. (Oka settlement) 7291 (iv).
Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 7293 (iv).
Interior—Hydrographic Institutions (astronomical surveys) 7269 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275; (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).
N.W. Ter. Govt. (commissioner's salary) 7272; (litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (council grant) 7278; (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Surveys and Surveyors Bill: *See* "Dom. Lands".
Swamp Lands in Man., Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
——— Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1849 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 946 (i).
"Tagish Charlie", Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property (Ans.) 890 (i).
Timber Regulations, Number of Permits, &c. (Ans.) 7008 (iv).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
Water Reserve Lands in Lethbridge, Sale of, Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 4216 (iii).
Wire Fencing on Boundary between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
Yukon Mining Claims, Held by Canadian Cos., U.S. Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1561 (i).
——— Officials, Absence from Duties (Ans.) 887, 1063 (i).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5022; in Com., 5704 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7544, 7579 (iv).
Yukon Territory Ordinances Approval (prop. res.) 7542 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt. (B. 109) 1° m., 4440; 2° M., and in Com., 5016; in Com., 5674 (iii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson, Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheimers (Ans.) 3425 (ii).
Yukon Council, Audit Grant, (remarks) 6008 (iv).
Yukon, Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, (Ans.) 1136 (i).
——— Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c. (remarks) on M. to Ways and Means, 4527 (iii).
——— Liquor Permits granted by J. D. McGregor, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4212 (iii).
——— Mining Concessions, Cancellation *re* Failure of Conditions (Ans.) 889 (i).
——— Ordinances, Approval (prop. res.) 7408 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mines, Owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4212 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Address, The, 120 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7367 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7466 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilton Radial B."
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7434 (iv).
Tariff—(animals, &c.) in Com., 1255; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1214 (i).

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*
French Immigration of Clerical Orders (remarks) on M for Sup., 6379 (iv).

Paquet, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Grosse Isle Yacht, Tenders *re* Gasolene Engine (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Belgium, Number, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1805 (i).
I.C.R., Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Repatriation of French Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1058 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 3°, 4996 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6739 (iv).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1283 (i).

Pardee, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1794 (i); in Com., 4410 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5091 (iii).
International Paper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 73) 1°*, 1794 (i).
National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 803 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3875 (ii), 3978, 4461, 4514, 4776 (iii).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c. (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. Charles H., *Shefford.*
British American Insurance Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 4610 (iii).
Geo. E. Smith Lumber Co.'s Patent Relief B. 10) 1°*, 515 (i).
Insurance Report and Evidence, Printing of in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7001 (iv).
——— Amt. to 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Masonic Protective Association of Can. incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 803 (i).
Printing Committee, 3rd Rep., (M.) to conc., 7001 (iv).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6 (Ans.) 570 (i).
——— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6 (Ans.) 1554 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
Apples, Hay, Maple Sugar, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6 (Ans.) 2582 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 2069 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Export Trade, Applications *re* Subventions (Ans.) 4271 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4155 (iii).
Binder Twine Machinery, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6014 (iv).
Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4594 (iii).
Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6013 (iv).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports, &c. (Ans.) 1047 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Names of Countries admitted (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Coal brought to Montreal in British and Foreign Vessels, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1452 (i).
——— (Ans.) 1051 (i).
Coboconk and Gull River Canal, Construction of, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 495 (i).
Cordage Co., Amounts of Fines (Ans.) 4048 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 4862; in Com., 5511; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5581; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5640 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 6781; 1°*, 6790; 2° m., 7517 (iv).
Customs, Commissioner, Charges *re* Sending Official Papers out of Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5722 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4882 (iii).
Duties collected at Sydney, Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ans.) 1926 (i).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2282 (ii), 4637, 4649 (iii).
Emerson Customs Collector, &c. (Ans.) 1562
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906 (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie (Ans.) 483 (i).
Farm Wagons, Duty, &c., collected *re* Dumping Clause (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
Fish Transhipment on Western Coast, O.C. on Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
Foreign Goods and British Preference, German Surtax, &c. (remarks) *re* Par. in "Citizen", 4843 (iii).
Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, &c., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Ret., 492 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
German Export Trade during years 1900-6, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).
German Tariff, Cor. with J. B. Jackson, on Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 5864 (iii).
Glass imported from G.B., Increases in (Ans.) 1048 (i).
Goods imported free, Rebates, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 727 (i).
Grain exported from Can. and U. S. Ports, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Grain received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 570, 1046 (i).
Horses imported into Canada, Minimum Tariff (Ans.) 1055 (i).
Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports, Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).
Imports via Canadian Ports, Value of, in 1906 (Ans.) 5085 (iii).
Insurance Commission, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) and M. (Mr. Foster) that Words (Mr. Martin) be taken down, 6404 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7464 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
Iron Tubing (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Knitted Goods, Importations from Germany and G. B., Value, &c. (Ans.) 724 (i).
Leather Goods Shipments to U. S., Increase in (Ans.) 1048 (i).
McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).
Petroleum, Bounties on, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4052 (iii).
Pig Iron imported from U. S., Names of Entries (Ans.) 708 (i).
Port Stanley Customs Collections for 1900-6 (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Return ordered, on Inquiry for, 582 (i).
Ross Rifle Co., Contracts with Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Copies, 727 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U. S., &c. (Ans.) 2833 (ii).
Slate Quarries, Location, Quantity imported, &c. (Ans.) 1053 (i).
Spirits—Customs and Excise Duties in Can. and U. S. (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Standard Chemical Co., &c., Cor., &c., with Govt., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 725
——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 7520 (iv).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Stoves imported into Western Canada, Values, &c. (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Sugar above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Duty collected (Ans.) 1050 (i).
Sugar Duties, No. 16, Dutch Standard, Total Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1049 (i).
Sugar Importations, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— from Fiji Islands, Total Amount (Ans.) 4455 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Customs) 2765 (ii).
Customs (Bain, Mr., gratuity) 5977; (collectors salaries) 5975; (McDougald, Mr., gratuity) 5979; (new ports) 5973 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 3585; (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (animals, &c.) 1254 (i); (beet root sugar) 4423 (iii); (berries) 1899 (i); (brass, nickel, &c.) 4195; (britannia metal) 4204; (chains) 4265, 4266 (iii); (cheese) 1335 (i); (coal for smelting) 4435; (confectionery) 4182 (iii); (corks) 2136 (ii); (crucibles) 4191; (cutlery) 4431; (drawbacks) 4424 (iii); Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1208 (i); (glass, raw) 4436; (glassware) 4193; (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (glue, &c.) 2120 (ii); (horse powers) 4419 (iii); (intermediate tariff) 534 (i); (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (lime juice) 2044 (ii); (liquid fillers) 4186; (machinery from G. B., preferential duty) 4551; (malleable chains) 4391; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (matrices) 4395 (iii); (melons) 1909 (i); (military stores) 2411 (ii); (mining machinery) 4421 (iii); (nuts, &c.) 1919 (i); (oils) 4188 (iii); (paper bags) 2051 (ii); (pig iron) 4427; (portable engines) 4407, 4414 (iii); (printing paper) 2057 (ii); (rice, &c.) 1858 (i), 4143 (iii); (sago, &c., in Com., 1860 (i); (seeds, &c.) 4145 (iii); (spirits) 2108 (ii); (springs and axles) 4429; (steel bars) 4208; (steel wire) 4264; (sugar, 16 Dutch standard) 4150 (iii); (tea) 1360 (i); (tin plate) 4426 (iii); (tomatoes) 1872 (i); (unenumerated items) 2412 (ii); (U. S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1200 (i); (wire cables) 4422 (iii).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4338 (iii).
——— Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 528 (i).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
Timber and Lumber imported into Canada free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 570 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2824 (ii).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution of (remarks) 6 (i).
——— Misprint, &c. (remarks) 278 (i).
——— (statement) 424 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Wilson, Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6014 (iv).
Wood, Dr. H. W., St. John's Customs Collector, Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3636 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantity exported, Rebates, &c. (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2040 (ii).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, Legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1973 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4707; in Com., 4742 (iii).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c. (Ques.) 2574 (ii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land (Ques.) 2337 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906 (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
Lachute Public Building, Delay *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190 (iv).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps, &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Paper Combine, in Com. on Tariff, 2052 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B., 7028 (iv).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2836 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7235 (iv).
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1125 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3866 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2811 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6030 (iv).
Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue (Ques.) 2830 (ii).
Tariff—Agricultural Products, in Com., 1358 (i).
——— Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2045 (ii).
——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2052 (ii).
——— Wines, in Com., 2049 (ii).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Belleville Drill Hall, Progress of, &c. (Ques.) 1397 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Contract, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
——— Revetment Wall, Govt. Aid *re* Construction (Ques.) 2632 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Civil Service Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 2837 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1989 (ii).
Brass, Rolled, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4554 (iii).
Brighton Postmaster, Apptmnt., &c. (Ques.) 3426 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1616 (i), 2012 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2426 (ii).
G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2098 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 84) 1° m., 1985 (i).
Insurance Commission, Cor. with Min. of Justice, and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3906 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Report, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution of (remarks) 2906, 2997 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4134 (iii).
Magazines, Tariff Rates (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Milk Inspection: *See* 'Inspection and Sale Act.'
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3390 (ii).
Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 2636 (ii).
Post Offices in Cities, Civil Service Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditures, for 1904-6, Amount paid to J. Hurley (Ques.) 3426 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3185 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3982 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6424 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (brass &c.) in Com., 4201; (brass, nickel, &c.) 4194 (iii); (magazines) 2050 (ii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5715 (iii).

Power, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7964 (iv).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1751 (i).
I.C.R. Employees' Pension B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1493 (i).
Old Age Pensions (prop. res.) 3374 (ii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2361 (ii).

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55), 1°*, 1293 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Binder Twine Machinery, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1115 (i).
Canada and Japan Treaty B. 23 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 1550 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on Sen. Amts., 6773 (iv).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c. (Ques.) 486 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5847 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4748 (iii).
Estimates, Protest against Delay in bringing down, 7831 (iv).
'Golspie,' Str., Wreck of (remarks) 1106 (i).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c. (M. for ret.) 727 (i).
G.T.P., Route from Quebec Bridge, Contract &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7359 (iv).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6775 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Minister of Rys., 5242 (iii).
'Kestrel' Str., Supplies purchased, Cor., &c. with agents, &c., (M. for copies*) 1470 (i).
McIlwraith, Mr., Charge *re* Halifax Newspaper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Marriages (minor) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7850 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificate Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 607 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7570 (iv).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
'Neptune' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid (Ques.) 3637 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) 7781 (iv).
Prescott Wharf, Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., *re* B.N.A. Act on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7780 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in bringing down papers (remarks) 3460 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 582 (i).
——— Inquiry for *re* Public Accounts Com., 3089 (ii).
Ross Rifle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals, Chambly (St. John harbour improvements) 5549 (iii).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5553 (iii); (gate lifter) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Galops (construction) 7530; (entrance) 7530; (Gilbert contract) 7531; (retaining walls) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (tug-boat) 7669 (iv).
Canals—Trent (McLaren's Creek) 7669 (iv)
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531 (iv).
Dom. Lands (gratuity to Mr. Young) 6245; (homestead inspectors) 6247; (outside service salaries) 6244 (iv).
Fisheries (oyster culture) 5911 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Ont.) 6715 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5865 (iii).
Marine, Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5773 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5748 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Brunet, Mr. A., remuneration) 7669 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (patrol vessels) 5772; (wrecking plant) 5771 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. rooms) 7820, 7821 (iv); (Sussex St. property) 3967 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (wharfs) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Great Salmon) 7824; (St. Andrew's) 6081 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Poirierville pier) 6057; (Port Hastings) 6061; (Port Hood) 6063; (Round Hill) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6936; (Goderich) 6953; (Little Current) 6957; (Port Stanley) 6972 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside) 6072 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Baie St. Paul) 6093; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6096; (Chicoutimi) 6096; (Cross Point)

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. —*Con.*

6096; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Escoumains pier) 6098; (Lake St. John wharfs) 6110; (Magdalen Island) 6114; (Murray Bay) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Rivière à la Pipe) 6121; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (St. François) 6131; (St. Maurice) 6128; (Saguenay) 6125; (Sorel deep water) 6132 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 7521; (Indiantown branch) 7663; (St. John) 7663 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 7524 (iv).

Railways—Railway Commission (maintenance) 7534 (iv).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (berries) 1897; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1229 (i); (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1864 (i); (structural steel) 4208; (sugar) in Com., 4178 (iii).

Transportation Committee's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennet) 1597 (i).

——— Suggestions &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6091 (iv).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2326 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).

Robitaille, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 823 (i).

Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6227 (iv).

Militia Officers and Provisional Courses Allowance, (M. for ret.) 1072 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness of Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 511 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5855 (iii).

Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3392 (ii).

Order, Ques. of *re* Motion, 2588 (ii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7939; in Com., 7959 (iv).

Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton, &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).

Quebec Harbour Improvements *re* Ry. Terminals, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).

Spirits in Bond, Two-year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application of Consolidated Revenue Act of 1883, Cor. &c. (M. for copy*) 802 (i).

Standard Chemical Co., O.Cs., Cor., &c. with Govt. (M. for copies) 725 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7519 (iv).

Robitaille, Mr. L.—*Con.*

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).

Tariff—Pickles, &c., in Com., 1886 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6 (Ques.) 569 (i).

Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 1558 (i).

Brandon Post Office, Names of Employees, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2838 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c. (Ques.) 6010 (iv).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 766 (i).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5599 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4713; in Com., 4740, 4789, 4815, 4871 (iii).

Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3098 (ii).

Emmerson Customs Collector, &c. (Ques.) 1562 (i).

G.T.P., Tax Exemption in N.W.Provs., Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1611 (i).

Homestead Inspectors, &c., Instructions *re* Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation by Govt., Cor. between Five Corporations, &c (M. for copies*) 1119 (i).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation (M. for copies*) 1068 (i).

I.C.R., Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2383 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg Fishing, Restrictions, Cor. *re* with Board of Trade, Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 1067 (i).

Lees, W. A. D., Contracts, Agreements, Cor., &c. *re* Fencing Contracts (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).

——— (Ques.) 710 (i).

Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1834 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2295 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* (Ques.) 4857 (iii).

Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson (Ques.) 4858 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5703 (iii).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries (Ques.) 223 (i).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Deeds *re* Hudson Bay Estate in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 5505

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Southern Alberta Land Co., and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2509 (ii).

Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2970 (ii).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2795 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6243; (outside service, salaries) 6244 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 5891 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Mossy Point) 6995 (iv); (St. Andrew's rapids) 6001 (iii); (Sandy Point) 6995 (iv).

Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1258 (i).

Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and C.P.Rys B. No. 127 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 5512; in Com., 5522; on M. for 3°, 5670 (iii).

Yukon-Dawson Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re* for 1901-6 (Ques.) 1562 (i).

Yukon Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1135 (i).

Yukon, Mining Claims held by Canadian Cos. and by U.S. Cos., &c. (Ques.) 1560 (i).

Yukon Mining Concessions, Cancellation of *re* Failure to comply with Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 889 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Mail Service Distances, &c. (remarks) 7186 (iv).

Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4585 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1724 (i).

Canadian Sealers imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1382 (i).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1624 (i).

Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. House, 7173 (iv).

Election Frauds (personal explanation) 7095 (iv).

"Empress of Britain," Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c., (Ques.) 950 (i).

French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6872 (iv).

Government Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup. 6692 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement, (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6468 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Rep., in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7211 (iv).

Personal Explanation *re* Correction in Hansard, 6544 (iv).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5364 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3733 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (fish curing) 5932 (iii).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5882 (iii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6468 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6032; (Porter's Lake) 6058 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. &c. *re* read, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3931 (ii).

Tariff—Boots and Shoes, &c., in Com., 4585 (iii).

Tariff on British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4312 (iii).

Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

B. C. Appellate Court, Representation from Provincial Govt. (remarks) 4945 (iii).

Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition, Ques. of Order, 4088 (iii).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 786 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7135, 7144 (iv).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1293 (i).

Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7030 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4444 (iii).

Great Northern Ry., and Mr. J. J. Hill, Insinuations *re*, Rep. in 'Journal' (personal explanation) 3457 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7319 (iv).

Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. of Sup., 5426 (iii).

——— Charges against h. m. *re* J. J. Hill's Rys., Ques. of Order, 5492 (iii).

Land Cos. in N. W., Scandals, &c., Charges *re* Conservative M.P.'s (remarks) 3314 (ii).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7196, 7221 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 1147 (i).

Private Bills Com. (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse., 7246 (iv).

Railway Committee, Voting, &c. (personal explanation) 4388 (iii).

Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Dom. Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) Ques. of Order, 741 (i).

Ross, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4255 (iii).
S. A. War and B. C. Soldiers, Names of, Nurses, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3373 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3292 (ii), 3993, 4463, 4782 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (fumigating stations) 2976 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Jersey cove) 6050 (iv).
Tobacco Duty, Change in Excise Regulations (remarks) 6142 (iv).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 58) 1°*, 1293 (i).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5562; (amt.) 5573, Neg. (Y. 22, N. 56) 5627 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4813, 4878 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii).
Man. Franchise Act, Fraud *re* Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7934 (iv).
Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition (Ques.) 2982 (ii).
Pelican Lake Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Postal Parcel System, Protests against Extension in Man. (Ques.) 2829 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 3146 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 7823 (iv).
Swamp Lands near Lake Manitoba, Leasing of, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1564 (i).
——— Lease to Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1846 (i).
——— Leases to Sporting Club, &c. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1222 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 1120 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1950 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4377 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7632 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Conmee) 7937 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7948 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rainy River) 5999; Que. (St. Mary's current) 6002 (iii).
Tariff—Glass, Raw, in Com., 4436 (iii).
——— Wood Veneers, in Com., 2404 (ii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4107 (iii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5150 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 683 (i); on M. for 2°, 2425 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*
Provincial Boundaries Extension, &c., Cor., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Territorial Boundaries, O. C. *re*, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1783
Canned Foods Inspection B. 32 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2032 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2468 (ii).
Customs Duties collected at Sydney, Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 1926 (i).
Fish Scrap Reduction Works, Rep. *re* Experiments (M. for copy*) 802 (i).
Govt. Dredging during 1901-6, Names of Ports, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2584 (ii).
I.C.R. Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue *re* (Ques.) 4850 (iii).
"Lena M.", Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3189 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour (Ques.) 4217 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 600 (i).
Modus Vivendi Licenses and Fines of U.S. Vessels, Total Amount collected (Ques.) 1049 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish transportation) 5939; (herring nets) 5918 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6734 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous, (maps, &c.) 7276 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction &c.) 5870; (Marconi stations) 5876 (iii).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6032; (Half Island Cape) 6042; (Middle Country) 6051 (iv).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1699 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. &c. (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809; in Com., 1300, 1643, (i), 2011 (ii).

Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years past (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).

Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5122, 5123 (iii).

Cold Storage *re* Trans-Atlantic SS. Regulations *re* (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 687 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 2445; in Com., 2461 (ii).

Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4631; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4967 (iii).

Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, Quantity, &c. (M. for ret.) 492 (i).

Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 1092 (i).

G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2883 (ii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 604 (i).

Revised Statutes, Distribution to Members (Ques.) 481 (i).

San Jose Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).

Steamship Contracts, Transatlantic, Bonuses paid in 1906 (M. for copies) 491 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (alterations) 3609; (furniture, &c.) 3597; (Royal mint) 3604; (Sussex St. property) 3622, 3956 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means(apples) 1892; (berries) 1894 (i); (brass, &c.) 4203 (iii); Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1003; (farm products) 1269; (florist stock) 1869; (fruit, &c.) 1908; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (marble) 4192 (iii); (melons) 1910; (rye) 1859 (i); (sugar) 4156 (iii); (tomatoes) 1875; (vegetables) in Com., 1881 (i).

Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships, Names, Dates of Sailing, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).

Vaulvagnas Beach, Pet. *re* Post Office (Ques.) 1066 (i).

Smith, Mr. Geo., *North Oxford.*

Grand Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4310 (iii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson (Ques.) 480 (i).

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 789 (i).

Coal Strikes, &c. in the N. W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7139, 7147 (iv).

——— Terms of Settlements, &c. (Ques.) 616 (i).

Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa "Citizen" (Ques.) 888 (i).

Esquimalt Station, Establishment of School of Instruction (Ques.) 3370 (ii).

Experimental Farm, Labourers' Wages, Working Hours, &c. (Ques.) 2576 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Coal Lands, Pre-emption, &c. (Ques.) 6256 (iv).

——— Land Grants in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2100 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 158) 1°*, 6377 (iv).

Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 234 (i).

Immigration, Fraudulent Representations in G.B., Cor. with W. L. Mackenzie-King *re* (M. for copies*) 3373 (ii).

Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1174 (i); (Amt.) agreed to (Y. 78; N. 40) 3697 (ii).

Life Saving Station on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 479 (i).

Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Mr. McBride, &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).

See 'Vancouver,' &c.

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7226 (iv).

Provincial Premiers' Conference, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 486 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Circulars *re* (Ques.) 4453 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3285, 3848 (ii), 3979, 3991; on M. for 3°, 4997 (iii).

Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 579 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5682, 5714 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *North Essex.*
Bills, Royal Assent: (Mess. from His Ex., 2315 (ii); 5176, 5185 (iii); 6518 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Blairmore Town Site, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonell) 6563 (iv).
B.C. Judgeship, Statement of Sale of, Members' remarks checked (ruling) 580 (i).
Canned Foods B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6773 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain), on Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 4085 (iii).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control by Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Stockton) *re* Amt. (Mr. Knowles)—(ruling) 773 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Members remarks checked, 7543 (iv).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith), and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5123; Ruling read (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5123 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., (remarks) *re* interruptions, 682 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (ruling) 520, 523 (i).
Collingwood Ship Building Co., and Sittings of Pub. Accounts Com., on Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep (remarks) 2287 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. Bill (Mr. Gervais) on M. to introduce, 1608 (i).
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7977 (iv).
Electoral Districts, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notification) 2 (i).
Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).
Elections Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).
French Hansard, Members remarks checked, 582 (i).
Fuel Famine in N.W., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows), 2826 (ii).
Govt. Officials, &c. and Political Interference, Members' Remarks checked, 6664 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 82 on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 4800 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Payments *re* Construction, Members' Remarks checked, 5088 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, Ques. of Order, 4376 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Announcement &c. (remarks) 581 (i).
——— (announcement) 7246 (iv).
——— Legality as to Form (remarks) 7 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, Letter (read) 2 (i).
——— Rep. of Committee *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4762 (iii).
——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ (notification) 3276 (ii).
See "London", &c.
Insurance Commission and Charges against Cabinet Ministers, Ques. of Order, *re* Ref. to previous debate, 5400 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) and Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) Ruling, 5426 (iii).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Ross' Connection with J. J. Hill Rys. (ruling) 5493 (ii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa), Ques. of Order, 5657, (ruling) 5665, agreed to (Y. 104; N. 37) 5665 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Cor. *re*, Members' Remarks checked, 2345 (ii).
I.C.R., Accidents and Compensation, Notice of Motion *re* (remarks) 1077 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 219 (i).
Jamaica Disaster, Members' Remarks checked, 1613 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1879 (i).
Labour Disputes Bills, Members' Remarks checked, 1299 (i).
L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5022 (iii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 5 (i).
Life Saving Stations, &c., Minister's Remarks checked, 993 (i).
London Electoral District, Issue of Writ (notification) 2943 (ii).
——— Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman (remarks) 2 (i), 7186 (iv).
See "Hyman, Hon. C. S.," &c.
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Senate Amts., 5205 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman (remarks) 5860 (iii).
Meeting of House at later hour (remarks) 5808 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, 1907-8 (read) 278 (i).
——— Reply to Address (read) 1044 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2294 (ii), 7837 (iv).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1907 (presented) 5643
Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates (1908) (read) 7213 (iv).
Nicolet Electoral District, Notice of Certificate, 1380 (i).
——— Vacancy (notification) 515 (i).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (ruling) 6912 (iv).
Opening of Parliament: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
——— Ques. of *re* Remarks (Mr. Ward) on 'Globe' Reports, 3278 (ii).
Port Arthur Development Co.'s B. 154 (Mr. Conmee) on Protest (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Haggart)—(ruling) 7899 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7901; (ruling) 7922 (iv).
Postal Rates, Reduction, &c. (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 3728 (ii).
P.E.I., Winter Communication (ruling) *re* Discussion, &c., 703 (i).
——— Members' remarks checked, 4370, 4841 (iii).
——— Freight Service, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1078 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) Ques. of Order *re* Seconder, 3198; (ruling) 3206 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Expiration of Time for Receiving, 1981 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. German) for Precedence, 7482 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive (ruling) 2068 (ii).
——— Precedence, &c. (ruling) 7483 (iv).
Private Bills from Senate, on M. (Mr. Talbot)) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) Charges *re* Members, &c. (remarks) 3429 (ii).
Prorogation, Comn. from Gov. Gen. Sec.'s (read) 7983 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) Ruling, 5358 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) Ruling, 5379 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule)—(ruling) 7709 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, (ruling) 7778 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock, on M. *re* Sittings, 3841 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. Rep., on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6765 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) h. m. asked to wthdw. statement *re* 'dirty work,' 7942 (iv).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Queens and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges (presented) 1 (i).
Ques. of Order (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Debate on Address, Reading from Documents (ruling) 153 (i).
Railway Grievances (Mr. Maclean) Members' Remarks checked, 4849 (iii).
Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5083 (iii).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., on prop Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) Ruling *re* Ques. of Order, 741 (i).
St. Mary's Electoral Div., Certificate of (notification) 468 (i).
Speech from Throne (read) 3 (i).
SUPPLY—
Legislation—H. of C. (clerkships) 7972; (debates, salaries) 7977 (iv).
Three Rivers Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 4044 (iii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 3101 (ii).
Transportation Commission, Reading of Letter by Min. (ruling) 3713 (ii).
Trent Canal, Outlet, &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) to adjn., 3627 (ii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts (notification) 2977 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5673 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent (message) 2743 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. (ruling) *re* Discussion, 2008 (ii).
Cold Storage Systems, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ruling of Mr. Speaker (read) 5123 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5846 (iii).
Digby Pier Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 6028 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation (notification) 2728 (ii).
Insurance Commission on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) and Reply (Mr. Fowler) 6400 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to take down words (Mr. M. Martin)—(ruling) 6404 (iv).
——— Rep., Member's Remarks checked, 6459 (iv).
——— printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7004 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2742 (ii).
Montreal (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re* (notification) 1470 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7312 (iv).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil)—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on Ques. of Order, h. m. (Mr. Lavergne) requested to withdraw word 'cowardice,' 7720 (iv).
——— in Com. on Res., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7751 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4974 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6633 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Discussion in Com. of Sup., on Quebec Harbours, Ques. of Order (ruling) 6091 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts B. 36, Ques of Order *re* Statement reflecting on Minister by Outsiders (ruling) 3327 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 6... (iv).
Tariff, Flax Seed, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1348 (i).
Transportation Commission's Rep., Members' Remarks checked, 6084 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) *re* Discussion in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 6087 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6260, 6274 (iv).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5673 (iii).
Aylmer, Lord, Retirement of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow (remarks) in Conc., 7988 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Boots and Shoes and Tanners' Combine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4581 (iii).
British Columbia Mills, Timber and Trading Co., Applications *re* Cancellation of Leases, &c. (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Cattle, Tuberculosis, Compensation *re* by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7992 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i); in Com., 2008 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Location, Cost, Amount of Transportation Charges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1148 (i).
——— (Ques.) 947 (i).
Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iv).
Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 747; on Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 797 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7153 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7310 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes, Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith), Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670, 679 (i).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5276 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep. (remarks) 2287 (ii).
——— on M. to sit concurrently with Hse., 6834 (iv).
Criminal Code (Public Works, &c.) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7187 (iv).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5622 (iii).
Digby Pier Grant, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 6028 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4792, 4867 (iii).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 72 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 4946; (amt.) 4953; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4962 (iii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3667 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
German Treaties, *re* Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4450; on M. for 3°, 4849 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7355, 7389 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter from Sir Wilfrid *re* Resignation (remarks) 3627 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5719 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to M. for Sup., 6164, 6239 (iv).
Indian Reserve Timber Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3412 (ii).
I. C. R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1500 (i); in Com., 2948 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6776 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Minister, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5662 (iii).
——— Evidence, Printing (remarks) 3881 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7456 (iv).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115, on M. (Mr. German) to place on Order Paper, 7694 (iv).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4131 (iii).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2619 (ii).
Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 942 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c. (remarks) 942 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 6204 (iv).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Manitoulin and .North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 133 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6586 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 604 (i).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7189, 7218 (iv).
Mines Dept. Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes (remarks) 5688 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7080; in Com., 7571 (iv).
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5792 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7206, 7312 (iv).
Paper Combines, in Com. on Tariff, 2053 (ii).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2344 (ii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7650 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3890, 3897 (ii).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp. B. 167 (Mr. Donnee) on M. for 1°, 7123 (iv).
——— on Protest *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Ques. of Order, 7901, 7922 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2575 (ii).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. *re* Immigration to S. Africa and Canada (remarks) 2958 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (ii).
Private Bills from Senate, on M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill,' 'Petawawa'.
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5299 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5379 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5346 (iii).
——— On Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 5359 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7054 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7711; Ques. of Order, 7702 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7749 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. W. McIntyre) for Com., 2526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., on M. for 2°, 7953; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4973 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6(Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 644 (i); on M. for Com., 3683 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7414, 7426 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 982 (i).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2171 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1505 (i).
Ross Rifle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5761 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4257 (iii).
Standing Orders Sel. Com., 7th Rep. on M. (Mr. Grant) to conc., 6376 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3055; on M. that Com. rise, 3310; on Ques. of Order *re* Statement of Mr. Hall, 3327; in Com., 3341 (ii), 4470 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6008 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2961; (census) 2964; (fumigating stations) 2974 (ii); (live stock products) in conc., 7988 (iv); (Year-book) 2972 (ii).

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5553 (iii); (Port Colborne elevator) 7532 (iv).

Civil Govt (Aud. Gen.'s) 2764; Customs, 2767; Interior, 2957 (ii); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5766 (iii); Militia (salaries) 7686 (iv); Post Office, 2770 (ii).

Customs (Bain, Mr. gratuity) 5977 (iii).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 5909; (cold storage bait) 5910; (dogfish extermination) 5921; (fish breeding) 5893; (fish curing) 5931; (fish transportation) 5935; (legal expenses) 5971; (oyster culture) 5909 (iii).

Immigration (bonuses) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 7291 (iv).

Indians—Ont. (roads, &c.) 7289 (iv).

Indians—Que. (Oka settlement) 7291 (iv).

Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 7293 (iv).

Interior (timber inspector) 7294; miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5949 (iii).

Marine, Public Works (Cap à la Roche) 5776; (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 5773 (iii).

Militia (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5647; (R.M. College) 5764; (supplies) 5763; (surveys) 5724 (iii).

Miscellaneous (litigated expenses, Dom. and Provinces) 7972; (Revised Statutes) 7972 (iv).

N.W.T. Govt. (litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946; (life saving stations) 5767; (Quebec Coal Co.'s claim) 5947 (iii).

Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (London militia stores) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (Owen Sound) 4025; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (St. Catharines) 4026; (Simcoe) 4028; (Toronto, customs) 4030; (Toronto, drill hall) 4032 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 3951; (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3621, 3960 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (generally) 7000 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018; (Glace Bay) 6034; (Inverness Mines) 6047; (Moose) 6053; (Parrsboro) 6056; (Port Hastings) 6060; (Port Hood) 6064; (Scotch cove) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6941; Goderich) 6953 (iv); (ice-breakers) 5994 (iii); (Little Current) 6954; (Meaford) 6962 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5982 (iii).

Public Works—Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 7001 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton car shops) 7306; (Mulgrave) 7297 (iv).

Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4350 (iii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) in Com., 4402 (iii); (berries) 1898 (i), 4148 (iii); (binders) 4228; (boots and shoes, &c.) 4581 (iii); (casket trimmings) 4434 (iii); (cements, &c.) 2122; (coins) 2130; (denatured alcohol) in Com., 2046 (ii). (flax seed) 4144; glass, raw) 4435; (iii); (intermediate tariff) 532; (extension to British or foreign countries) 844 (i); (iron, &c., pipe) 2133 (ii); (machinery for sugar refining) 2135; (marble) 2125 (ii); (matrices) 4401; (metallic trading checks) 4438 (iii); (pickles, &c.) 1889 (i); (printing paper) 2053 (ii); (starch, &c.) 4143 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1864 (i).

Transportation Commission's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Considn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1591 (i).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Letter read to contradict statements by hon. mem., 3713 (ii).

Treaties (commercial) Canadian B. 17 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 1552 (i).

Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1937 (i).

Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 260 (i).

Wiarton Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).

Winnipeg Terminals C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5523 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5017, 5675, 5682 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5708 (iii).

Yukon Territory Ordinances Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7409 (iv).

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Agriculture (remarks) *re* Information asked for, 7832 (iv).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5574 (iii).

Leech, R. E., McLean, Mr., and Others, Emplymt. by Govt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2985

Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3370 (ii).

Malloy, John P., and Ira Stratton, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6012 (iv).

Staples, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3369 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7819; (exhibitions) 7818; (experimental farms) 7814 (iv).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6247; (surveys) 7263 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Carman) 7822 (iv); (Neepawa) 4599 (ii); (Red River bank protection) 7833 (iv); (Winnipeg immigration) 4600; (Winnipeg P. O.) 4602 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Red River) 6995; (St. Laurent) 6991 (iv).

Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1842 (i).

Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 946 (i).

Tariff—Agricultural Implements, in Com., 1375 (i).

—— Oats, in Com., 1372 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Morgan, Henry J., Cor. *re* Superannuation, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*

Address, The, 204 (i).

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1769 (i).

C. P. R. Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 816; in Com., 1328, 1615 (i).

Coal Lands in the Northwest, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 772 (i).

Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1460 (i).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1754 (i).

G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. for Ways and Means, 2078 (ii).

Hampton Postmaster, Mr. Z. Hall, Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).

I. C. R., Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1486 (i).

—— Mail Service to Halifax and St. John (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Judicial Apptmnts. to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 2211 (ii).

Labour Disputes Bill (remarks) on M. to adjn., 1299 (i).

—— Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).

Stockton, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 906, 931 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 599 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 1093 (i).

Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for Copies, 1444 (i).

Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c. (remarks) 2757 (ii).

Queen's and Shelburne Election Trial, Ref. to in Debate on Address, 207 (i).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2173 (ii).

Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1656 (i).

Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 225 (i).

Tariff—Cheese, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Tax, Ruling of English Speaker (read) 1349 (i).

—— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1228 (i).

—— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1243 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 523; in Com. on Res., 697 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4808 (iii).

French Clergy and Exiles from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6666 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Quebec-Moncton Section, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 273 (i).

Insurance Commission's Rep., Ques. of Order, 6459 (iv).

Live Stock Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 6005 (iv).

Lake Superior Power Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 4839 (iii).

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7846 (iv).

Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side (remarks) 5590 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., (Mr. Beddoe) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5810 (iii).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) 1°*, 6005 (iv).

Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).

Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Copies, 1815 (i).
Private Bill (M.) for Second Readings, 4927 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7940 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7558 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3801 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3293, 3330 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6738 (iv).
Public Works—H. of C. (telephones on 4th floor) 7820 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., *Leeds.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6276 (iv).
Breweries and Distilleries in Local Option Municipalities, Pet. *re*, Prohibition of, &c. (Ques.) 4452 (iii).
Brooks, E. L., & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept. (Ques) 472 (i).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 472 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 831; in Com., 1308, 1623 (i). 2023 (ii).
Coal Strike in N.W., Inquiry &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7163 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 671 (i).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7050 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2255 (ii), 4629 (iii).
"Fielding" Dredge, Construction, and Cost of Maintenance (Ques.) 3187 (ii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5072 (iii).
House of Commons, Whip's Rooms (remarks) in conc., 7987 (iv).
Immigration Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., Dismissal of (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
I.C.R. Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delays in Mails, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).
Judges Salaries in Man. and B.C. B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7782; (amt.) 7792 (iv).
Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2616 (ii).
Lansdowne Mail Delivery by Night Trains, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896, and from 1902 to 1906 (Ques.) 471 (i).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymnt. in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
Magee, Mr. Justice, Delays in rendering Judgments, &c. (Ques.) 884, 1927 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. on Judges B., 7782 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Auditing of Purchases, &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased for Lighthouse Service (Ques.) 471 (i).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Surrender of, O. Cs. Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 2585 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Covering of Steps, &c. (remarks) 174 (i).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re* (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7923 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B. 7028 (iv).
Post Offices in Cities, Employees Salaries, increases to (Ques.) 5779 (iii).
Private Bills, Precedence, &c. (remarks) 7483 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding to send Mess. to Senate, 7780 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Advance Copies sent to Persons, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 2578 (ii).
Rideau Canal Reserve Land, Lease of, &c. (Ques.) 6903 (iv).
——— Letters from Farmers in District (read) 6912 (iv).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Rep. in "Gazette" *re* Statement of Mr. Girard, 4662 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4257 (iii).
Speech from Throne, Distribution to Members (remarks) 6 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3294, 3330 (ii).
Strubb, Chas., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 472 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7816 (iv); (archives) 2961; (census) 2969 (ii); (cold storage) 7815 (iv); (Year-book) 2972 (ii).
Canals—Trent (Curtis Bros'. claims) 7538; (O'Toole, J., claims, &c.) 7538 (iv).
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6735; (Just, Mr. C. F., salary) 6242 (iv).
Legislation (voters' lists) 6763 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston barracks) 7820; Ottawa (H. of C. rooms) 7822 (iv); (Sussex St. property) 3957 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Little Current) 6957; (Port Stanley) 6979; Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (axes, scythes, &c.) 4418; (brass, &c.) 4196; (chains) 4266 (iii); (cheese) 1338 (i). (drawbacks) 4423 (iii); (Indian corn) 1366 (i); (malleable chains) 4392; (oils) 4187; (springs and axles) 4429; (sugar) 4169; (timetables, &c.) 4184 (iii); (tomatoes) 1873 (i); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii); (wire cables) 4422 (iii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4365 (iii).
Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1338 (i).
——— (M.) to increase Duty, 1349 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1350 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1025; (binder twine) 1220; (felloes of hickory, &c.) 1190 (i).
Wharfs and Docks in Ont., Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Wilson, Thos. & Co., Amounts purchased, &c. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5018 (iii).
Yukon, McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Resignation as Commissioner, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2427 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5895 (iii).

Templeman, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Victoria City, B.C.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. (B. 127) 1° m., 4929 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 6259 (iv).
Athabaska Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames), 6259 (iv).
Bait Cold Storage Establishments, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
Blind River, Ass't Inspector, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
Breweries and Distilleries, in Local Option Municipalities, Pets. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 4452 (iii).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1610 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6789 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Quantity made and sold, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).
Dion, Ulric, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6904 (iv).

Templeman, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Electric Inspection (B. 111) 2° and in Com., 7030 (iv).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5085 (iii)
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L Borden) for Ways and Means, 2082 (ii)
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant (Ans.) 5288 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1092 (i).
Inland Revenue, Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c., employed by Govt. (Ans.) 946 (i).
Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c. (Ans.) 2634 (ii).
Marconi Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Marconi Station at Clarke City (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Marine Supplies, Method of Purchase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment (B. 139) 1° m., 5258 (iii); 2° *, and in Com., 7189; in Com., 7212, 7213, 7252; 3° *, 7255 (iv).
Mines, Dept. of, Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes (remarks) 5688 (iii).
Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re* (Ans.) 487 (i).
——— International Waterways Commission, Reps, O.Cs., &c., on M. for Copies, 1443 (i).
Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 99) prop. Res. 2637; in Com. on Res., 3464; 1°* of Bill, 3465; 2° m. and in Com., 3890 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* this Session (remarks) 5863 (iii).
——— Postponement of (remarks) 4441 (iii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. (B. 97) 1°*, 2728 (ii); in Com., 4656 (iii).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association *re* Bait Freezing (Ans.) 6904 (iv).
St. John River Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 6634 (iv).
Standard Chemical Co., on Inquiry (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 7521 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Inland Revenue) 2822 (ii); Labour Dept. (McNiven, J. A.) 6620; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 7678 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 6630, 7295 (iv).
Fisheries (bait, cold storage) 5910; (Canadian exhibit) 5908; (dog fish extermination) 5920; (fish breeding) 5892; (fishery commissions) 5941, 5971; (fish curing) 5923; (fish transportation) 5932; (herring nets) 5917; (inspectors' salaries) 5890; (legal expenses) 5970; (marine biological stations) 5932; (oyster culture) 5909; (protection service) 5905, 5963 (iii).
Geological Survey (boring for gas, &c.) 3159; (clerical assistance) 3166; (maps, &c.)

Templeman, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey—*Con.*

3163; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (salaries) 3159; (specimens) 3165 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 5867 (iii), 7679 (iv); (book-keeping reorganization) 5947; (construction, &c.) 5869 (iii); (lighthouses, &c.) 7679 (iv); (maintenance, &c.) 5868; (Marconi stations) 5874; (salaries) 5864; (signals) 5872 (iii).

Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946 (iii); (life saving stations) 7678 (iv.); (N. W. M. P. patrol boat) 5946; (Quebec Coal Co.'s claim) 5947 (iii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).

Meteorological Service, 5690 (iii); (allowances, &c.) 7684 (iv); (steamer, B.C.) 5879

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7096 (iv).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (gas inspection) 6627; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2046; Spirits, in Com., 2112 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount collected for 1906 (Ans.) 1612 (i).

——— Excise Duties, Changes *re* (remarks) 5862 (iii).

——— Manufactures in Can., Duties on Foreign Products, &c. (Ans.) 1925 (i).

——— Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S. in 1906 (Ans.) 2141 (ii).

Waubaushene Light, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).

Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).

Wiarton Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Alaska and Yukon Ry. incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1472 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 1119 (i); in Com., 2769 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of, Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7971 (iv).

Tariff (mining machinery) in Com., 4420 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5691 (iii).

Yukon Boundaries Delimitation, on M. for Sup., 3102 (ii).

Yukon Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4519 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5708 (iii).

Yukon Wheat Raising, Samples placed on Table, 3548 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Address, The, 199 (i).

G. T. P. Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 600 (i).

Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (i).

Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 986 (i).

Ross Rifle Inspections, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1408 (i).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 37 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1040 (i).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7826 (iv).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 7027 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (herring nets) 5917 (iii).

Transportation Commission's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Considn. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1600 (i), 3698 (ii).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*

Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5672 (iii).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1794 (i).

Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 773 (i).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5623 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4753, 4792, 4815, 4867 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3471 (ii).

Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1839 (i).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 119) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Ottawa Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii)

Quinze and Blanche River Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii).

Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6765 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 732 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Transactions, &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2569 (ii).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) to Ways and Means, 4307 (iii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2357 (ii).
Travellers' Indemnity Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 120) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Verville, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iv).
Govtl. Printing, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 4851 (iii).
I. C. R. Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2938 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1171 (i).
See 'Coal.'
Labour on Public Works, Hours (B. 32) 1° m., 803 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dry Dock, Plans, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3388 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Rules and Regulations governing (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3071; in Com., 3284, 3815, 3856 (ii), 4465; on M. for 3°, 4996 (iii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2360 (ii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4081 (iii).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5575 (iii).
Homestead Duties, N. W., Quarter Section 22, &c., Entries, &c. (Ques.) 1924 (i).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c. (Ques.) 2983 (ii).
Malone and Hopkins Point Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 515 (i).
Post Cards, coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of (remarks) 5284 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Post office) 2795 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay) 6095 (iv).
Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1258 (i).

Walsh, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Ann's.*
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Report of Pub. Accts. Com., 5110 (iii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Bethany Ass't Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 723, 1147 (i).
——— Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters (M. for cor.*) 1148 (i).
Bowmanville Poultry Station, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 3369 (ii).
Cobourg, Ry. Ferry to Charlotte (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
See "Port Hope".
'Globe' Newspaper Reports, Order, Ques. of, 3278 (ii).
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry, on M. for Sup., 7579 (iv).
See "Cobourg".
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 637 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carried for 1906 (Ques.) 3186 (ii).
Registration Fee on Letters, Increase of, &c. (Ques.) 2829, 3185 (ii).
Rideau Hall Conservatory, Collapse of Dome (remarks) 1091 (i).
Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3795 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (construction) 7667 (iv).
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6720 (iv).
Militia (clothing) 5744; (training schools) 5730 (iii).
Trent Canal, Outlet, &c. (M.) to adjn., 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake, and Lake Ont., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 1929 (i).
——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 4664 (iii).

White, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Speech of P.M. G., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 571 (i).
——— Surveys, Inquiry for, 3547 (ii).
Petawawa Docks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Petawawa Military Camp, Compensation to Township *re* Taxes (remarks) 6519 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7663 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 7819 (iv).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (cream separators) in Com., 1205 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4103 (iii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*
G.T.P. Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
Immigration from Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) in Com. on Res., 7803 (iv).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

St. John River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6634 (iv).

St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Frederickton (Ques.) 6017 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6733 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (plant) 7000 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lincoln wharf) 7824; (Oak Point) 6077; (St. Andrew's) 6080; (St. John River) 6079 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Binder Twine Seizures, in 1906 &c. (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3886 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Agricultural Com., Evidence *re*, Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).

American Silver exported by Banks, Commissions paid, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Tanner's Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4587 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1305 (i), 2010 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 4557 (iii).

Centreville Postmaster, Absence, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

——— Removal from Belleville, &c. (remarks) 7781 (iv).

Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 241 (i).

Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6 &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Immigration Distributing Agents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6747 (iv).

Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6167 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Evidence, Distribution of, Number of Copies, &c. (remarks) 4118 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3723 (ii).

Interior Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 174, 658, (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7501 (iv).

Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa (Ques.) 1140 (i).

National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Moneys paid to Nov. 1, 1906, Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 239 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).

Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7096 (iv).

——— Evidence *re* Investigation, Apptmnt. by Govt., &c. (M. for copy) 576 (i).

——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa, on M. for Sup., 3728 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7800 (iv).

Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location (Ques.) 2836 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s office) 2764 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 6620 (iv).

Fisheries (protection service) 5964 (iii).

Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6713 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 7108 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4036 (iii).

Public Works—B.C. (Vancouver) 4043 (iii)

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria) 4018; (Belleville) 4018; (Kingston barracks) 4022; (Toronto customs) 4030; (Toronto, drill hall) 4035; (Toronto, postal station 'F') 4035 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 3951 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (immigrant buildings) 4011; (Montreal barracks) 4010; (Que. trachoma hospital) 4012 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Regina P.O.) 4040 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7096 (iv).

Tariff—Boots and Shoes, in Com., 4587 (iii)

——— Chains, in Com., 4268 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5018, 5675 (iii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence (Ques.) 4051 (iii).

Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c. (Ques.) 474 (i).

Eastern Townships Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).

Eastern Townships, Expenditure of Public Money *re* Public Works, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).

G.T. Ry., Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep., &c. (M. for copy*) 2839 (ii).

Immigration Agents, Apptmnt. in Eastern Townships, &c. (Ques.) 1142, 1395 (i).

——— Record of Agents, &c., (Ques.) 2579 (ii).

I.C.R., Carpets supplied, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3633 (ii).

Magog Public Building, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Militia Headquarters Staff, Name of Oldest Officer (Ques.) 6634 (iv).

Worthington, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*
Militia Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c. (Ques.) 7700 (iv).
Military Stores Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 720 (i).
Permanent Force, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 1050 (i).
Ross Rifle, Accidents in N.W. Mounted Police, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4051 (iii).
——— Accidents, &c. at St. John, N.B., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept. (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c. (M. for copies) 727 (i).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer, &c. (Ques.) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3759 (ii).
——— Imported Parts from U.S., &c. (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
——— Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for ret.) 1398 (i).
——— Pattern *re* Rep. of Commissioner, 1901 (Ques.) 4216 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
——— Reports from Officers *re* Defects (Ques.) 4273 (iii).
——— Reps., &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3626 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Proposed Erection of (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Militia (customs duties) 5765 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec East) 4015; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6274 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2419 (ii).
Committee, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep., (presented) 2286 (ii).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 2414 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4886 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) 7037 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2260 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7068
Private Bills Com., 5th Rep. *re* Petitions (presented) 2480 (ii).
Tariff—British Preferential applicable to Goods shipped to Canadian Ports on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4291 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
Tariff, Berries, in Com., 1896 (i).
——— Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2357 (ii).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1275 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep. on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4092 (iii).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*
Bracebridge, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition of, on Ques. of Order, (M.) to adjn. debate, 4090 (iii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2267 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands in Baxter Townships, Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 492 (i).
I.C.R., Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent (Ques.) 2834 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7513 (iv).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1562 (i).
SUPPLY—
Customs (salaries) 5974 (iii).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7296 (iv).
Indians—Ont. (roads, &c.) 7289 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 4023; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (Toronto customs) 4030 (iii)
Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615 (ii).
Tariff—Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4407 (iii); (beeswax) 1332 (i); (binders) 4428; (chains) 4269 (iii); (cheese) 1334 (i); (disinfectants) 4185 (iii); (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 2134 (ii); (malleable chains) 4391; (portable engines) 4413 (iii); (whips) 2404; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2387 (ii).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations (Ques.) 3635 (ii).
Wharfingers, Apptmnt. of in Muskoka, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7318 (iv).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1173 (i).
SUPPLY—
Customs (salaries, &c.) 5974 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5742; (properties) 5739
Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Hamilton drill hall) 4021 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (britannia metal) 4206 (iii); (pickles, &c.) 1889 (i); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (tweeds) 1349 (i).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

Abitibi and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'

Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'

Acetone, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).

Acland, Mr. A., Apptmnt. to Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6619 (iv).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Pardee) 9; seconded (Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville) 15 (i).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 21; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33; (Mr. Foster) 43; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 61; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 69; (Mr. Sproule) 77; (Mr. Bourassa) 94; (Mr. E. B. Devlin) 108; (Mr. Cockshutt) 111; (Mr. Clements) 116; (Mr. Osler) 120; (Mr. Boyce) 123; (Mr. Alex. Johnston) 144; (Mr. Bergeron) Ques. of Order, 153; (Mr. Barker) 161; (Mr. Lake) 162; (Mr. Bergeron) 167; (Mr. Campbell) 175; (Mr. Broder) 194; (Mr. Tisdale) 199; (Mr. Stockton) 204; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 218 (i).

—— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1044 (i).

—— Debate, Ques. of Order (Mr. Bergeron) reading of documents, 153; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 153 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).

Administration of Justice in Alta. and Saskn.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Administration of Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Adulteration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agricultural Com., Evidence *re:* Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 3001 (ii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 569 (i).

—— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1553 (i).

Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352, 1376 (i), 4402 (iii).

Agricultural Products: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).

—— Imports and Exports from Can. to U. S., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1149 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*

Animals, Health of: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7810 (iv); Conc., 7988 (iv).

—— Deptl. Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1392 (i)

Barrels, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).

Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).

Bowmanville Poultry Station, Expenditure *re:* Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3369 (ii).

Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost of, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1145 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G. B. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1055 (i).

Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).

Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 3189 (ii).

Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Official Arbitrator at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).

Cheese Curing Buildings, Number, Locations, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 947 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1148 (i).

Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1143 (i).

Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).

Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 710 (i).

Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years Past: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*
Cold Storage Shipments, Regulations *re:* M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Sup., 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Labourers' Wages, Working Hours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2576 (ii).
Experimental Stations in P. E. I., Location of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1391 (i).
Farm Products, &c.: in Com., 1256, 1260 (i).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
Kelly, Mr. John, Compensation for Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Live Stock Products, Compensation *re* Slaughter of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Rep. *re* Packing Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 229 (i).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
P. E. I. Fruit Inspector, Applications *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 2759 (ii).
Seeds Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships, Names, Dates of Sailing, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 480 (i).
Alameda Land Office: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation Bill, Information *re* Census: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1471 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 1472 (i).
Alberta, Representation: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Alexandria Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Algoma District, Indian Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).
Algoma, Indian Lands, Sales, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii), 6015 (iv).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 3641 (ii).
Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Allegash River, Diversion of Water: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 6635 (iv).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co. *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Alum Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 885 (i).
American Silver exported by Banks, Commission paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 233 (i).
Amherst Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Analysts, Apptmnt. of: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Animals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1254 (i).
Animals for Breeding Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4597 (iii).
Animals, Health of: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence: (Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
Annual Drill; in Com. of Sup., 5735 (iii).
Annuity Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Anse à L'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).
Anse du Cap Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Ansley, Celina Kingan, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Apples, Hay, Maple Syrup, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 2581 (ii).
Apples, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1892 (i).
See 'Inspection Bills.'
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp: Ques. (Mr. Hunt) 1050 (i).
Arsenal, Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6632 (iv).
Arthabaska Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Arts, Agriculture, &c., on Conc., 7988 (iv).

Assets of Canada, Interest and Non-Interest bearing, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3882 (ii).
Ash Wednesday: M. for Adjournment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2728 (ii).
Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Astronomical Surveys, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iv).
Athabaska Fish Co., Reps., Cor., Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 1066 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3844 (ii), 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).
Athabasca Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Atlantic Fast SS. Subsidy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2764 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Vol. i: Presented (Mr. Fielding 2480; 2727 (ii).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 4008 (iii).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1119 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 658, 703, 992, 1091, 1470 (i), 2069, 2344 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 514, 1044 (i), 1991, 3277 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (P.O. Dept. and N.W.M. Police): Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3546 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Export Trade, Applications *re* Subventions: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4271 (iii).
Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1699 (i).
Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3837 (ii).
Automobiles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2398 (ii).
Axes, Scythes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4418 (iii).
Aylmer, Mr. F. W., Apptmnt. as Engineer, Resignation, &c., Cor. *re:* M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 580 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iv).
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6136 (iv).
Babine Indians, Investigation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7286, 7293 (iv).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6019 (iv).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Bain, J. L. and Campbell, J. O., Apptmnt. as Scrutineers in Elections, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Bain, Mr. John, Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5977 (iii).
Bait in Cold Storage Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
——— Statement: Read (Mr. Templeman) 5910 (iii).
Banff Park, Waterworks and Sewerage: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
Banks, Co-operative: *See* "B. No. 2".
Baptist Missionary Union: *See* 'B No. 105'.
Barachois de Malbaie Training Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Barges, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 35'.
Barley: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Barrels, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
Batiscan River Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Baxter Island, No. 136, Sale to L. E. Embree, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833 (ii).
Bay of Quinte Lights: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal, Charges *re* Investigation of 1906: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1389 (i).
——— South Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Valleyfield Banks: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Water-Power, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk 1388 (i).
——— Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2999 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1118 (i).
——— O.C., *re* Alienation of: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 1473 (i).
Beaver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Beeswax: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Belle River Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c., Rep. *re* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 484 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv).

Belleville Armoury, Delays in Building: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1397 (i).

Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re* Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i).

——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2288 (ii).

Belleville Harbour Revetment Wall, Contract *re*, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398

——— Govt. Aid *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2632 (ii).

Belleville Post Office, and Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2837 (ii).

——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1989 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co., Investigation *re* Toronto Strike, Tel. from W. L. Mackenzie King: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 3276 (ii).

Bell Telephone Commission, Toronto *re* Labour Dept., Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).

Berne Convention, Answer to Proclamation: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 7700 (iv).

Berries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1894 (i).

Bethany and Millbrook Post Office, Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ward) 1148 (i).

Bethany Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 723 (i).

——— Asst. Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 1147 (i).

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6094 (iv).

Big Lorraine Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, 7993 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Letter from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Read (Mr. Speaker) 5176 (iii), 6518 (iv).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 5185 (iii), 6557 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent: Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 2742 (ii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) Respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk.)
1°, 89; 2°, 582; ref. to Sel. Com., 945 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act, 1903. —(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 90; 2°, 594; in Com., 595; 3°*, 618 (i); Sen. Amts., 7012 (iv).

Bill (No. 4) In further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 91; on Order for 2°, 595; 2° m., 951; in Com., 961 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 91; 2°, 595 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean.)
1°, 274; 2°, 618 (i); M. for Com., 3674 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Act respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets. —(Mr. Maclean.)
1°, 275; 2°, 961 (i).

Bill (No. 8) Respecting Patent of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., 1750, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting a Patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting a Patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 11) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2452 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) To incorporate the Malone and Hopkins Point Railway Company. —(Mr. Walsh, Huntingdon.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord. —(Mr. Bureau.)
2°*, 708 (i); in Com., 2768; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant.)
2°*, 708; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Joliette and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 612 (i).

Bill (No. 17, from the Senate) To amend an Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 657; 2°, 1552; in Com., and 3°*, 1553 (i).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
1°*, 657 (i); 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 4838 (iii).

Bill (No. 19, from the Senate) Respecting the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 945; 2°, and in Com., 1502, 1510. 3° m., 1543; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) Neg. (Y. 31; N. 84) 1546 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 20) To encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage Warehouses for the Preservation of Perishable Food Products.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Res. prop., 515; M. for Com. on Res., 658; 1°* of B., 702 (i); 2°, 2416; in Com., 2449, 2460; 3°, 2476 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) To Consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 703 (i); 2° m., 4669; in Com., 4739, 4785, 4804, 4865 (iii).

Bill (No. 22, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 803; 2°, 1092; in Com., 1094; 3°*, 1300 (i).

Bill (No. 23, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Treaty between Canada and Japan.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 803; 2°, 1546; in Com., and 3°*, 1552 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Parmelee.)

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 803; 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 2110; ref. back to Ry. Com., 2525, 3172; 3°*, 3180 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Manufacturers Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Kemp).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i).

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

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To incorporate the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—(Mr. Grant).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 31) To incorporate the Northwestern Trusts Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Calgary).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., 4008; 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville.)

1°, 803 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill No. 33) To provide for the further supervision and inspection of Canned Food Products, Meats and Fish.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 523; in Com. on Res., 804; 1°* of B., 838; 2°, and in Com., 1300, 1615 (i), 1992; 3°*, 2229 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting Inland Navigation Companies.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny.)

1°, 884 (i).

Bill (No. 35) To provide for the Official Inspection of Barges.—(Mr. Laurence.)

1°, 1035 (i).

Bill (No. 36) To aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lockouts in Coal Mines, and Industries connected with Public Utilities.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 1036 (i); 2°m., 3002; in Com., 3278, 3802, 3844 (ii), 3978, 4458, 4616, 4772; 3°m., 4978; 3°*, 5015 (iii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., 2769; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., 2769; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Derbyshire).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 42) To incorporate the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne, Drummond and Arthabaska).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Dominion Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Arthabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3587 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii), 6204 (iv).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dugas).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Glengarry.)

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) To amend an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her late Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the City of Montreal.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°, 1120 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2476; 3°*, 2478 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) For the Representation in the House of Commons of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°, 1120; 2°, 1614 (i); M. for Com., 5670; in Com., 5673 (iii), 6766; 3°*, 6766 (iv).

Bill (No. 52) To confirm certain Agreements between the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus; and between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4409 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3587 (ii).

Bill (No 55) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ratz.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., 2453 ; ref. back to Ry. Com., 2526; in Com., and 3°*, 3122 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Perth.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Surveys of the Public Lands of the Dominion, and the Surveyors entitled to make such Surveys.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°*, 1293 (i); 2°, 3091; in Com., 3093, 3461; 3°*, 3464 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To regulate the Exportation of Electric Power and certain Liquids and Gases.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°*, 1293 (i); 2° and in Com., 2229 (ii); on Order for 3°, 4669; 3° m., 4946 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 61) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Lennox.)

1°, 1380 (i).

Bill (No. 62) To further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Kennedy.)

1°, 1380 (i).

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

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the Annuity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 66) To incorporate the Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1879 (i); withdrawn, 3720 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 68) To establish the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Fund.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

Res. prop., 1297, 1473; in Com. on Res., 1500; 1°* of B., 1501 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2907, 2943; 3°*, 3002 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4865 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Quebec, Oriental Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°*, 1553; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., 4969; 3°*, 4976 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6633 (iv).

Bill (No. 70) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°, 1608 (i).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2109; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110 (ii); in Com., 4410; in Com., and 3°*, 4557, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting a Patent of the International Paper Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3763 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth)
1°, 1794 (i); 2°, and in Com., 7410; 3°, 7435 (iv).

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 1796 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2478; 3°*, 2479 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 1841 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Great West Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate the Prudential Savings Society.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2138 (ii); on Order for Com., 4409; in Com., 4442, 4557; 3°*, 4558 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°*, 1986; on Order for 2°, 2827; 2°*, 3122 (ii); on Order for Com., 4409; in Com., 4442; 3° m., 4794, 4844; in Com., 4844; 3°, 4344 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 83) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 1985 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—Mr. Porter.)
1°, 1985 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
1°, 2068; 2°, and in Com., 3092; 3°*, 3091 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 2137; 2°, and in Com., 2479; 3°*, 2479 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 2342 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Ferry Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 2415; 2°*, 2527 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 3122 (ii). in Com., 5204; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5205 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Oxford.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2943 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2943 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 94) To incorporate the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°* 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 95) To incorporate the Yukon Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1907.—(Mr. Fielding.)
In Com. on Res., 2727; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 2727 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 97, from the Senate), To amend the Petroleum Bounty Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 2728; 2°, 3890; in Com., 3890 (ii), 4656; 3°, 4657 (iii).

Bill (No. 98) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

1°, 3424 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

M. for Com. on Res., 3464; 1°* of B., 3465 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 3723 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gervais.)

1°, 3725 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) To ratify an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia respecting the Western Boundary of the Railway Belt.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3977; 2°, and in Com., 4655; 3°*, 4655 (iii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 4045; 2°*, 4156; in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) For the relief of Osprey George Valentine Spain.—(Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 105, from the Senate) To incorporate the United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. Logan.)

1°* 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 5590; Fees remitted, 5504 (iii).

Bill (No. 106, from the Senate) Respecting the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada, and to change its name to the Royal Accident Company of Canada.—(Mr. Ames).

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413 (iii), in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 108) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 4209; 2°, and in Com., 4656; 3°*, 4656 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4440; 2°, 5016; in Com., 5016, 5674; 3°*, 5701 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting the Traders' Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 4518; 2°*, 4850; in Com., 5285; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5285 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 111, from the Senate) Respecting the Inspection of Electricity.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 4610 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7030; 3°*, 7052 (iv).

Bill (No. 112, from the Senate) Respecting the British American Assurance Company.—(Mr. Parmelee).

1°*, 4610; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 4610 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7020; 3°*, 7030; Sen. Amts., 7839 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To authorize the Exchange of certain Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 4610; 2°, and in Com., 5701; 3°*, 5704 (iii).

Bill (No. 115, from the the Senate) To amalgamate the Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company and the Erie and Ontario Development Company, Limited, into one corporation, under the name of "The Jordan-Erie Power Company."—(Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 4664; 2°*, 4850 (iii); M. for Com., 7482, 7694; in Com., 7909; 3°*, 7911 (iv).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4664; 2°, and in Com., 5016; 3°*, 5016 (iii).

Bill (No. 117, from the Senate) For the relief of Celina Kingan Ansley.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 4771; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 118, from the Senate) For the relief of George William Hadley.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 4771; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) To revive certain Patents of the Nichols Copper Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

1°*, 4927; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977; in Com., 5589; 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) To incorporate the Travellers' Indemnity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4927; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 4927; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 122, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turgeon.)
1°*, 4838; 2°*, 4977 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)
1°*, 4839; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathona.)
1°*, 4839; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 4839; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Company, Limited.—(Mr. Marcil.)
1°*, 4928 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 127) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Templeman.)
1°, 4929 (iii); 2°*, 6259; in Com. 6260; 3°*, 6279 (iv).

Bill (No. 128) Respecting the Winnipeg Terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson.)
1°, 4929; 2°, 5512; in Com., 5515; 3° m., 5670 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., 6585. 3°*, 6585 (iv).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; M. for 2°, 5258; 2°*, 5441 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586; Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com. 6586; 3°°, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., 6585; 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 134) Respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Prop. Res., 4862; 1°, 5015; 2°, and in Com., 5510; in Com., 5562, 5590; 3° m., 5627; 3°*, 5643 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 5022; 2°, and in Com., 5704; 3°, 5717 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7544, 7578 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting the preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 5023 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7187; 3°*, 7189 (iv).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 5258 (iii); 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 6008; in Com., 7012; 3°*, 7014 (iv).

Bill (No. 138) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, York.)
1°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 139) To create a Department of Mines.—(Mr. Templeman.)
1°, 5258 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7189; in Com., 7212, 7213, 7252; 3°*, 7255 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate) To incorporate the St. Leon Railway Company. —(Mr. Finlayson.)
1°*, 5441; 2°*, 5590 (iii). in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 141) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding.)
M. for Com. on Res., 5395; in Com. on Res., 5397; 1° of B., 5397; 2°, 5561; in Com., 5561; 3°, 5561 (iii).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) To incorporate the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 5504; 2°*, 5590 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 5504; 2°, and in Com., 5717; 3°*, 5721 (iii).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Militia Pension Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
Res. prop., 4612; in Com. on Res., 5643; 1°*, 2° of B., 5645; in Com., 5645; 3°*, 5646 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Criminal Code. —(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5777; 2°, and in Com., 5778 (iii), 7014-15; 3°*, 7019 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To make certain amendments to the Statute Law in its application to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 5778 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7440; 2° and in Com., 7442, 7578; 3°, 7578 (iv).

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5778 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7019; 3°*, 7020 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 148) To amend Schedule A to the Revised Statutes, 1906.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5883; 2°, and in Com., 5884 (iii), 6766; 3*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate) To incorporate the Rock Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 150, from the Senate) To incorporate the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate the General Animals Insurance Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Walsh, St. Ann's.)
1°*,6005: 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa Terminals Railway Company.—(Mr. Caldwell.)
1°*, 6005; M. for 2°, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7203, 7311, 7483; 3°*, 7484 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the relief of Victor Harold Lyon.—(Mr. Wilson, Russell.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)
1°*, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7911; 3°*, 7912 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Philp J. Green, Melvin Hunt and John D. McMurchy.—(Mr. Perley.)
1°*, 6135; 2°*, 6587; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°*, 6256; withdn., 7793 (iv).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate), For the relief of Arthur Leon McPherson.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 6256; M. for 2°, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 6377; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7484, 7912 (iv).

Bill (No. 159) To increase the Borrowing Powers of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 6518; 2°, and in Com., 7545; 3°*, 7569 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lanctot, Laprairie-Napierville.)
1°, 6518 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Act of the present Session incorporating the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°*, 6519; 2°*, and in Com., 7014; 3°*, 7014 (iv).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate), To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 6630; 2°, 6774; in Com., 6778; 3°*, 6781 (iv).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) To incorporate the Prudential Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°*, 6630; 2°*, 6836; in Com., 7312; 3°*, 7407 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fidelity Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Johnston.)
1°*, 6764; 2°*, 6836; in Com., 7312; 3°*, 7407 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson.)
In Com. on Res., 6781; 1°*, 6790; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7517 (iv).

Bill (No. 166) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Res. prop., 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7054 1°* of B., 7091; 2°, and in Com., 7569; 3°*, 7575 (iv).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Port Arthur Power and Development Company.—(Mr. Conmee.)
1°*, 7123; 2° m., 7123; M. for 2°, 7482 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting the Erie-Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 7213; M. for 2°, 7482 (iv.)

Bill (No. 169) To authorize a Loan to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Res. prop., 6906; in Com. on Res., 7230; 1°* of B., 7245; 2° m., 7939; in Com., 7955; 3°*, 7968 (iv).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 7246; 2°, and in Com., 7808 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
Res. prop., 6257; in Com. on Res., 7255; 1°*, 2°* of B., 7257; in Com., and 3°*, 7544 (iv).

Bill (No. 172) Respecting the Surveys of the Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such Surveys.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 7308; 2°*, 7308; in Com., 7437; in Com., and 3°*, 7544 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 173) Respecting Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada (Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 4612, 5888 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7443, 7492; 1°* of B., 7514; 2° and in Com., 7515; 3°*, 7515 (iv).

Bill (No. 174) Respecting the manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada (Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 5887 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7515; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7517; Sen. Amts., 7985 (iv).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.— (Mr. Fielding.)

1°, 7694; 2° m., 7694; in Com., and 3°*, 7696 (iv).

Bill (No. 176) To empower the Courts to declare certain marriages invalid.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°, 7696; 2°*, and in Com., 7841 (iv).

Bill (No. 177) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

Res. prop., 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7781; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 7792; 3°*, 7793 (iv).

Bill (No. 178) To authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 7126; in Com. on Res., 7799; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7808 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the period of nine months ending the 31st March, 1907, and of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding.)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 7990; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7993 (iv).

Binders for Harvesting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).

Binder Twine Manufacture: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Binder Twine, Drawbacks *re* Duty, up to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1612 (i).

Binder Twine: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1208 (i), 4438 (iii).

—— Items dropped: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5777 (iii).

—— Machinery, Customs Valuation: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3629 (ii).

—— Materials: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2368 (ii).

—— Seizures, in 1906: Ques. (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 2140 (iii).

Biological Stations, Marine: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Biscuits, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1865 (i).

Blackberries, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).

Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplmt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6014 (iv).

Blairmore Town Site, Patents cancelled, &c., Charges *re*: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lake) 6522, Neg. (Y. 27; N. 56) 6616 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 4615 (iii).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).

Blind River, Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2292 (ii).

Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1131 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Opening up for Sale: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).

Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 474 (i).

Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'

Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2983 (ii).

Bonuses, Immigration, British and Continental: in Com. of Sup., 7277 (iv).

Books: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

Bookkeeping Reorganization: *See* 'Marine', &c.

Boots and Shoes and Tanners' Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).

Boots and Shoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4558 (iii).

Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2143 (ii).

Bounty on Binder Twine Manufacture: *See* 'B. No. 174'.

Bounties on Iron and Steel: *See* 'B. No. 173'.

Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).

Bowmanville Poultry Station, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3369 (ii).

Bracebridge Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii).

Brandon Post Office, Names of Employees, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2838 (ii).

—— Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1558 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).

Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).

Brass Band Instruments: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).

Brass Bars, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2129 (ii).

Brass, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).

Brass, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Porter) 4554 (iii).
Breweries and Distilleries in Local Option Municipalities, Pet. *re* Prohibition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4452 (iii).
Brick, Mr. T. A., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Census in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).
Bridging Material: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7523 (iv).
Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Appointments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).
Britannia Metal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
British America Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 112'.
B.C. Appellate Court, Representations from Provincial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 4945 (iii).
B.C. County Court Judge (salaries) Prop. Res. withdrawn (Mr. Aylesworth) 3841 (ii).
See 'Judges', &c.
B.C. Elections, and Election Money, Charges against Mr. D. Ross (Mr. Fowler) 3314 (ii).
B.C. Electric Co., &c., Agreements: *See* 'B. No. 52'.
B.C. Judges' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 177'.
B. C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 718 (i).
——— Statement *re* Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Aylesworth) 580; Members' remarks checked: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 580 (i).
British Columbia Mills, Timber and Trading Co., Applications *re* Cancellation of Leases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2145 (ii).
B.C. Railway Belt, Sales or Lease of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1149 (i).
British Glass Goods, Increase in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
British Gum., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).
British Preference Tariff: *See* 'Preferential Tariff'.
British Textile Goods, Total Increases in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1047 (i).
Brockville Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39'.
Bronson and Ray Yukon Concessions, Transfer to Guggenheimers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3425 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Bronte Lighthouse, Allowance to Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Bronze Works of Art: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (ii).
Brooks, E. L. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Brown, Beddingfield et al. Grazing Leases, O. Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).
Brunet, A., Remuneration *re* G.T.P. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Brushes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Buckingham Strike Riots: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bourassa) 240 (i).
Budget, The, (Financial Statement)—(Mr. Fielding) 278; Reply (Mr. Foster) 297 (Mr. Miller) 425; (Mr. Cockshutt) 441 (i).
See 'Financial Statement,' 'Tariff,' &c.
Budget Speech and Distribution of Pub. Accounts and Nav. Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 92 (i).
——— Prop. Motion *re* Precedence in debate: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 237 (i).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
——— Generally, Clerks of Works, &c. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4043 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii), 7822 (iv).
——— N.B., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3974
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4018, 4598 (iii).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup. 4009 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Sask., Alberta, and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii), 7823 (iv).
See 'Public Works'.
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1394 (i).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71'.
Business of the House, Delays in Proceedings: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1110 (i).
——— Procedure: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3728 (ii).
Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost of, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1145 (i).
Butter: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Button Blanks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancy in N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 6135 (iv).
See 'Hyman', 'London Election', 'Railways Minister of'.
Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 720 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103'.
Calgary Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Campbelll, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meigs) 565 (i).
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).
Canada and Australia SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7121 (iv).
Canada Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
'Canada,' Cruiser, Design *re* Flag: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Canadian Sealers, Imprisoned at Montevideo, Representations *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1381 (i).
——— Release of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 229 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 108 & 175.'
Canada and South Africa SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1610 (i).
Canada and U. S. Negotiations by Mr. Bryce. &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5508 (iii).
Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 6258 (iv).
Canadian Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G. B. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1055 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Countries admitted to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3369 (ii).
See 'Can. Mercantile Coasting,' &c.
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1670, 1699 (i).
——— O.C., quoted by Member: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1856 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Canadian Fog Signal Co, Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada,&c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2146 (ii).
Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2147 (ii).
Canada Newspaper Syndicate, Tariff *re* Matrices, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
See 'Matrices,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv).
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Can. Northern Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Land Reserve, Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6010 (iv).
——— Land Grants, Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2584 (ii).
C. P. R. and B. C. Electric Co., &c.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
C. P. R., Coal Lands, Selected by Govt., Conditions of Sale of Coal to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3883 (ii).
——— Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4666 (iii).
——— Gagetown Branch Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
——— Land Taxation, Appeals to Judicial Com. of Privy Council: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
——— Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stockton) 491 (i).
——— Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2289 (ii).
Can. Treaty with Japan: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
CANALS:
Beauharnois, Charges *re*, Investigation of 1906: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1389 (i).
——— South Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Valleyfield Banks: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
——— Valleyfield, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
Beauharnois Water-Power, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1388 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1118 (i).
——— O.C., *re* Alienation of: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 1473 (i).
——— Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2999 (ii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 7530, 7534 (iv).
——— Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 567 (i).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
Chambly, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Conduit: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 5552 (iii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Galops Canal, Final Estimate: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
——— Gilbert Settlement: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Upper Entrance Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Rep., Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 230 (i).
——— Rep. of Speech by P. M. G., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 571 (i).
——— Surveys: Inquiry for (Mr. White) 3547 (ii).
Lachine, Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Murray, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Quebec Canals, Purchase of Cement: in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Rideau, Mr. J. O'Toole's Claim: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Reserve at Jones' Falls, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6903 (iv).
——— Letters from farmers in district: Read (Mr. Taylor) 6912 (iv).
——— Tug-boat: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Soulanges, Cascade Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Clement's Gully Bridge, Soulanges Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Electric Staff Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7535, 7666 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Manny's Gate Bars: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Water Powers, Leases, Transfers, &c., by Govt., Contracts, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 241 (i).
Trent, Coboconk to Gull River Waterways, Construction of Canal: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 493 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7667 (iv)
——— Curtis Bros., Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Lake Simcoe Section, ref. to on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways (Mr. Bennett) 497 (i).
CANALS—*Con.*
Trent, McLaren's Creek Road: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 468 (i).
——— Outlet, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Ward) 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake Section, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1929 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par in Toronto 'Globe' Remarks (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4839 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).
——— Tow Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Water Powers leased, owned, by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 565 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Welland: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Improvements, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 484 (i).
——— Port Maitland Wall: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Water Power, Amount contracted for by Cataract Power Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1923 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).
Canned Food Products: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 501 (i).
Cant Dogs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Cap à la Roche, Plant. in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 573 (i).
Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (iv).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Carpets purchased, I.C.R., Canadian-made or Foreign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3637 (ii).
——— Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3633 (ii).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Casket Trimmings, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
Cattle, Contagious Diseases, Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Conc., 7989 (iv).
Cattle Insurance: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).
See 'Animals,' &c.

Caustic Soda: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Cements, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Census Forms distributed to Manufacturers, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4217 (iii).
Census of Man. and Sask. and Alberta: Rep. Presented (Mr. Fisher) 2727 (ii).
Census Population of N.W.T., Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 514 (i).
Census Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Central Can. Mfrs. Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Central Counties Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 3189 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Central Ontario Ry. Subsidy (Bancroft to C. A. Ry. near Whitney): in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Centreville, N. B., Customs Collectorship Vacancy: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
Centreville, Ont., Postmaster, Absence of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Removal from Belleville: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 7781 (iv).
Cereals, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Chains, Sprockets and Coils: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Chambly Canal, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Conduit: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
Champlain Market Property and G. T. P. Station Building, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
See 'G. T. P.,' &c.
Champlain Memorial: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 5504 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5666 (iii).
See 'Insurance Commission.'
Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1107 (i).
Charlesville Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building: M. for Copies* (Mr. Blain) 2840
Charlo's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Charlottetown Accommodation, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount contributed: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1393 (i).
Chartered Bank Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6095 (iv).
Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4020 (iii).
Chaudière Junction Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Official Arbitrator at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Location, Cost, Amount of Transportation Charges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1148 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 947 (i).
Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1143 (i).
Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).
Cheese, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1333 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 2577 (ii).
Chicory: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Chicoutimi Pier Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
Chinese Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Memorial *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7095 (iv).
Chockfish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6075 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).
Church Army and Immigration: *See* 'Immigration from Eastern Canada.'
Church Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture of, Prohibition, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4053; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4085; Amt. (Mr. Barker) 4087: Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 4088 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1801 (i).
Civil Servants, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of: Remarks on M. to dschg. Civil Service Bill, 7793 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Names, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 7686.
Civil Service at Ottawa, Salaries, Wages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2140, 2289, 2634 (ii).
Clam Point, Cape Sable Island Canal, Access to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3188 (ii).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2836 (ii).
Clarke City, Marconi Station: in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Clement's Gully Bridge, Soulanges Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1056 (i).
Clifton (Stonehaven) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Coal in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Coal, Bituminous, for Smelting Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Coal Lands, Leases, Sales, &c., Areas, Dates of Purchases: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 4053 (iii).
Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* preventing Strikes: Prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 743; Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 766; Agreed to (Y. 80; N. 39) 800 (i).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 486 (i).
Coal from Canadian Mines, Quantity transported in British or Foreign Vessels, to Montreal Port: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1388 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 8 (i).
——— Additional Information: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 7693 (iv).
——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7518, 7985 (iv).
——— Investigation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7309 (iv).
——— Location of Dep Min. of Labour: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).
——— Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell, Ques. (Mr. Monk) 488 (i).
——— Press Reports and Jurisdiction of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 219 (i).
——— Ref. to in Debate (Mr. Lake) 162 (i).
——— Shortage of Fuel: Remarks: M. (Mr. Bole) ta adjn. Hse., 7131 (iv).
——— Taber Mines, Cor. *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 6144 (iv).
——— Tel. from Blairmore *re* Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7092 (iv).
——— Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade: Read (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 6908 (iv).
——— from C.P.R., &c.: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 424 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Tel. from Dep. Min. of Labour: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 514 (i).
——— Tel. from Mr. King: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 7543, 7838, 7871 (iv).
——— Terms of Settlement: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 616 (i).
——— statement *re:* (Mr. Lemieux) 174 (i).
——— information *re* settlement: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 276 (i).
——— inquiry *re* settlement (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Coal Strike in N.W.: *See* 'Crow's Nest, &c.,' 'Fuel Famine.'
Coal Supply, I.C.R., Reps. and Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parker) 1810 (i).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 721 (i).
Coasting Trade, Canadian Legislation *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1051 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1445 (i).
See 'Can. Coasting..
Coboconk to Gull River Waterways, Construction of Canal: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 493 (i).
Cobourg, Car Ferry to Charlotte: *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Cocoa Nibs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1359 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. E., late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4367 (iii).
Colborne Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 710 (i).
Cold Storage for Fishing Bait: in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years Past: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Sup., 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage *re* Trans-Atlantic SS, Regulations *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2143 (ii).
Collars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3000 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston), Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accts. (Mr. Bennett) 5843 (iii).
——— Sittings *re:* M. (Mr. Finlayson) to conc., 3840 (ii).

Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 150.'
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, Rumours *re*: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5260 (iii), 6280 (iv).
——— Canadian Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin or Sir Jos. Ward, *re* Imperial Council: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5525 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3001 (ii).
——— Provisions for Expenditure *re* Ministers: in Com. of Sup., 7982 (iv).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2634 (ii).
See 'Tariff,' 'Preferential,' &c.
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trusts Funds: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Combines: *See* 'Lumber Combine.'
Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 241 (i).
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).
Commercial Travellers Tax, Agreement with Provincial Premiers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4213 (iii).
Commercial Treaties: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Committees: Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— Lists presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 558 (i).
——— M. to add Name (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4440 (iii).
Committees, Standing Orders, 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2286 (ii).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2414 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Condensed Milk: in Com., 1361 (i).
Confectionery Sugar, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Congdon, Mr. F., Inquiry for Rep. *re* Investigation into Charges, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).
Connaught, Prince Arthur's Visit: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
Contractors' Deposits, Amounts paid in to Receiver Gen., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1564 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1386 (i).
Contracts let by Govt. to Ottawa Contractors: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
Co-operative Societies: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Copper Cliff Post Office, Instructions to P.O. Inspector, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 4458 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6697 (iv).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3883 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Cordage Co., Amount of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4047 (iii).
Cordage Lines, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Corks, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2136 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 5552 (iii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Cotton Fabrics: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater: in Com., of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Crawford Bay and St. Marys Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Cream Separators: Remarks in Com., 1190 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. Bill (Mr. Gervais) M. to Introduce, 1608 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1608 (i).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Criminal Code (exclusive contract) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Criminal Code (offences) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Criminal Code (peace on Public Works) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4856 (iii).
Crossings of Railways at Level: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Cross Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
——— Purchase of Lumber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Crow's Nest Coal, Assurance fo Govt. *re*: Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6905 (iv).
Crows Nest Pass Coal Strikes and Labour Bill: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6006 (iv).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Crucibles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Culloden Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6023 (iv).
Curling Stones, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Curry, Mr. S. G., Payments as Architect *re* Toronto Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).

Customs Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 134, 'B. No. 165.' *See* 'Tariff.'

CUSTOMS :

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 569 (i).

——— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1553 (i).

Apples, Hay, Maple Syrup, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 2581 (ii).

Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).

Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymnt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6014 (iv).

British Glass Goods, Increase in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).

British Textile Goods, Total Increases in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1047 (i).

Centreville, N.B.. Customs Collectorship Vacancy: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).

Customs Commission, Charges *re* Sending Official Fyles out of Canada (Mr. A. Johnston) 5721 (iii).

Customs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).

Customs Duties collected at Sydney, N.S., Sault Ste. Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1926 (i).

Emerson Customs Collector, &c. : Ques. (Mr. W. J Roche) 1562 (i)

Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3883 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 483 (i).

Farming Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 948, 1067 (i).

Farm Wagons, Duty, &c. collected *re* Dumping Clause: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).

Germany, Export Trade with Canada during years, 1900-6, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1124 (i).

Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).

Horses imported, Minimum Tariff Value : Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1055 (i).

Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 569 (i).

Imports via. Canadian Ports, Value for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 5085 (iii).

Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 724 (i).

McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 566 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Outside Ports, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U.S., Names of, Ports of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 708 (i).

Port Stanley, Customs Collections for 1900-6: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).

Pulp Wood, Cut and Made in Canada, Export Duty *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 888 (i).

Stoves imported from Western Canada, Number and Value of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2293 (ii).

Sugar Duties, above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Duties, Total Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4455 (iii).

Sugar imported, Name of Countries, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 568 (i).

Sussex, N.B., Customs Port: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).

See main heading.

Threshers, Total Value of Importations: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3635 (ii).

Timber and Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).

Wilson, Mr. Wm., Emplmt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).

Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. Johns Customs Collectorship, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).

Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1125 (i).

Cutlery and Foreign Goods, Surtax and British Preference: Par. in 'Citizen' (Mr. Armstrong) 4842 (iii).

Dalhousie Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 8'.

Dates, Figs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).

Dauphin Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).

Dayley, Mr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., &c., Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1988 (ii).

Debates Committee, Meetings and Recommendations : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7008 (iv).

Debates of the House, French Translation Delay: Remarks (Mr. Beauparlant) 3543 (ii).

Debates, Officials, Reporting Staff and Translators' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

Deep Sea Missions, Grant to Dr. Grenfell: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 5882

Demurrage on Cars: *See* 'B. No. 160'.
Denatured Alcohol, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2045 (ii).
Denaturated Alcohol, Manufacture of, &c., Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1956 (i).
——— Quantity made and sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1121 (i).
——— Ref. to in debate on Budget (Mr. Fielding) 304 (i).
Desks, Furniture, Purchases by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (iii).
Detroit River Tunnel: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Diamond Dust, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Digby Harbour Improvements, Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Car Shortage: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7252, 7310 (iv).
Dion, Ulric, Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5904 (iii).
Disinfectants, Non-Alcoholic Liquids: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Disraeli Wharf: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7827 (iv).
Divorce of Celina Kingan Ansley: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Divorce of George William Hadley: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Divorce of Victor Harold Lyon: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Divorce of Arthur Leon MacPherson: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Divorce of O. G. V. Spain: *See* B. No. 104.'
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 490 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Dogfish Extermination Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
Dolsen's Burying Ground, Cost of Protection Banks: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. to Canning Wharf, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Dom. Central Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Dominion Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* B. 'No. 16.'
Dom. Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5864 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Dom. Lands, in Man. &c., Sales for 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1978 (i).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).
See 'Interior,' 'Surveys,' &c.
Dom. Notes printed in French: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6015 (iv).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1119 (i).
——— Retiring Allowances to A. McCuaig: in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6762 (iv).
Dom. Public Lands: *See* 'B. Nos. 21 and 59.'
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 5024 (iii).
Dorchester Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6097 (iv).
Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 888 (i).
Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor., Papers, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Cash) 4458 (iii).
——— Dom. Lands Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5780 (iii).
——— Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers *re* Inspection of: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Draper, Mr. P. M., Apptmnt. in Printing Bureau: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6635 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7247 (iv).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Drawbacks on Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Dredging, Mar. Provinces: in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Drugs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5086 (iii).
Drummond Counties Ry. Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Drummondville Improvements, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).
Dubé, R. B., Dismissal of, from 'La Canadienne,' Reps. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 1978 (i).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 4045 (iii).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
Dumping Clause: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1000; Amts. in Com., 1186 (i).
See 'Tariff.'
Dunnville Drill Hall, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474 (i).

Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5177 (iii).
Eastern Can. Mfrs.' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Eastern Township Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Eastern Townships, Public Works, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret* (Mr. Armstrong) 2838 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2581 (ii).
——— Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from: in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Edmonton Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Edmonton Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Elections Act: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Election Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6791, Amt. neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 6898 (iv).
Election Acts Amts.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2637 (ii).
Election Irregularities: *See* 'Queen's and Shelburne.'
Election of New Members, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Election Oaths, Form, &c., London Election Trial, on M. for Sup., (Mr. Barker) 7872 (iv).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Electric Bulbs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).
Electricity, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Electric Power Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Elgin Road Station, I.C.R., Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).
Emerson, Customs Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1562 (i).
Emigration to Canada, Fraudulent Representations in G.B., Cor. with Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 3373 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Emmerson:, Mr.: *See* 'Railways, Minister of.'
Employees in Interior Dept. in N.W. Ter., Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1804 (i).
'Empress of Britain' Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Roche) 950 (i).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mails, *re* Halifax Route: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1059 (i).
Engineers of Steamboats: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 115 &
Escoumains Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6098 (iv).
Eskasoni Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Esquimalt Military Station, Establishment of Schools of Instruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3370 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Estimates, 1907-8: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).
——— Suppl. (1907): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5643 (iii).
——— Suppl. (1908): Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7213 (iv).
——— Further Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7837 (iv).
Exchange of Certain Lands: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt. of French Judge: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3185 (ii).
Excise: in Com. of Sup., 6626, 7294 (iv).
——— Allowances to B.C. Officials: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
Exhibitions, Dublin and Milan: in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
Exhibitions, General Vote: in Com. of Sup., 7818 (iv).
Exhibitions at Toronto and Sherbrooke, Conflicts of Dates, &c: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2589 (ii).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
——— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (iii).
——— Electric Ry. Track: in Com. of Sup., 7818 (iv).
——— Labourers Wages, Working Hours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2576 (ii).
See 'Central Canada,' &c.
Experimental Stations in P.E.I., Location of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1391 (i).
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3883 (ii).
Export of Electric Power, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Express Companies, Control of by Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 473 (i).
——— Revision of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 5861 (iii).
Famine in Coal in N.W.: *See* 'Coal Strike.'
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 483 (i).

Farming Implements, Total amount of Duty collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 948 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Henderson) 1067 (i).

Farm Products, &c.: in Com. 1256, 1260 (i). *See* 'Agriculture.'

Farm Wagons, Duty, &c., collected *re* Dumping Clause: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).

Father Point Wharf and Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (iv).

'Favoured Nations' Treaties, between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1123 (i).

Felloes of Hickory, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1190 (i).

Fencing of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).

Fidelity Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

'Fielding, W. S.', Dredge, Construction and Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3187 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1798 (i).

Financial Situation—Public Expenditure, Criticism *re*: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).

FINANCE:

American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 885 (i).

American Silver exported by Banks, Commission paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 233 (i).

Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest bearing, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3882 (ii).

Chartered Bank Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trusts Funds: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).

Contractors' Deposits, Amounts paid in to Receiver-Gen., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1564 (i).

Estimates, 1907-8: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).

Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).

Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 4458 (iii).

Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 6378, 7409 (iv).

Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govert., Amounts collected, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 503 (i).

Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 219 (i).

Temporary Loans since 1st Jan., 1906, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 234 (i).

Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4272 (iii).

Fire Brick: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).

Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'

Fire Damage Claims, P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).

Fish, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 33.'

FISHERIES:

Athabasca Fish Co., Reps., Cor., Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 1066 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Bait in Cold Storage Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5910; Statement: Read (Mr. Templeman) 5910 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

Dog Fish, Extermination Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).

Fish Breeding, Amounts expended *re* Propagation: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1929 (i).

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (iii).

Fish Curing Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).

Fisheries Commission, Expenses, Messrs. Birnie and Noble, Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5941 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 723 (i).

Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Protection and Preservation, Expenditure of Moneys, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Copp) 277 (i).

Fishery Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5970 (iii).

Fish, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).

Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1928 (i).

Fish Transportation, I.C.R., Quantity and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4850 (iii).

Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).

Herring Nets *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5890 iii).

Jurisdiction of Provinces: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg, Fishing Restriction *re*, Cor. with Board of Trade, Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1067 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion of by American Fishermen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 724 (i).
Meaford Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5895 (iii).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen: Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1379 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1670, 1699 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1049 (i).
——— O.C., quoted by Member: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1856 (i).
North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1394 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
Poaching in Lake Superior, Patrol *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3372 (ii).
P. E. I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3883 (ii).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 5905, 5960 (iii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P. E. I., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1143 (i).
Quinté Bass Pond, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3185, 3426 (ii).
Reduction Works, Experiments *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Sinclair) 802 (i).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).
Transhipment on Western Coast, O.C.: Inquiry for: (Mr. Foster) 3001 (ii).
Transportation and Conservation Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Wiarton Fish Hatchery: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).
Flax Seed: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1348 (i), 4143 (iii).
Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
Florists' Stock: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii).
Food Products and Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Foreign Goods and British Preference, German Surtax, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4842 (iii).
See 'German,' 'Preferential,' &c.
Forestry Branch, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7265 (iv).
Fraser River Improvements of Ship Channel and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Fredericton to Woodstock, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7806 (iv).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 724 (i).
Freight Rates, I.C.R., Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Lévis, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 728 (i).
French Clergymen expelled from France: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) *re* Immigration Policy, 6150 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 6379 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).
——— Par. in Press *re* Criticisms: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6766 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6654; Reply, 6673 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1141 (i).
French Language, Use of in Coinage and Postal Notes: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3641 (ii).
French Language on Stamps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6012, 6015 (iv).
French Language, *re* Time Tables of I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).
French Tariff: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) in Com., 1252 (i).
Fruit and Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Fruit Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Fruit, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1903 (i).
Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 492 (i).
Fuel Famine in N. W.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows) *re* Rep. in 'Telegram,' 2824 (ii).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
Fur Skins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).
Galops Canal, Final Estimate: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
——— Gilbert Settlement: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Upper Entrance Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 719, 1124 (i).
Galvanized Iron: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).

'Galveston,' Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transference, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 574 (i).
Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Garden Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2830 (ii).
Garden Seeds: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4145, 4389 (iii).
Gas Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6627 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Campbellton SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).
General Animals Ins. Co. of Can., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Geological Specimens, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Geological Survey, Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii). *See* 'Mines Bill.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Rep., Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 230 (i).
——— Rep. of Speech by P. M. G., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 571 (i).
——— Surveys: Inquiry for (Mr. White) 3547 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands in Baxter Townships, Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Wm. Wright) 492 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. W. S. Pratt: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).
——— Cor. with J. B. Jackson: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 5863 (iii).
Germany Export Trade with Canada, during years 1900-6, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1124 (i).
German Maximum Tariff, Fiscal Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1128 (i).
German Silver: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4389 (iii).
German Silver, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential Tariff,' &c.
German Treaties, and Tariff, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (i).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5084 (iii).
Giant's Tomb Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Water Pipe Laying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2575 (ii).
Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2983 (ii).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Glass, Raw, &c., for Plate Glass: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4435 (iii).
Glassware, Cut, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4193 (iii).
'Globe' Newspaper Reports: Ques. of Order (Mr. Ward) 3278 (ii).
Gloves, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Glucose, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4181 (iii).
Glue, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2118 (ii).
Glycerine, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).
Gold and Silver Coins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
'Golspie' or 'Osceola,' Str., Name of Port of Entry: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).
——— Wreck of, Investigation *re:* Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1097 (i), 2346 (ii).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 2763 (ii), 7685 (iv).
Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1092 (i).
Govt. Business, Bills wthdrn.: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 7438 (iv).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2728 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4274 (iii). *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).
——— M. for Ret* (Mr. Armstrong) 4458 (iii).
Govt. Dredging, for 1901-6, Names of Harbours, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Sinclair) 2584 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 6378, 7409 (iv). *See* 'Loans.'
Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c., Application for Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1810 (i). *See* 'Dom. Lands,' 'Interior,' &c.
Govt. Officials and Political Interference: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6664, 6677; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 6705 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Political Interference, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* French Clergy, 6664, 6683 (iv).
Govtl. Printing, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4851 (iii).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Govt. Steamgers, Expenditure *re:* Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5766
—— Repairs and Expenditure, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (iii).
Gowan, Sir James, Resignation from Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3626 (ii).
Grain exported from Can. and U. S. Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 475 (i).
Grain Shipments to Montreal for Lake Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 231 (i).
Grain Trade Commission, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7983 (iv).
Grain in unbroken Bulk received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1046 (i).
Grand Etang Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iv).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 948 (i).
G.T.Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 5027 (iii).
—— Car Ferry: *See* 'Port Hope', &c.
—— Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 2839 (ii).
—— Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 614 (i).
—— Payments to by Govt., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1470 (i).
—— 2-cent a Mile Rate: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).
—— Use of Rolling Stock of G.T.P.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5656 (iii).
G.T.R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82'.
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Advertisement for Tenders in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3183 (ii).
Cars, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
See 'G.T.R.' &c.
Coal Lands Pre-emption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6256 (iv).
Commission, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 715, 885 (i).
Commissioners' Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 7010 (iv).
—— Delay in Presenting: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1045 (i).
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Contracts for Construction: Rumours *re* Signing: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3727 (ii).
Contracts *re* Steam Shovels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3182 (ii).
Contract *re* Ties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1393, 1559 (i).
District 'F', Construction Contract, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2635 (ii).
Investigation *re* Payments on Construction: Amt. (Mr. Barker) to M. to Conc. in Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5627, 5086; Debate resumed, 5091 (iii).
Land Grant, B.C. Indian Reserve: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2069 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1792 (i).
Lands purchased at Moncton: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1130 (i).
La Tuque Branch, Construction Contract, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Location of Line between Quebec and Edmonton and Lake Pohenegamook, Reps. Plans, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 240 (i).
Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 2633 (ii).
N.B. Section, Proposed Routes, Resurveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 469 (i).
Number of Miles constructed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5505 (iii).
Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymnt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2984 (ii).
Quebec-Moncton Section, Progress of Work, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 468 (i).
Quebec-Moncton Section, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Crocket) 263 (i).
Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1938 (i).
—— Purchase of Champlain Market Property: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
Route from Chipman to Grand Falls, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2837, 2980 (ii).
Route through N.B., Rep. of Commissioners: Inquiry for (Mr. O. S. Crocket) 7010 (iv).
—— Reps. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 4118 (iii).
Route from Quebec Bridge, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Morin) 1978 (i).
Route from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2886 (ii).
Steel Rails, Tenders called for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7006 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Surveys and Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Surveys and Construction, N.B. Route: in Com. of Sup., 7670 (iv).
Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 3117 (ii).
Surveys, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1394 (i).
Tax Exemption in N.W. Provs., Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1611 (i).
Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tisdale) 1799 (i).
Western Division, Amounts expended, Verification of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4053 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3634 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. No. 128'.
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5288 (iii).
Grand Manan Life Saving Station, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 936 (i).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grande Riviere de Beaupre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grand Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.
Granite Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Gratuities *re* Immigration to Mr. Young: in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent over-due Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1557 (i).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co.: Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 484 (i).
Grazing Leases granted to Messrs. Hitchcock and McGregor, Transfer to Grand Forks Cattle Co., Q.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Grazing Leases, Sask., Original Applicants, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1061 (i).
——— Applications for Leases, 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1978 (i).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Union of the Empire: prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2585, 2840; wthdrwn., 2901 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Claims *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3591 (ii).
——— Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Great Northern Ry and Mr. J. J. Hill, Insinuations *re* 'Journal' Rep.: Personal Explanation (Mr. D. Ross) 3457 (ii).
Great Salmon River Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Great West Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2574 (ii).
Green, Philip J., et al, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2480 (ii).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Building: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
Grosse Isle Yacht, Tenders *re* Gasolene Engine: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 4046 (iii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2837 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Gypsum, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Hadley, George William, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Half-breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner for 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).
Half-breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number and Name of Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 713 (i).
Halifax Drill Hall Property: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
Halifax Election Protests: Personal Explanation (Mr. Wm. Roche) 7095 (iv).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 894, 1057 (i).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Halifax Naval Dockyards, Relinquishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. C. Macdonnell) 241 (i).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
Halifax, St. Johns, Newfoundland and Liverpool Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
Hall's Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6042 (iv).
Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6257 (iv).
——— Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1062 (i).

Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (iii).
Hamilton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
Hamilton Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Hampton, Postmaster, Mr. Z. Hall, Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).
See 'Hall,' &c.
Hansard, French Edition, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 582; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 582 (i).
See 'Debates of the Hse.'
Harbour au Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 486 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2839 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6991, 7833 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073, 7824 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6932, 7833 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii), 6083 (iv).
Hay, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1867 (i).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District, Conditions *re*: Ques.. (Mr. Bourassa) 7541 (iv).
——— Additional Answer (Mr. Oliver) 7701 (iv).
Hay Shipments, Claims for Refunds, by P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4854 (iii).
Henderson, Alex., Resignation as Judge in B.C. Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2145 (ii).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2147 (ii).
Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3640 (ii).
Hepburn, Mr. W. H., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1558 (i).
Hepburn, W. H. Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1558 (i).
Heraldic Collection of Can., Item in 'Le Canada' *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1057 (i).
Herring Nets *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Higgin's Shore Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7692 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, I.C.R., Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 614 (i).
Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 234 (i).
Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter-Section 22. Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1924 (i).
Homestead Entries, issued on Quarter-Sections 20, &c: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4851 (iii).
——— Section 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c. *re* Patents: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2141 (ii).
——— Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Applications for: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspectors *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) [illegible] (iv).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Homestead Rights on Quarter-Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Hope Island Lighthouse Reserve, Sale of Timber, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 490 (i).
Hops: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Horses, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2414 (ii).
Horses imported, Minimum Tariff Value: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1055 (i).
Horse Power Machines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419, 4549 (iii).
Hot Spring Reservation, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7273 (iv).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Ash Wednesday: M. for Adjournment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2728 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 4841 (iii).
Debates, Official, Staff and Translators' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5177 (iii).
Election of New Members, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
House of Commons, Additions to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
——— Employees, Salaries, Duties, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Bergeron) 2584 (ii).
——— Envelopes furnished to Members: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
House of Commons, Postal Facilities *re* Special Stamps and Postal Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1378 (i).
——— Post Office, Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Legality of Form: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Resignation: Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).
——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3276 (ii).
——— Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 7246 (iv).
See 'London.'
Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5022 (iii).
London Election Investigation, Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 225 (i).
London Electoral District, Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman: Remarks *re* Form (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2943 (ii).
See 'Hyman, Hon. C. S.'
London, East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections for 1905-6, Forms of Writs, &c., issued: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 803 (i).
Montreal (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re:* Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1470 (i).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5553 (iii).
Nicolet Vacancy: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 513 (i).
——— Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 515 (i).
——— Certificate of Election, 1380 (i).
Papers taken from Members' Desks in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
Porch in Entrance: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).
Private Bills, Rule respecting Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 717 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7983 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).
Queen's and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act: Prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2447 (ii).
Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5083 (iii).
St. Mary's Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 468 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Saturday Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).
Three Rivers Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3101 (ii).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4044 (iii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2977 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 582 (i).
——— Statement *re* Information asked: (Mr. Fisher) 617 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3605 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).
Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).
Whip's Rooms, H. of C., Better Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on Conc., 7987 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register 'A,' Disappearance of: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).
——— Recovery of: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7540 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Pension Claims, Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1141 (i), 6011 (iv).
Hudson Bay, Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2574 (ii).
Hudson Bay, Railway to, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3548 (ii).
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Huron and Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation by Govt., Cor. between Five Corporations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1119 (i).
Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii).
——— Survey Steamer, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).
——— Survey Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 7685 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 7246 (iv).
——— Cor., &c.: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2735 (ii).
——— Original Letter and Witnesses: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3104 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier *re* Resignation: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3627 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Legality of Form: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).

——— Resignation as Minister of Pub. Works, and Status as Member of House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 839 (i).

——— Resignation as Minister and Member for London: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).

——— M.(Mr. R. L. Borden) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 3170 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i); (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).

——— Resignation of Portfolio of Public Works: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 92 (i).

——— Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4759 (iii).

——— Second Resignation: Remarks (Mr R. L. Borden) 6790; Tel. read (Mr. Fielding) 6790 (iv).

——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3276 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Further Information *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 581, 1184, 1472 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).

——— Resignation of, Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 514 (i).

See 'London Election Trial', &c.

Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'

IMMIGRATION:

Agents, Apptmnt. in Eastern Townships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1142 (i).

Agents, Belgium, Number, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1805 (i).

Agents, Circulars issued *re* Bonuses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 478 (i).

Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).

Agents in Germany, Number and Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1988 (ii).

Agents in G.B., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).

——— Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).

Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5655 (iii).

Agents in Ont., Number and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).

Agents in Quebec: Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).

Bonuses to Booking Agents: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 4615 (iii).

Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 4519 (iii).

Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1123 (i).

Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2143 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

B.C. Immigration Legislation, Assent to by Lt. Gov.: Remarks (Mr A. Lavergne) 7985 (iv).

British and Continental Bonuses: in Com. of Sup., 7277 (iv).

Chinese Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., Memorial *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7095 (iv).

Circulars issued *re* Bonuses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 478 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 580 (i).

Distribution Agents in Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).

Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 888 (i).

——— Dom. Lands Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5780 (iii).

Doukhobor Colonies, Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers, *re* Inspection of: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).

Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor., Papers, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Cash) 4458 (iii).

Employment Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4861 (iii).

Fraudulent Representations *re* Emigration to Canada in G. B., Cor. with Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 3373 (ii).

French Clergymen expelled from France: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne *re* Immigration Policy, 6150 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 6379 (iv).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6654; Reply, 6673 (iv).

——— Par. in Press *re* Criticisms: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6766 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).

French Immigration to Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1141, 1556 (i).

——— Policy of Govt. *re*: Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for Sup., 6145, 6156 (iv).

Gratuities *re* Immigration, to Mr. Young: in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).

Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 234 (i).

Homestead Entries unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspectors *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).

Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter-Section 22: Entries, &c: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1924 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6245 (iv).
Homestead Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Homestead Rights on Quarter-Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).
Immigrants to Canada from 1901 to 1903, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1382 (i).
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parent) 2633 (ii).
Immigrants, Number of Arrivals, 1906, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 571 (i).
Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Parent) 3189 (ii).
Immigrants, Total Number since 1904, Distribution , &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1053 (i).
Immigration, Deportation of, Expenditure *re:* in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).
Immigration to the Eastern Townships, Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i), 2579 (ii).
Immigration from Eastern Canada to N.W.: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) in Com. of Sup., 6725, 6729, 6737 (iv).
Immigration, Fuel, Provisions, &c. *re* Freight Blockade: in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).
Immigration, Promotion in Mar. Provs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 716 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilmot) in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers' Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4217 (iii).
New Ottawa, Sask., Lands held without performing Settlement Duties: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1046 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1928 (i).
——— Audit of Books: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2884 (ii).
——— Claims, Amounts paid by Govt., Cor. *re:* M. for Ret., (Mr. Monk) 1068 (i).
——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 1147 (i).
——— Moneys paid to 1st Nov. 1906, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 239 (i).
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5788, 5835; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 99) 5857 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 5502 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Railway Fares to Northwest, Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1058 (i).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4855 (iii).
Salvation Army Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).
——— Circulars *re* : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 4453 (iii).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Statement of Mr. Southworth: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 4661, 4667 (iii).
Walker, Mr. Bruce, Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).
Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' *re* Cor. between Sir Wilfrid and Australian Premier: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 4667 (iii).
See 'Colonial Conference', &c.
Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 569 (i).
Imports via Canadian Ports, Value for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 5085 (iii).
Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Indeterminate Sentences: *See* 'Probationary'.
Indian Corn : in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40'.
INDIANS :
Agents and Teachers, Average Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3629 (ii).
Algoma, Land Sales of Indian Reserves, Terms and Conditions *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii), 6015 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3373 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).
Babine Indians, Investigation *re:* in Com. of Sup., 7286, 7293 (iv).
Blood and Piegan Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1131 (i).
——— Opening up for Sale: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Crooked Lake Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4826 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Completion of Survey : Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 5024 (iii).
Garden Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2830 (ii).
Georgian Bay Indian Islands, Sale of, &c : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Giant's Tomb Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner for 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Issued on Quarter-Sections 20, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4851 (iii).
Hot Spring Reservation, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7273 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2957 (ii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 1699 (i), 2415 (ii).
Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).
——— Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7247 (iv).
Lands sold or leased, Number of Acres, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 492 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2835, 2980 (ii).
Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Metlakatla Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295 (ii).
Mississaguas Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 7292 (iv).
Muscowequan Indian Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty, Money, Names, Ages, &c. of Pupils: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1068 (i).
Nipissing Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).
——— Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2832 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2585 (ii).
Oka Indians, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Reserves, Maintenance of Roads and Bridges: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Schools at Fort Alexander, &c., Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4209 (iii).
Schools for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Schools, Qualifications of Teachers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2582 (ii).
Seed Grain to Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 478 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Senghees Indian Reserves, Negotiations for, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Pedley *re* Investigation: M. for Papers* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Superintendent, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 946 (i).
Timber Limits, Indian Reserves, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Yukon, Indians, Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7308 (iv).
See 'Co-operative'.
Industrial Schools for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Inland Navigation Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'

INLAND REVENUE:
Blind River, Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Br. Boyce) 2292 (ii).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, &c., Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1956 (i).
——— Quantity made and sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1121 (i).
——— Ref. to in debate on Budget (Mr. Fielding) 304 (i).
See 'Spirits.'
Excise: in Com. of Sup., 6626, 7294 (iv).
——— Allowance to B.C. Officials: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 1092 (i).
——— Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c. employed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk 946 (i).
Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1057 (i).
Spirits in Bond, Two-year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application and Consolidated Revenue Act of 1882, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Robitaille) 802 (i).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
Standard Chemical Co., O.C.'s, &c. with Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Robitaille) 725 (i).
Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5861 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 6140 (iv).
Total Amount collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1612 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
Tobacco Manufacturers in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1924 (i).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S., 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2141 (ii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 219 (i).
——— Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Wood Alcohol: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Inspection of Barges: *See* 'B. No. 35.
Inspection of Canned Food Products, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 33,' 'B. No. 20.'
Inspection of Electricity: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Inspection of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 162.'

INSURANCE COMMISSION, THE:
Bill, Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Charges against Cabinet Ministers: Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5397; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) ref. to previous debate, 5400; Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 5426; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5426 (iii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5657; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5657; Ruling, 5665; Agreed to (Y. 104; N. 37) 5665 (iii); Debate resmd., 6379; Charges against Members *re* Investment Moneys (Mr. M. Martin) 6399; Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) 6400: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6400; M. (Mr. Foster) that words be taken down, 6402; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6404 (iv).
Charges by Mr. Foster: Notice of Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5509 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. for Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Bourassa) 4771 (iii).
Cor. with Min. of Justice and Commissioners: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 3899,3903 (ii).
Cor. with Messrs. Shepley and Tilley *re* Methods of Investigation, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 241 (i).
Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3844 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3889 (ii).
Evidence *re* Printing and Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr Foster) 93 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2906 (ii).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
——— Printing of: M. on 3rd Rep. of Printing Com. to consider, 5176 (iii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Fielding) 3881 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2997 (ii).

INSURANCE COMMISSION, THE—*Con.*
Evidence; French Translation and Printing: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc. in amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Evidence and Report laid on Table: M. to print, &c. (Mr. Fielding) 3722-3 (ii).
Evidence, Translation and Printing: on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7001 (iv).
Exhibits, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4441, 4615 (iii).
French Translation: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7984 (iv).
Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4118 (iii).
Inquiry for further Cor., not in Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2345 (ii).
Mr. Shepley's Retainer: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3639 (ii).
M. for Senate Papers: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5258 (iii).
Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 5859 (iii).
Remuneration to Mr. Shepley: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3631 (ii).
Rep.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6913; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 92) 6931 (iv).
Report, in Com. of Sup.: Statement (Mr. Foster) 6280 (iv).
——— Remarks *re* Rep. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 992 (i).
Rep., Inquiry for (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2769 (ii), 4091 (iii).
Total Cost, Communications between Min. of Jus. and Counsel *re* Information supplied: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4214 (iii).
Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
——— (fires, &c.): *See* 'B. No. 98.'
——— Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 68.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents and Compensation *re* Injured: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 1055 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Laurence) 3396 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion *re* Question (Mr. Laurence): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1077 (i).
Amherst Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 5177 (iii.)
——— Reply (Mr. Haggart) 5227 (iii).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3837 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7523 (iv).
——— Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1469 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3637 (ii).

——— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3633 (ii).

Cars, &c., Exchanges with U. S. Rys., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2578 (ii).

Cars used in U. S., Return of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7007, 7248 (iv).

Chaudière Junction Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).

Coal Supply, Reps. and Complaints *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1810 (i).

Drawbars on Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Drummondville Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).

Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5086 (iii).

Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).

Facilities and Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

Fire Damages, Claims at Manseau and Lemieux: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 3632 (ii).

Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4850 (iii).

Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Lévis, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 728 (i).

French Language, *re* Time Tables of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).

Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i)

——— Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).

Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c.; Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2983 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmnt., Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 722 (i).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).

——— Purchase of Property at Halifax, O.C., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 241 (i).

——— Roundhouse, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 485 (i).

——— Roundhouse and Machine Shops at Halifax, Purchase of Property, &c., O.C.'s, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 241 (i).

Indiantown and Blackville Branch: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7297 (iv).

I.C.R. and Dom. Atlantic Ry., Windsor Branch Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 615, 1141 (i).

I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Rentals, Betterments, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7069 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

I.C.R. and G.T.R., Running Rights, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2835 (ii).

McDougall and Bruce, Emplymt by Govt.; Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 711 (i).

McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2835 (ii).

Mail Service to Halifax and St. John: Remarks on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Maintenance and Operation: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).

Matthews, Mr. John, Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).

Midnight Train between Montreal and Lévis, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 3180 (ii).

Moncton, Car Shops and Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 7301, 7521 (iv).

——— Lands acquired by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3885 (ii).

——— M. for Reps.* (Mr. Ames) 1148 (i).

——— Purchase of Land at Moncton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1131 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2586 (ii).

Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. of Mr. Joughins: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 722 (i).

Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Newcastle Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iv).

New Glasgow Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Rep. *re* Investigations: M. for Copy (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).

O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stolen Postage Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3181, 3425 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1130 (i).

Passenger Service from Nicolet: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 3632 (ii).

Passenger Tariff in 1904, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1118 (i).

Passenger Tariffs from Truro, Moncton and Lévis: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 729 (i).

Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock, Use of by Strangers: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).

Payments to Geo. Cochrane, *re* Supplies: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).

Pensions to Employees, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1469 (i).

Pictou, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

——— Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 4854 (iii).

——— Station, Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4857 (iii).

Positions created, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1054 (i).

Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 7664 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Record Foundry Co., Purchases of Scrap Iron, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).

Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5780 (iii).

Rivière du Loup Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).

Ste. Flavie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).

St. John, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Duties of Agent: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 2344 (ii).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1134 (i).

Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 2834 (ii).

Scrap Iron, Sale of to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3839 (ii).

Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3838 (ii).

Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2835 (ii).

Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Sydney Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delay in Mails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 615 (i).

Truro, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).

——— Purchase of Land from H. W. Yuill, O.Cs., Valuation, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).

Wallberg, E. A., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1051 (i).

Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).

Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3182 (ii)

——— Printing of Ret.: M. (Mr. Foster) 3277 (ii).

See 'Colonial Conference.'

INTERIOR:

Brown, Beddingfield et al., Grazing Leases, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

Employees in Interior Dept. in N.W. Ter., Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1804 (i).

Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c.: Application for Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1810 (i).

Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering Stock, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 948 (i).

Grazing Lands in Sask., Applications for Leases, 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1978 (i).

Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent overdue Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1557 (i).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co.: Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).

Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 484 (i).

Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).

Grazing Leases granted to Messrs. Hitchcock and McGregor, Transfer to Grand Forks Cattle Co., O.C.s., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).

Grazing Leases, Sask. Original Applicants, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1061 (i).

Homestead Entries, Sections 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c., *re* Patents: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2141 (ii).

Homestead Entries of Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Applications for: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2957 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 1119 (i)

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 992 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 174, 658 (i).

Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).

Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4857 (iii).

Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 231 (i).

Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

Milk River Cattle Co. Transfer of Grazing Leases by E. C. Hall &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i)

Peace River District, B. C., Selection and Location of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2633 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or Grant of to others than Settlers, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Entries: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 223 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
——— Application by C.P.R. for Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1138 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization, Plans filed, Water Rights, Constitution of Incorporated Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1060 (i) .
——— Grants of Lands, &c., in Alberta, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Sale of Land to, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i)
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2143 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. and Section 2 of Twp. 25, Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 485 (i).
——— Date of Homestead Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2139 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co.: Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2491 (ii)
Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1842 (i).
——— Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Shaffner) 1388 (i).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Schaffner) 1564 (i).
Timber Lands sold or leased subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4458 (iii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13. Topographical Surveys, &c.: Rets. M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1066 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Extension to British or Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Intermediate Tariff, *re* German Treaties, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Intermediate Tariff *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 993 (i). *See* 'Tariff', &c.
Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
International Paper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2751 (ii).
International Waterways, Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 514 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6043 (iv).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7804 (iv).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6011 (iv).
Iron Angles for Bedsteads: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Iron Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 173'.
Iron or Steel Bars : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Iron or Steel Beams, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron or Steel Billets: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
——— Amounts paid to Companies: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2979 (ii).
——— Item dropped: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
Iron Piping, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Iron, Rolled or Rolled Steel: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
——— Tubing, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2132 (ii), 4549 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4047 (iii).
Iron or Steel Scrap, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4206 (iii).
Iron or Steel Nuts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Iron and Steel Ry. Bars, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2131 (ii).
Iron, Wrought, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigation *re* Conservation of Water Supplies: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 4453 (iii).

Jamaica Disaster, Govt. Grant: Announcement (Mr. Fielding) 1698 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1879 (i).
——— Govt. Grant: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) 1613 (i).
——— Imperial Prestige, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1842 (i).
——— Jamaica Disaster, Relief B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 2727 (ii).
Japan, Treaty with : *See* 'B. No. 23'.
Jeannette's Wharf Creek, Cost of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Thames River'.
Jersey Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iv).
Joliette and Brandon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15'.
Jordan—Erie Power Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 115, 168'.
Judges Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Judges acting as Directors of Stock Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2144 (ii).
Judges in Review, Que., Slection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4853 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Extra Judicial Work, Cor. &c.: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies*, 1978 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3461 (ii).
Judges of Provl. Courts: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Judges, Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3640 (ii).
——— Retired, resuming Practice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3370 (ii).
——— Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S.: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse. 2206, 2225 (ii).
Justice, Admn. of in Sask. and Alta.: *See* 'B. No. 146'.
JUSTICE :
B.C. Appellate Court, Representation from Provincial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 4945 (iii).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 718 (i).
——— Statement *re* Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Aylesworth) 580; Members remarks checked: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 580 (i).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1056 (i).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Dom. and Ontario, &c., Litigated Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1119 (i).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency *re:* Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt of French Judge: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3185 (ii).
Henderson, Alex., Resignation as Judge in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2145 (ii); M. for Cor. &c.: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2147 (ii).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Extra Judicial Work, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies*, 1978 (i).
Judges Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3640 (ii).
Judges, Retired, resuming Practice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3370 (ii).
Judges in Review, Que., Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4853 (iii).
Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).
Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7689 (iv).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
MacIlwraith, T. R., Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2144, 2292 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).
——— Verdict *re* Charges against Halifax Papers: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Complaints *re* Delays in Judgments: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 884, 1927 (i).
Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4858 (iii).
N.S. Supreme Court Vacancy, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
N.S. Supreme Court Judgeship, Vacancy *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1300 (i), 5508 (iii), 7009 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2206, 2225 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6765 (iv).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation, and State of Health: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4046 (iii).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re:* Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, General Vote: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2828 (ii).
Revised Statutes B., Copy laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 1470 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1382 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 481 (i).
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4856 (iii).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship, Apptmnt. *re:* Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Conmee) 3638 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Northern Advance': Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4368 (iii).
Sol. Gen.'s Office, Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 841 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).
Sunday Legislation, Legal Expenses of R. U. Macpherson: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Supreme Court Library: in Com. of Sup., 7693 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 3641 (ii).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re:* Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).
——— Complaint from Chief Justice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Vacancy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).
——— Cor., &c., read: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3916; Neg. (Y. 50, N. 83) 3949 (iii).
——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 840 (i).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).
Yukon, Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
——— Judges' Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
Just, Mr. C. F., Causes for Suspension: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 489 (i).
——— Suspension and Re-instatement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 228 (i).
——— Remarks: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).
Kaien Island Land Grant, O.C.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3977 (iii).
Kelly, Mr. John, Compensation for Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, Awards &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1385 (i).
'Kestrel,' Str., Cor., &c., *re* Provisioning for Year 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 580 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Kennedy) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).
——— Supplies purchased, Cor., &c., with Agents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1470 (i).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredges: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
King, and H. E. Lyon, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 4839 (iii).
Kingston Barracks, Repairs to Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1140 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 724 (i).
La Banque Nationale: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Labour Dept., Printing 'Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 3579 (ii).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Private Secretary's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
——— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1150 (i), 2590. Neg. (Y. 40; N. 78) 3696; Amt. (Mr. R. Smith) agreed to (Y. 78; N. 40) 3697 (ii).
Labour Dispute Bill, Distribution of: Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 1378 (i).
——— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Stockton) 1299, 1330 (i).
——— N.S. Coal Strikes: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6005 (iv).
Labour on Public Works, Hours: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Labour Strikes Prevention: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Labour Troubles: *See* 'Coal Strikes,' 'Strikes and Lockouts.'
Lachine Canal, Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
——— Delay *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1124 (i).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

Lake St. François, Beauce: Wharfs in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lake St. John Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6110 (iv).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion of by American Fishermen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
Lake Superior Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Lakeville Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Fishing Restriction, Cor. *re* with Board of Trade, Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1067 (i).
Lamontagne and 'Le Soleil' Cos., Amounts paid to for 1906-7: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3631 (ii).
——— Ans. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3727 (ii).
Lamp Black, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Lamp Springs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4391 (iii).
Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &s., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 231 (i).
Landsdowne, Mail Service from Night Trains: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2581 (ii).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7, and 13, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4857 (iii).
Lands, Public: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
See 'Interior,' 'Immigration,' &c.
Land Sales in N.W. and Insurance Investigation, Charges against Conservative Members: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 3314 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission,' &c.
Lands taken for Ry. Purposes: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Lands for Schools: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5022 (iii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Laurier Tower, Collapse, Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4665 (iii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lead Bounties, Amounts paid, Names of Companies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 4053 (iii).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Leather Combine: *See* 'Boots and Shoes.'
Leather Goods, Increase in Shipments to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
'Le Canada,' Attack on Dr. Sproule, &c., *re* French Clergy: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).
Leech, Mr. R. E., McLean, and Others, Emplymnt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 2985 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
Lees, Mr. W. A. D., Contracts, Agreements, Cor., &c. *re* Fencing Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 802 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 710 (i).
Legal Expenses, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Legislative Union, &c., Correction in Hansard: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 5509 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
'Lena M.', Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 3189 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).
'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Abuse of Mr. Fielding: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4052 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Speech: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Dubeau) 3843 (ii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4217 (iii).
Lethbridge District Water Reserves Lands, Sale of, Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4216 (iii).
Lethbridge Coal Strike: *See* 'Coal Famine.'
Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase in Number: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Letter Carrier Service, N.W.T. Extension to Calgary and Edmonton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 615 (i).
Level Crossings of Railways: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Library Bureau Headquarters: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3837 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 611 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
——— Purchase of Books: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Life Saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
——— maintained in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
Life-Saving Station on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 479 (i).
Life-Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 898 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5864, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5869 (iii).
——— Repairs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i). *See* 'Marine.'
Lime Juices: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2044 (ii).
Lime Kiln Channel, Lake Erie, Regulations *re* Boats passing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4045 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 942 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Liquid Fillers for Varnishes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (iii).
Liquor Permits granted by J. D. McGregor in Yukon, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4211 (iii).
L'Isle d'Alma, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Litigated Expenses, Dom. and Ontario, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Litigation Expenses, Interior: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).
Little Beausoleil Island, Sale to Mr. W. S. Pratt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833, 2984 (ii).
Little Current, North Channel, Georgian Bay Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
Live Stock Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Live Stock Products Compensation *re* Slaughter of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on conc., 7988 (iv).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 2983 (ii).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 724 (i).
Lockouts, &c.: *See* 'Strikes.'
Locomotives, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).
London, East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections for 1905-6, Forms of Writs &c., Issued: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 803 (i).
London Election Investigation, Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 225 (i).
——— *See* 'Election Oaths.'
London Electoral District, Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman: Remarks *re* Form (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
London Election, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2943 (ii).
London, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office Improvements, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 7251 (iv).
London and St. Clair Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Long Sault Rapids and International Waterways: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7544 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4611 (iii).
——— Prohibition of Sunday School Papers: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5023 (iii).
Lotbinière and Portneuf Counties, Wharfs, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6114 (iv).
'Lowrey's Claim,' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails: M. for Copies* (Mr. Galliher) 490 (i).
Lumber Combine in N.W.T., Charges *re*: M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1816 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii); M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add name, 4117 (iii).
Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
Lyon, H. E. v. Malcolm McKenzie, &c., Cor. *re* Exchequer Court Suit: M. for Copies* (Mr. Herron) 2838 (ii).
Lyon, Victor Harold, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Morin) 490 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Morin) 235 (i).
Mackintosh Clothing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5023
——— Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 3884 (ii).
McCormick and Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 566 (i).
McCracken and McCann, Messrs., Application for Lands, Papers, &c. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 578 (i).
McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid Post Office, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).
McDougald, Mr. J., Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
McDougald and Bruce, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt., I.C.R., Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 711 (i).
McGee, Thos. D'Arcy, Monument, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7700 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. in Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

McGregor, Mr. J. D. ,Yukon License Inspector, Number of Permits granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4211 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services: M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2144, 2292 (ii).

—— Verdict *re* Charges against Halifax Papers: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2978 (ii).

'McKeen, G. A." Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 468 (i).

McNiven, Mr. J. A., Apptmnt. to Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6619 (iv).

McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., I.C.R., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2835 (ii).

McPherson, Arthur Leon, Relief of: *See* 'B. 157.'

Mabou Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).

Macaroni: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1866 (i).

Machinery for Sugar Refining, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).

Machinery, Packed, &c. from G.B., Preferential Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).

Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G.T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 950, 1064, 1130 (i).
See 'Railways.'

Magazines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

—— Tariff Rates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).

Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. on Sup., 6114 (iv).

Magdalen Islands and Mainland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Complaints *re* Delays in Judgments: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 884 (i), 1927 (i).
See 'Justice.'

Magog Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2140 (ii).

Mail Carriers, Increases in Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).

Mail Service, Country Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Mail Service, I.C.R., to Halifax and St. John: Remarks on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).

'Maisonneuve,' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3633 (ii).

Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).

Malleable Chains, Sprockets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4390 (iii).

Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3370 (ii).

Malloy, John P., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6012 (iv).

Malone and Hopkins Point Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Malt Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).

Manilla Rope, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. Brown: Ques. (Mr. Bole) 3839 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2295 (ii).

—— Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Greenway) 1803 (i).

—— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4857 (iii).
See 'Provincial Subsidies, &c.

Man. Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 116.'

Man. Franchise Act, Frauds *re* Elections: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner), 7924 (iv).

Man. Judges' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4858 (iii).

Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2982 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Manufacturers' Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2634 (ii).

Maps, Engraving, &c., Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).

Maps, Printing and Lithographing: in Com. of Sup., 7275 (iv).

Marble, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).

Marble Mountain Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6050 (iv).

Marbles, Tombstones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4191 (iii).

Marconi Stations: in Conc., 7987 (iv).

Marconi Stations *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).

Marconi Tel. Co. and Contract with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1299 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1299 (i).

Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7541 (iv).

Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5085 (iii).

Marine Engineers' Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an English Minister: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 5860 (iii).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 480 (i).

Bay of Quinte Lights: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).

Bronte Lighthouse, Allowances to Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).

'Canada,' Design *re* Flag: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).

Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).

Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada, &c.: M. for Ret.*. (Mr. Macdonell) 2146 (ii).

Clarke City, Marconi Station: in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).

Coasting Trade, Canadian Legislation *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1051 (i).

Coasting Trade, Countries admitted to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3369 (ii).

Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1445 (i).

'Golspie' Str., Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1097 (i).

——— Name of Port of Entry: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).

——— Rep. of Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2346, 2590 (ii).

——— Total Amounts paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5766, 5946 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).

Grand Manan Life Saving Station, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 936 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii).

——— Steamer, B.C.,: in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).

Kestrel, Str., Cor., &c. *re* Provisioning for year 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 580 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Supplies: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Kennedy) 5969 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

'Kestrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, Cor., &c., with Agents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1470 (i).

'Lena M.' Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 3189 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).

Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii), 7678 (iv).

Life Saving Stations, maintained in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2293 (ii).

——— Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 479 (i).

——— P. E. I. Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 893 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5864, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).

——— Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).

——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5869 (iii).

——— Repairs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).

Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 942 (i), 5767 (iii).

Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).

'McKeen, G. A.,' Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3633 (ii).

Marconi Stations *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii); Conc., 7987 (iv).

Marine Biological Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 219 (i), 4518 (iii).

——— Book-keeping Re-organization, Expenditure *re:* in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iii), 7678

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii), 7678 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Auditing of Purchases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 709 (i).

Marine Hospitals, Seamen's Fund: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii).

Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).

Marine Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).

Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Premier McBride, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 481 (i).

See 'Vancouver.'

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine Supplies, Purchases of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5874 (iii).
'Monarch,' SS., Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5867 (iii).
'Neptune,' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3637 (ii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Patrol Boats for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5772 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collection of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
Pilots of Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3885 (ii).
——— Tour de Role System: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Point Pelee Life Saving Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., 931 (i).
Port Credit Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
P.E.I. Life Saving, &c., Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) Remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 993 (i).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2836 (ii).
Red Island Light, near Riviere du Loup, Loss of Sailors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 941 (i).
'Resolute' Wreck and Life Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re:* Remarks (Mr. Kemp) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, &c., P.E.I., 934 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3641 (ii).
St. John Harbour Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
——— Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots *re* Widening, and Grounding of SS. 'Victorian': Ques. (Mr. Monk) 573 (i).
——— Dredging at Cap a la Roche, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 575 (i).
Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2836 (ii).
Signal Service between Montreal and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
'Sovinto,' Ship, Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train *re* Life-Boats: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1064 (i).
MARINE—*Con.*
'Sovinto,' Wreck of, Request to Govt. for Life-Boats of Govt. Strs.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 711 (i).
'Strathmore,' Str., Wreck of, Investigation into: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1383 (i).
Sub-Marine Signals for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2830 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Stations, *re* Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 487 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 579 (i).
See 'Marine Road.'
Waubaushene Light: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 5771 (iii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1392 (i).
Marriages of Minors: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Martin, Thos., late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4518 (iii).
Maskinongé River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Masonic Protective Assen.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Masters and Mates Certificates Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 7517 (iv).
——— Evidence and Papers of Sel. Com.: M. to lay on Table (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1985 (ii).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Contract: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Matrices for Printing Newspapers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
Matrices, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
See 'Tariff,' &c.
Matthews, Mr. John, I. C. R. Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904
Meaford Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5895 (iii).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6961 (iv).
Meats, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6633 (iv).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4039 (iii).
Medicines, Patent, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2116 (ii).
See 'Patent Medicines.'

Melons, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1909 (i).
Members introduced: 3, 515 (i).
Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 5890 (iii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Purchases of Goods, &c.: by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i).
Mess from His Ex., Estimates, 1907-8: Read (Mr. Speaker) 278 (i), 2294 (ii)
Mess from His Ex., Reply to Address: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1044 (i).
——— Estimates, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 5643 (iii).
See 'Estimates.'
Metallic Trading Checks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii).
Metals, Tariff Changes: Read in Budget Speech (Mr. Fielding) 313 (i).
Meteorological Service, Allowance to Mr. A. W. Found: in Com. of Sup., 7684 (iv).
——— Gratuity to Mrs. Harrison: in Com. of Sup., 5960 (iii).
Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295 (ii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Complaints *re* Irregularity of: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2831 (ii).
Mid'and Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123'.
Militia Pension Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 144'.
Militia Stores, Marking: *See* 'B. No. 85'.

MILITIA:

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5735 (iii).
——— Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp: Ques. (Mr. Hunt) 1050 (i).
Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6136 (iv).
Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 474 (i).
British Soldiers, Honourably Discharged, as Settlers in Canada: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 736 (i).
Clothing, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 2883 (ii).
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 490 (i).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 4045 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Esquimalt Military Station, Establishment of Schools of Instruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3370 (ii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 713 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations. Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 894, 1057 (i).
Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6634, 7700 (iv).
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parent) 2633 (ii).
Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Parent) 3189 (ii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, Awards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1385 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6633, 7248 (iv).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
Military Stores, Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 720 (i).
Military Stores, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2408 (ii).
Militia, Cost *re* aiding Civil Power, Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 895 (i).
Militia Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
Militia, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii), 7686 (iv).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 5084 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7780 (iv).
Militia Drill Sheds: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4615 (iii).
Militia Estimates, Annual Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 5647 (iii).
Militia Properties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii), 7981 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1799 (i).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Naval Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2147 (ii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Officers and Provisional Courses Allowance: M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 1072 (i).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).
Permanent Forces, Tactical Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1050 (i).
Petewawa Militia Camp, Confiscation of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxation: Remarks (Mr. White) 6519 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7610 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6910 (iv).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Rifle Matches, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 485 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Ross Rifles, Abandonment by N.W. Mounted Police, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 614 (i).
——— Accidents in N. W. Mounted Police, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
——— Accidents, &c., at St. Johns, N.B., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4213 (iii).
——— Amounts paid to Sir Charles Ross and Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 5025 (iii).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Worthington) 727 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 3732 (ii).
——— Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
——— Defects *re:* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. S. Hughes) 5026 (iii).
——— Defects, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).
——— Factory, Erection of, Cor., &c.: M for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1977 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2833 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Worthington) 1398 (i).
——— Mounted Police, Question *re*: Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 572 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased and Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 222 (i).
——— Pattern inspected by Commissioners of 1901: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4216 (iii).
——— Reports from Officers *re* Defects: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4273 (iii).
——— Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 4053 (iii).
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Royal Scots Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5656 (iii).
Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 476 (i).
Smith, Lt. Col. H., and Medals Board, Payment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7248 (iv).
S.A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7311 (iv).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants, &c: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 730 (i)
——— Terms and Conditions, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4665 (iii).
South African War, and B.C. Soldiers, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ross) 3373 (ii).
S.A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7542 (iv).
Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor., O.Cs. with Militia Dept., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— M. to ref. Papers to Pub Accts. Com., (Mr. Foster) 3887, 3977 (ii).
Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 225 (i).
Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 719 (i).
13th Haldimand Battalion, Militia Arms, Amounts paid for Storage: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2828 (ii).
Toronto Fort, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Training Schools: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Warburton Property, P.E.I., Purchase of for Rifle Range, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2584 (ii).
Milk Inspection: *See* 'Inspection and Sale B. No. 84.'
Milk River Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by E. C. Hall, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Mines, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Mines Dept., Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5688 (iii).
See 'Geological Survey.'
Mining Machinery: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4420 (iii).
Ministers of the Crown, Charges *re* Graft, &c.: *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
Minors' Marriages: *See* 'B. No. 176.
Mispec Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Mississaguas Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 7292 (iv).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen: Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1379 (i).
Modus Vivendi, Licenses and Fines on U.S. Vessels, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1049 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Molasses: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4180 (iii).
'Monarch', SS, Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
Moncton Car Shops, Land Purchase, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7301, 7521 (iv).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2586 (ii).
——— Location, Equipment, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Ames) 1148 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3885 (ii).
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2985 (ii).
Monotypes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4401 (iii).
'Montague', Dredge, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3189 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2980 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Montreal, (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re* Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1470 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *Se* 'B. No. 166.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman, as per Statute 6, Edward VII, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
——— Nominations and Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 236 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dry Dock, Plans, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2581 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, Erection of Sheds, Contract *re* Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 237 (i).
——— Lower Division, St. Mary's Current: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
Montreal and Manchester SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1799 (i).
Montreal Pilots, Tour de Role, System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Goods, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1989 (ii).
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, Reps. in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2228 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 503 (i).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Rep. *re* Packing Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 229 (i).
Moose Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Morgan, Henry J., Cor. *re* Superannuation, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stewart) 239 (i).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5753 (iii).
Mortgages of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Mossy River, Man., Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Motor Cars, I.C.R., Investigation and Rep. of Mr. Joughins: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 722 (i).
Mould Boards, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Mulgrave Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Murray Canal, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
See 'Railways, P.E.I.', &c.
Muscowequan Indian Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty Money, Names, Ages, &c. of Pupils: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1068 (i).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5867 (iii).
National Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
See 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Naturalization Act: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Naval Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).

Neepawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
'Neptune,' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3637 (ii).
N. B. Petroleum Co. and Memramcook and Dover Oil Co., Quantities purchased and prices paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchases by Govt. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1052 (i).
New Campbellton Wharf, Kelly's Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1395 (i).
Newcastle Improvements, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iv).
New Glasgow Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).
New Ottawa, Sask., Lands held without performing Settlement Duties: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1046 (i).
Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stockton) 2757 (ii).
New Westminster, Marine and Indian Agencies Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
New Zealand Flax, Experiments in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5286 (iii).
Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 487 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment to Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 567 (i).
——— International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.Cs. &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lancaster) 1426 (i).
Nichols Copper Co's Patents: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Nicolas, Mr. F., Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
Nicolet Electoral District: Certificate of Election, 1380 (i).
——— Vacancy: Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 515 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 513 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Co.'s subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii)
——— Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2832
——— Surrender of, O.Cs. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2585 (ii).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1928 (i).
——— Audit of Books: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3884 (ii).
——— Claims, Amount paid by Govt., Cor. *re*: M. for Ret., (Mr. Monk) 1038 (i).
——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 1147 (i).
——— Moneys paid to 1st Nov. 1906, Cor. &c.: for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 239 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup, 6751 (iv).
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse: Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5835; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 99) 5857 (iii).
——— notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 5502 (iii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4023 (iii).
Northern Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13'.
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 2349 (ii).
North Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
North Lake Post Office, P.E.I, Change in Location: Ques (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7249 (iv).
North Rustico Harbour Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 475 (i).
Northwest Land Deals and Insurance Commission, Charges (Mr. Fowler) *re* Members and Minister, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3428 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police, Compensation *re* Accidents: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iv).
——— Patrol Boats in Hudson's Bay: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (ii).
——— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
——— Rep. Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3546 (ii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt., Commissioner White's Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iv).
N.W.T. Act (powers of commissioner, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 76'.
Northwestern Trusts Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
N.S. Bench, Resignations and Apptmnts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1300 (i), 7009 (iv).
N.S. Chief Justice, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5508 (iii).
N.S. Judiciary, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6765 (iv).

N.S. Judiciary, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser, as Lt. Governor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Nuts, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Oak Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1'.
Oatmeal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1374 (i).
Oats: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1372 (i).
Observatory at Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5766, 5946 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Office Specialty Co., Purchases from: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Oil and Gas Borings, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
Oils, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Oils, for Paints, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Oka Indians, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Old Age Pensions: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3374 (ii).
Old Man's River, Stream Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
Ontario Development Power Co.: Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* Committee (Mr. Bennett) 6910 (iv).
Ont. Hudson's Bay and Western Rys. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.
Ont. and Que. Ry. Ferry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88'.
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary, Increased Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4219 (iii).
Opium, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Orangeville Post Office, Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 7249 (iv).
Orders-in-Council, Commission *re* Codifying: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4657 (iii).
—— Consolidation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4946 (iii).
Orders of the Day, Printing in English: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 7838 (iv).
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24'.
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1130 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3181, 3425 (ii).
Otonabee River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Otonabee River Water Power, Leasing of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4612 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Architect's Plans *re* New Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
—— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
—— Eastern Block: in Com. of Sup., 3950 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Elevators, Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4609 iii).
—— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3585 (ii).
—— Gas and Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
—— H. of C. Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).
—— Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
—— Museum: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
—— Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1799 (i).
—— Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1562 (i).
—— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
—— Post Office, Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1557 (i).
—— Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 4053 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3839 (ii).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
—— Supreme Court Building: in Com. of Sup., 3625 (ii).
—— Sussex St. and Mackenzie Avenue Properties: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 3951 (ii).
—— Sussex St. Property, Mr. Riopelle's Commission: Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 3627 (ii).
See 'Properties'.
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Balance Sheet *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3002 (ii).
—— Inquiry for O.C. (Mr. Foster) 1991 (ii).
—— Number of Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6905 (iv).
Ottawa Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Ottawa Terminals Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation and State of Health: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4046 (iii).
Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
Pacific Cable, Compensation *re* Losses: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1559 (i).
Paper, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
Paper Combines, Investigation into, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).

Papers taken from Members' Desks in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2344 (ii).
Paris Green, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Parkhill Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Parliament Buildings, Covering for Steps: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 174 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex. Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Parrsboro Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Paspebiac and Gaspé SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Passenger Tickets on Rys. Sale Bill, Change in Rev. Statutes: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7309 (iv).
Passes to Members on SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Patent Medicines, Inspection Act: Prop. Res., M. (Mr. Templeman) 2637 (ii).
Patent Medicines Bill, Legislation this Session: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 5863 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* proceeding with (Mr. Fielding) 7439 (iv).
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Patent of 'Damen, Wm. A.': *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Patent of International Paper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Patents of Nichols Copper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Patent of Philip J. Green, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Patent of Geo. E. Smith Co.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Patent of Summers, E. W., &c.: *See* B. No. 9.'
Patrick, Mr. J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 569 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 576 (i).
Patrol Boats for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5772 (iii).
Patterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).
Peace River District, B.C., Selection and Location of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2633 (ii).
——— Exploratory Survey, Rep. Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3189 (ii).
Pease: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 2828 (ii).
Penitentiaries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1292 (i).
——— General Vote; in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
Percé Wharf, North Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Pere Marquette Ry., Litigation *re* Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Peribonka River Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Perishable Food Products: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Permanent Forces, Tactical Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1050 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Montmagny Patronage (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2482 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Relationship to Mr. Sifton, 7131 (iv).
See 'Privilege,' &c.
Petawawa Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6910 (iv).
——— Compensation *re* Timber Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5656 (iii).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxation: Remarks (Mr. White) 6519 (iv).
——— Confiscation of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7610 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6077, 7825 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Petroleum, Bounties *re*, Total Amounts: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4052 (iii).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Pickles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1886 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1613 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collection of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Pictou Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 4854 (iii).
Pictou Station, Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4857 (iiii).
Picture Frames in Govt. Buildings, Repairing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).
Pig Iron used in Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U. S., Names of Ports of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 708 (i).
Pilots of Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3885 (ii).
——— Tour de Role System: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineers, Rep., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 230 (i).
Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 897 (i).
Plums, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Poaching in Lake Superior, Patrol *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3372 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 219 (i).
Point Pelee Life Saving Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., 931 (i).
Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5023 (iii).
Pointes aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6116 (iv).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Political Partisanship: *See* 'Govt. Officials,' &c.
Portable Engines *re* Agricultural Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4407, 4414 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges by (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Conmee) 7898, 7919 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) referring to past debate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7901, 7922 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbours: in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iii).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Port Bruce Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4666 (iii).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6965 (iv).
——— Material purchased, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 483 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 484 (i).
Port Credit Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 726 (i).
Porter's Lake Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Junction Ry. Station, Cor. with Ry. Dept., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McLennan) 3373 (ii).
Port Hood Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3181 (ii).
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry Service: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Ward) 7579 (iv).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474, 489 (i).
Port Maitland, Dredging at Port Dalhousie Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).
Port Stanley, Customs Collection for 1900-6: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
——— Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
——— Burwell and Port Bruce Harbours: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Marshall) 3277 (ii).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

POST OFFICE:

Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6632 (iv).
Ass't Dep. P. M. G.: in Com. of Sup., 7691 (iv).
Belleville Post Office, Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1989 (ii).
Belleville Post Office and Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2837 (ii).
Bethany Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 723 (i).
Bethany Ass't Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 1147 (i).
Bethany and Millbrook Post Office, Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ward) 1148 (i).
Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1558 (i).
Brandon Post Office, Man.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
——— Names of Employees, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2838 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Appointments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 501 (i).
C.P.R. Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stockton) 491 (i).
Centreville Postmaster, Absence of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Removal from Belleville: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 7781 (iv).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2143 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
——— Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 4458 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6697 (iv).
Eastern Townships Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
'Empress of Britain' Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Roche) 950 (i).
'Empress of Ireland', Delays in Canadian Fast Mails, *re* Halifax Route: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1059 (i).
Galt Post Office Repairs, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1124 (i).
Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practices, *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6257 (iv).
Harbour au Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 486 (i).
Post Office, House of Commons, Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Lakeville Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).
Lansdowne Mail Service from Night Trains: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2581 (ii).
Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I., Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 723 (i).
Letter Carrier Service, N.W.T. Extension to Calgary and Edmonton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 615 (i).
Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase in Number: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
'Lowrey's Claim' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails: M. for Copies* (Mr. Galliher) 490 (i).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid Post Office, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).
Mail Carriers, Increases in Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Mail Service, Country Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).
Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2982 (ii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Complaints *re* Irregularity of: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2831 (ii).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
North Lake Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location, Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7249 (iv).
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary, Increased Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4219 (iii).
Orangeville Post Office, Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 7249 (iv).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2344 (ii).
Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cancellation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 473 (i).
Postal Cards coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 5284 (iii).
Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Papers: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 572 (i).
Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, P.E.I., Inauguration of: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3425 (ii).
Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2636 (ii).
Postal Express, Legislation *re*, Ref. to in Speech on Address, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 613 (i).
Postal Parcel System, Protest *re* Extension in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2829 (ii).
Postal Rates between G.B. and Canada, Reduction of: Announcement (Mr. Lemieux) 6630; Explanation, 6636 (iv).
Postal Station, Pointe St. Charles: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2575 (ii).
Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and Due: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 219 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postmasters in Rural District, Increases in Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii), 6621 (iv).
——— Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5779 (iii).
——— Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5779 (iii).
——— Ref. to in Com. on P.O. Bill, 7022 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7780 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7982 (iv).
Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii), 6620 (iv).
Post Offices in Cities, Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2583 (ii).
——— Employees' Salaries, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Employees, Ottawa, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2289 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 6519 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3158 (ii).
Post Office, Outside Service, Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup. 6623 (iv).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carred during 1907: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3186 (ii).
——— System *re:* Ques. (Mr. Ward) 2829 (ii).
Registration Fees on Letters, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3185 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, between Can. and U.S., Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2840 (ii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress, *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
St. Timothy Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2828 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4611 (iii).
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age, &c., Loss of Registered Letters: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).
Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7542 (iv).
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1125 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6696 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Toronto Mails from East, Cost of Carrying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1121 (i).
Vaulvagnas Beach Post Office, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1066 (i).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 896 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence of Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 888 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Blain) 889 (i).
Potash: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Damage on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4456 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, British: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526-7 (i).
——— *re* British Goods applicable to goods shipped to Canadian Ports: Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4276, 4291 (iii).
——— Distinction between G. B. and other Colonies or the Empire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
See 'Tariff,' 'German.'
Prescott Wharf, Govt. Assistance to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
——— Evidence *re* Charges against, and Aptmnt. by Govt.: M. for Copy (Mr. U. Wilson) 576 (i).
——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa: Inquiry for Paper (Mr. Lennox) 3728 (ii).
——— delay in answering question *re:* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5506 (iii).
——— Rep. to English Press *re* Immigration to S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2984 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2958 (ii).
Prince Albert District, Hay Permits, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 7541 (iv).
See 'Interior.'
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Prince Arthur's Visit: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
P.E.I., Claims for Refund *re* Hay Shipments: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4854 (iii).
——— Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 481 (i).

P.E.I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3883 (ii).
——— Fruit Inspector, Applications *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
P.E.I. Life Savings, &c., Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) Remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 993 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1078 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Freight Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1089 (i).
——— Telegraph Communication: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1297 (i).
P.E.I., Provincial Subsidy, Basis of Arrangement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5084 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).
——— Changes *re*, Protest *re* Winter Timetable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Additional Subsidy, Delegates' Memo *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1800 (i).
——— Claims of Mrs. Wiggins and Mr. C. Malley *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1144 (i).
——— Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 717 (i).
——— Kitchen, Mr. W., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 7984 (iv).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1382 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Bridge Branches, Expropriation of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 470 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lefurgey) 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1136 (i).
——— Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1388 (i).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Information *re:* (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1991 (ii).
——— Marconi Co.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1858 (i).
——— Rep. *re:* Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3547 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph Service, Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1809 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Investigation, Reports, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 945 (i).
——— Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 3189; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Seconder, 3206 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4667 (iii).
——— Communication with N. S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1042 (i).
——— Construction of Ice-breakers: Ques. (Mr J. J. Hughes) 3636 (ii).
——— Empress' and Stanley', Strs. Laying off for Season: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 703; Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 703 (i).
——— Ice-bound Steamers. Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service, &c: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 4929 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3186 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Contract *re* carrying Mails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 947 (i).
——— Mail Service, Negligence of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3887 (ii).
——— Names of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 612 (i).
——— Prime Minister's Remarks *re* Tunnel: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4370 (iii).
——— Res. of Board of Trade *re* Tunnel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 716 (i).
——— Steamers, Total Cost and Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1986 (ii).
——— Tel. read *re* Closing of Channel (Mr. Lefurgey) 512 (i).
——— Terms of Union, *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1927 (i).
Printing Bureau, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 3886 (ii).
——— Rules and Regulations Governing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 2147 (ii).
Printing Committee, 3rd Rep.: Translation and Printing of Insurance Rep. and Evidence: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc., 7001 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in amended Rep., (Mr. Parmelee) 7124 (iv).
Printing Materials, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
Printing Paper: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).
Printing of Parlt.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5176 (iii).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 611 (i).
Private Bills Com.: M. (Mr. D. Ross) to sit concurrently with Hse, 7246 (iv).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2480 (ii).
——— Bills from the Senate: M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4927 (iii).
——— Pets., Expiration of Time for Receiving: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1981 (ii).

Private Bills, Pets.: M. to receive (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2068; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2068 (ii).
——— Pets. *re*: M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1920 (i).
——— Rule respecting Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 717 (i).
——— Translation of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 708 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Charges of Graft, &c. against Ministers (Mr. Bourassa) 3428 (ii). *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
——— *re* Correction in Hansard: (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6544 (iv).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star,' *re* Collusion with Militia Dept. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6907 (iv).
Privy Council, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2764 (ii).
Probationary System and Indeterminate Sentences, Observation of Mr. Justice McMahon: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3841 (ii).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7983; Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).
Prorogation and Govt. Business, Bills withdrawn: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 7438 (iv).
Protective Association of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Provincial Boundaries Extension, &c., Cor. Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sifton) 240 (i).
——— Additions since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5285 (iii).
Provincial Premiers Conference: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 703 (i).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 486 (i).
Provl. Rights, Encroachment on: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
——— *See* 'Petawawa Military Camp.'
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Res. 5177; Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5343, Neg. (Y. 34; N. 96) 5373; Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5346; Ques. of Order on Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5358; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5378; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5382; Amt. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5385 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj.: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4861; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5288 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies and Quebec Resolutions, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2584 (ii).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2836 (ii).
Prudential Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Prudential Savings Society :*See* 'B. No. 80.'
Public Accounts Com.: M. to add Name (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4440 (iii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Sittings, 5561 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) to conc. *re* Collingwood Dock, 3840 (ii).
——— G. T. P. Payments, 6th Rep.: M. to consider (Mr. Barker) 4771 ; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 5027 (iii).
——— 11th-24th Reps.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6764 (iv).
Public Accounts Com. *re* Collingwood Ship Building Co.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) *re* Sittings: Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
——— Delayed Returns: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2907 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Papers: Remarks (Mr. L. L. Borden) 3459 (ii).
——— Documents produced at next Session's Sittings : M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7125 (iv).
——— Production of Deptl. Documents: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 2999 (ii).
Public Accounts Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. Fielding) 219 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3545 (ii).
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1387 (i).
Public Expenditure, Criticism, on Financial Situation: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (i).
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or grant of to others than Settlers, O.C.'s, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
Public Works and Hours of Labour: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Public Works, Preservation of Peace: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

PUBLIC WORKS :

Alexandra Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii).
Allegash River, Diversion of Water : Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 6635 (iv).
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
Anse du Cap Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Anse a L'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6019 (iv).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Beaver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Belle River Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 484 (i).
Belleville Drill Hall and Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Delays in Building: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1397 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Contract *re*, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i), 2632 (ii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6094 (iv).
Big Lorraine Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Blance River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Bracebridge Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii).
Brockville Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
——— Generally, Clerks of Works, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4043 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii), 7822 (iv).
——— N.B., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4018, 4598 (iii).
——— Ont., Total Cost and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1387 (i).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Sask., Alberta, and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1394 (i).
Calgary Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Cap a la Roche, Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (iv).
Champlain Market Property and G.T.P. Station, Building, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
Charlesville Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building: M. for Copies* (Mr. Blain) 2840 (ii).
Charlo's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6095 (iv).
Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4048 (iii).
Chicago Drainage Canada, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 2577 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pier Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
Chockfish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6075 (iv).
Church Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Clam Point, Cape Sable Islands Canal, Access to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3188 (ii).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2836 (ii).
Clifton (Stonehaven) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 721 (i).
Colborne Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Contracts let by Govt. to Ottawa Contractors: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
——— Purchase of Lumber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Culloden Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6023 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Digby Harbour Improvements, Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Disraeli Wharf: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7827 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dominion Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Dorchester Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6097 (iv).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Dredging, Mar. Provinces: in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iv).
Dredging for 1901-6, Names of Harbours, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2584 (ii).
Dunnville Drill Hall, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474 (i).
Eastern Townships Counties, Public Works, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2838 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr Worthington) 2581 (ii).
Edmonton, Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Escoumains Pier Extension :in Com. of Sup., 6098 (iv).
Eskasoni Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Father Point Wharf and Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (iv).
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
'Fielding, W. S.,' Dredge, Construction and Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3187 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McLean, A. A.) 1798 (i).
Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
Fraser River Improvements of Ship Channel and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 719 (i).
'Galveston' Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transferrence, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 574 (i).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Water Pipe Laying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2575 (ii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Glace Bay Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
See 'Dom. Coal,' &c.
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup.: 6950 (iv).
Grand Etang Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iv).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grande Riviere de Beaupre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Great Lake Dredging Co., Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Great Salmon River Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2574 (ii).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Building: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2837 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Halifax Drill Hall Property: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
Hall's Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6042 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (iii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6991, 7833 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073, 7824 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6932, 7833 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers; Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2839 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii), 6083 (iv).
Higgin's Shore Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Hudson's Bay, Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2574 (ii).
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6043 (iv).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6011 (iv).
Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Cost of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Jersey Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iv).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredges: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Kingston Barracks, Repairs to Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Kingston Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Lachute Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
——— Delay *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1124 (i).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).
Lake St. François, Beauce, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lake St. John Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6110 (iv).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
L'Isle d'Alma, Removal of Rocks; in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Little Current, North Channel, Georgian Bay Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
London Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
London Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Improvements, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 7251 (iv).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Wharfs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6114 (iv).
Mabou Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6114 (iv).
Magog Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2140 (ii).
Marble Mountain Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).
Marconi Tel. Co. and Contract with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1299 (i).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5085 (iii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Contract: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6961 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4039 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Militia Drill Sheds: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4615 (iii).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5726 (iii).
Miminegash Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Mispec Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
'Montague', Dredge, Total Cost of Repairing: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2980 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3189 (ii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup, 7820 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, Reps. in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2228 (ii).
Moose Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Mossy River, Man., Dredging: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
New Campbellton Wharf, Kelly's Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1395 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4023 (iii).
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 2840 (ii).
North Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
North Rustico Harbour Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 475 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Oak Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Old Man's River, Stream Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
Otonabee River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
——— Water Power, Leasing of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4612 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
——— Architects Plans *re* New Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
——— Eastern Block: in Com. of Sup., 3950 (ii).
——— Elevators, Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3585 (ii).
——— Gas and Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
——— H. of C. Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
——— Steel Shelves and Fittings: in Com. of Sup., 4024 (iii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa, Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 235.
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Morin) 490 (i).
——— Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 3951 (ii).
Ottawa, Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
Ottawa Museum: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
Ottawa Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1799 (i).
——— Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1562 (i).
——— Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1557 (i).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 4053 (iii).
Ottawa, Rideau Hall, Conservatory: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
——— Conservatory, Collapse of Dome: Remarks (Mr. Ward) 1091 (i).
——— Expenditure on Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa, Supreme Court Building: in Com. of Sup., 3625 (ii).
Owen Sound, Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1559 (i).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Parkhill Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Parrsboro' Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Percé Wharf, North Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Peribonka River, Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6077, 7825 (iv).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1613 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 230 (i).
Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5023 (iii).
Pointes aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6116 (iv).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbours: in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges by (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Conmee) 7898, 7919 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) referring to past debate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7901, 7922 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Cor. *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4666 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6965 (iv).
——— Contracts, Material purchased, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 726 (i).
Porter's Lake Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
——— Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3181 (ii).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474, 489 (i).
——— Dredging at Port Dalhousie Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
Postal Station, Pointe St. Charles: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1841 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
P.E.I. Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 481 (i).
Quaco Harbour Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Quebec East, Building: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
——— Improvements *re* Ry. Terminus, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Robitaille) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4009, 4011 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Rainy River Navigation, Obstructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1142 (i).
Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Gunn) 2840 (ii).
Red Island Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1927, 1987 (i).
Red River Bank Protection, West Selkirk: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Red River, St. Andrews' Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iii).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4040 (iii).
Renfrew Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Richibucto Harbour, Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Richibucto Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1928 (i).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Riviere a la Pipe, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Riviere aux Renards Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 571 (i).
St. Andrew's N.B., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
St. Anne des Monts Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
St. Catharines Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Charles de Limoilou Wharf Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1927 (i).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
St. John River, Extension of Lincoln Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
——— Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6634 (iv).
St. John Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iv).
——— Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 233 (i).
St. John River, Tidal Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6079 (iv).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
St. Johns, Que., Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
——— Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4215 (iii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2294 (ii).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Maurice River Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
St. Thomas Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4027 (iii).
St. Timothee and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3838 (ii).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2576 (ii).
Saguenay River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Saskatoon Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4451 (iii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii.)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (iii).
——— Proposed Erection: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2579 (ii).
Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
Stratford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Tatamagouche Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Wharfs at Mouth: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Jeannette's.'
Three Rivers, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
——— Harbour, Deep Water Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4031, 4598 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Breakwater, (eastern entrance): in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c., M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897.
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Works, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 7 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 224 (i).
Toronto Postal Branch, in Centre Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 4861 (iii).
Toronto Postal Station 'F': in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Trachoma Hospital, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Vancouver Post Office Building, Terms of Contract, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 894 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1066 (i).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2979 (ii).
West Head, Cape Sable, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
Wharfs and Docks, Ont., Govt. Assistance to Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6999 (iv).
Wingham Public Building: in Com. of Sup, 7822 (iv).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
——— O. Cs., Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (iii).
——— O. Cs., Tenders, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
Yukon Commissioner's Residence: in Com of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Yukon Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).
Pullman Cars, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Pulp Wood: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2063 (ii).

Pulp Wood cut and made in Canada, Export Duty *re:* Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 888 (i).
Quaco Harbour Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P.E.I., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1143 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Sask. Ry. &c. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Quebec and Rivière Ouelle SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7121 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Procedure *re* Business of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7008 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Quebec Canals, Purchase of Cement: in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Quebec Coal Co.'s Claim *re* Quebec Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iii).
Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 470 (i).
Quebec East Building: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Quebec Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
——— Improvements *re* Ry. Terminals, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Robitaille) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6256 (iv).
Quebec Military Buildings, Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Quebraco: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Queens-Shelburne Election, Apptmnt. of Lighthouse Keepers as Scrutineers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Queens and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6677 (iv).
——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stockton) 207 (i).
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2832 (ii).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditures for 1904-6, Amounts paid to J. Hurley: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re:* Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3185 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Rys. and Canals Act (damages to canal property) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Ry. Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 62, 75, 100.'
Railway Act Amt. Bill (Mr. W. F. Maclean) Remarks, 222 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Ry. Act (fencing) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Ry. Belt in B.C., Boundary of: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Ry. Commission and Counsel: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Railway Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Railway Committee Meetings, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Shirking Vote: Personal Explanation (Mr. Clements) 4387 (iii).
Railways, Minister of (Hon. H. R. Emmerson) Resignation: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5554 (iii).

RAILWAYS:

B.C. Railway Belt, Sales or Lease of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1149 (i).
Brunet, A., Remuneration *re* G. T. P. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Land Grants, Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2584 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6010 (iv).
C.P.R., Coal Lands, selected by Govt., Conditions of Sale of Coal to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3883 (ii).
——— Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4666 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Appeal to Judicial Com., Refusal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
——— Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2289 (ii).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1107 (i).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Car Shortage: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7252, 7310 (iv).
Drummond Counties Ry., Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Express Companies, Control of by Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 473 (i).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 724 (i).
Govt. Rys., Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re:* Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5780 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry.: *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 5027 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G. T. Ry., Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 2839 (ii).
——— Payments to by Govt., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1470 (i).
——— 2-cent a Mile Rate: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).
——— Use and Conditions of Rolling Stock of G. T. P.: Ques.(Mr. Lennox) 5659 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3548 (ii).
Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G. T. Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 614, 950, 1064, 1130 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Tracks on Mill St., Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7984 (iv).
N. T. Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P.'
Passenger Tickets on Rys. Sale Bill, Change in Rev. Statutes: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7309 (iv).
Pere Marquette Ry., Litigation *re* Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Junction Ry. Station, Cor. with Ry. Dept., &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. McLennan) 3373 (ii).
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry Service: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Ward) 7579 (iv).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Damage on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4456 (iii).
P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 614 (i).
See main heading.
Railways: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Railway Blockade in Northwest: Letters read (Mr. McCraney) 6521 (iv).
Railway Commission, Staff and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 1119 (i).
——— Deptl. Printing and Advertising, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1563 (i).
Railway Fares to Northwest, Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Railway Grievances: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4847 (iii).
Railway Rates on Commodities through Canada or to Foreign Countries, or G. B., on all Transportation Lines: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 742 (i).
Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 3188 (ii).
Railway Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iv).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Tariffs, upon Commodities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 503 (i).
Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 710 (i).
Subsidies to Railways: Res. proposed, 7126 (iv).
Temiscaming and North Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 239 (i).
Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295; Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2324 (ii).
Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2582 (ii).
Rainy River Navigation, Obstructions *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1142 (i).
Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4218 (iii).
Record Foundry Co., Purchases of Scrap Iron from I.C.R., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).
Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Gunn) 2840 (ii).
Red Island, Dredging Sand Bar, Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1927, 1987 (ii).
Red Island, near Rivière du Loup, Loss of Sailors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 941 (i)
Red River, Bank Protection, West Selkirk: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
——— St. Andrews' Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iii).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4040 (iii).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carried during 1907: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3186 (ii).
Registration Fees on Letters, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3185 (ii).
Renfrew Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1058 (i).
Reports: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1091, 1184 (i).
Representation of Alberta and Saskn.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs. Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2147 (ii).
Residential Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 28 and 161.'
'Resolute' Str., Wreck and Life Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re:* Remarks (Mr. Kemp) on M. *re* Life Saving, &c., P.E.I., 934 (i).
Returns, Delay in bringing down, *re* Public Accounts: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 2762 (ii).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i), 2479, 3625 (ii) 5890 (iii) 7519, 7985 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 4119 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2206, 3461 (ii).
——— Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3889 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 582 (i).
Returns, Preparation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1091 (i).
Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A': *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Revised Statutes, Advance Copies sent to Persons, Corporations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2578 (ii).
Revised Statutes, Copy laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 1470 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1382 (i).
Revised Statutes, Distribution to Members: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 481 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1614 (i).
——— Distribution to P.E.I. Libraries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).
——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
——— French Translation, Delay, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3183 (ii).
——— Names of Persons entitled to Copies: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1801 (i).
——— Translation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
——— Typographical Errors: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5287 (iii).
Rice, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Rice, Sago, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5083 (iii).
Richibucto Harbour, Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1928 (i).
Rideau Canal, Reserve from Jones' Falls to Kingston, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6903 (iv).
——— Letters from Farmers in District: Read (Mr. Taylor) 6912 (iv).
——— Mr. J. O'Toole's Claim: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Tug-Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
Rideau Hall, Conservatory: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
——— Collapse of Dome: Remarks (Mr. Ward) 1091 (i).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure on Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 223 (i).
Rifle Matches, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 485 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3641 (ii).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, I.C.R., Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Rivière à la Pipe Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Rivière aux Renards Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application by C.P.R. for Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1138 (i).
——— Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization, Plans filed, Water Rights, Constitution of Incorporated Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1060 (i).
——— Grants of Lands, &c., in Alberta, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Sale of Land to, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2143 (ii).
See 'Southern Alberta.'
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
Rock Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7664 (iv).
——— Number used in U.S. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7007 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iv).
Roofing, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2127 (ii).
Roofing Slate, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Abandonment by N. W. Mounted Police, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 614 (i).
——— Accidents in N.W. Mounted Police, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Accidents, &c., at St. John, N.B., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4213 (iii).
——— Amounts paid to Sir Chas. Ross and Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 5025 (iii).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Worthington) 727 (i).
——— Contract with Messrs Billings & Spencer &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects: on M. for Sup., (Mr. S. Hughes) 3732 (ii).
——— Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
——— Defects, Reports from Officers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4273 (iii).
——— Defects *re*: Ques. of Privilege, (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 5026 (iii).
——— Defects, &c.: Remarks Mr. J. D. Reid, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).
——— Factory, Erection of, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1977 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2833 (ii).
——— Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps. &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Worthington) 1398 (i).
——— and Mounted Police, Question *re*: Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 572 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased and Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 222 (i).
——— Pattern inspected by Commissioners of 1901: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4216 (iii).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3277 3546 (ii).
——— Ret., Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 3626 (ii).
——— Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 4053 (iii).
Rougemont Senatorial Apptmnt. Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 6010 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7011 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Ames) 7518 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4856 (iii).
Royal Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Royal Scots Armoury. in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Royal Visit of Prince Arthur of Connaught, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3588 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, between Can. and U.S., Cor. Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2840 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 571 (i).
Rye, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
St. Andrews, N.B., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids, Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c.: for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
St. Anne des Monts Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).
St. Ann's Island, St. Clair District, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6016 (iv).
St. Antoine's Island, Lease, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
St. Catharines Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress, *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
St. Charles de Limoilou Wharf Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1927 (i).
Ste. Flavie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).
St. François Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship. Apptmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
St. John, N.B., and Digby SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, &c. and Yarmouth SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iv).
——— Improvements, Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 233 (i).

St. John, N.B., Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).
——— Increased Accommodation, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).
St. John River, N.B., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6634 (iv).
——— Extension of Lincoln Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Fredericton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6017 (iv).
St. John River, Tidal Waters Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6079 (iv).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup.. 6077 (iv).
St. John, W. Indies and S. America, SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7117 (iv).
St. Johns, Que., Conduit, Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
——— Customs Collector, Transfer of Dr. H. W. Woods: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Military Barracks, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4215 (iii).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
St. Joseph de Lévis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5656 (iii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
——— at Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots *re* Widening and grounding of SS. 'Victorian': Ques. (Mr. Monk) 573 (i).
——— Dredging at Cap à la Roche, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 575 (i).
——— Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4456 (iii).
——— River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2294 (ii).
St. Leon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
St. Louis, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3639 (ii).
St. Mary's and Western Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
St. Mary's Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 468 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4926 (iii).
St. Mary River Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii).
St. Maurice River Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Ste. Perpetue Station, I.C.R., Duties of Agent: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 2344 (ii).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 4855 (iii).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1134 (i).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
St. Thomas Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4027 (iii).
St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3838 (ii).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismangament: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2828 (ii).
Sackville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2576 (ii).
Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 2834 (ii).
Sago: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
Saguenay River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4611 (iii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Circulars *re:* Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 4453 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).
See 'Immigration from Eastern Canada.'
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 2759 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. No. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier): M. to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 4928 (iii).
Saskatchewan, Representation: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2139 (ii).
——— and Section 2 of Twp. 25, Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 485 (i).
Saskatoon Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (iii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
Scalping of Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 5960 (iii), 7684 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Scrap Iron, Sale of to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3839 (ii).
Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3838 (ii).
Sea Weed Industry at Isle Verte, Tax collected *re:* Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5655 (iii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).
Seeds, Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Seed Grain to Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Seedsmen Reports from Govt., Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1140 (i).
Seeds, Timothy and Clover: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4144 (iii).
Selkirk, Lord, Estate and Hudson Bay Co.'s Land Deeds, in Possession of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5505 (iii).
——— Land Registers of Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).
See 'Hudson's Bay,' &c.
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
Senate Appointment, Par. in 'L'Evenement': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gauvreau) 5889 (iii).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Senators, New, Appmnt. of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1564 (i).
Senators, Appmnt. of from N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) on M. for Ways and Means, 1645 (i).
Senators, Appointment of, Rumour *re:* Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 1381, 1473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 708 (i).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Apptmnt. of Mr. Dessaulles, Rep. *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Girard: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4657; Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Read (Mr. Taylor) 4662 (iii).
Servis Tie Plate Co., I.C.R., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2835 (ii).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Settlers' Effects: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4451 (iii).
Shelburne, N.S., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2836 (ii).
Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3369 (ii).
Shepard, C. A., Rentals *re* Engine and Pile driver, Cor. &c. (read): in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (iii).
——— Proposed Erection: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2579 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. No. 175'.
Signal Service between Montreal and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Conmee) 3638 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Par. in 'Northern Advance': Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4368 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028
Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 478 (i).
Slate Quarries and Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1053 (i).
Sleeping Car Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6'.
Smith, Geo. E., Co's Patent: *See* 'B. No. 10'.
Smith, Lt. Col. H., and Medals Board, Payment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7248 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Charges *re* Land Sales and Fraudulent Representations: on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. Northrup) 4219; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4240; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 4262 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).
——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 841 (i).
——— Inconvenience *re* Vacancy: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserves, Negotiations for, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Pedley *re* Investigation: M. for Papers* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Cascade Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Electrical Staff Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7535, 7666 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Manny's Gate Bars: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
South African War, and B.C. Soldiers, Names, &c.: (M. for Ret.*) 3373 (ii).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7311 (iv).
——— Land Grants, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 730 (i).
——— Land Grants, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4665 (iii).
S. A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7542 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co.: and Robbins Irrigation Co.: Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2941; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2638, Neg. (Y. 53; N. 86) 2725 (ii).
See 'Robbins,' &c.
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age, &c., Loss of Registered Letters: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).

'Sovinto' Ship, Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train *re* Life-Boats: Ques. (Mr. J J. Hughes) 1064 (i).

——— Request to Govt. for Life-Boats of Govt. Strs.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 711 (i).

Spain, O. G. V., Relief of: *See* 'B. 104.'

Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 710 (i).

Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3: M. for Considn. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6 (i).

Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1057 (i).

Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
See 'Denatured,' &c.

Spirits in Bond, Two-Year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application and Consolidated Revenue Act of 1882, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Robitaille) 802 (i).

Spirits, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2106 (ii).

Spohn, Dr., Apptmnt. to Senate, Promise *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4659 (iii).

Springs and Axles for Vehicles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4429 (iii).

Springhill Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5863 (iii).

Stallions, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii).

Standard Chemical Co., O.Cs., &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Robitaille) 725 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 7520 (iv).

Standing Orders, Sel. Com., 7th Rep.: M. (Mr. Grant) to conc., 6376 (iv).
See 'Committees,' &c.

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2293 (ii).

Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7542 (iv).

Starch: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).

Starch, Potato Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).

Statute Law in Saskn. and Alta.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Steamship Contracts, Bonuses paid in 1906, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 173.'

Steel Bowls, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).

Steel Shafting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4209 (iii).

Steel Shelves, and Fittings, Ottawa Building: in Com. of Sup., 4024 (iii).

Steel used in Cutlery, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).

Steel Wire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).

Stellarton, Increased Accommodation: I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4757 (iii).

Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1125 (i).

Stoves imported from Western Canada, Number and Value of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2293 (ii).

Stove Urns: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419 (iii).

Stratford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).

Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).

'Strathmore,' Str., Wreck of, Investigation into: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1383 (i).

Stratton, Ira, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6012 (iv).

Strikes in Coal Mines and Public Utilities: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Strikes in Industrial Concerns, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5862 (iii).
See 'Labour.'

Strubb, Chas., Amount purchased by Marine Dept., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).

Structural Steel for Cars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).

Sub-Marine Signals for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).

Subsidies, &c.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Subsidies to Railways: Res. proposed, 7126 (iv).

Subsidies to Railways: *See* 'B. No. 178.'

Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor., O.Cs., with Militia Dept., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).

——— M. to ref. Papers to Pub. Accounts Com., (Mr. Foster) 3887 (ii), 3977 (iii).

Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 225 (i).

Sugar, 16 Dutch Standard: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4149 (iii).

Sugar Duties, above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Duties, Total Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4455 (iii).

Sugar imported, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 568 (i).

Summers, E. W., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 9.'

Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).

Sunday Legislation, Legal Expenses of R. U. Macpherson: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).

Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 96, 141 and 179.'

Supply (Interim) Bill, Announcement (Mr. Fielding) 5284 (iii).

Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 218 (i).

SUPPLY:
Committee:
Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice'.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Animals, Health, 7815 (iv).
Archives, 2958 (ii).
Census and Statistics, 2962 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Cold Storage, 7815 (iv).
Electric Ry. Track, Ottawa Farm, 7818.
Exhibitions, 6900, 7818 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 7810 (iv).
Fumigating Stations, 2974 (ii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 2977 (ii).
Year Book, 2971 (ii).
Civil Government:
Auditor General's Office, 2764 (ii).
Contingencies:
Post Office, 6620 (iv).
Customs, 2765 (ii).
Finance, 7690 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Sec.'s Office, 2763 (ii), 7685 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, 2958 (ii), 7692 (iv).
Indian Affairs, 2957 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 2822 (ii).
Interior, 2957 (ii).
Justice, 7689 (iv).
Labour, 2958 (ii), 6619, 7692 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 2822 (ii), 5765 (iii). 7678 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 7686 (iv).
Post Office, 2770 (ii), 7691 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 2764 (ii).
Public Works, 2824 (ii).
Customs :
Gratuity to John Bain, 5977 (iii).
Gratuity to John McDougald, 5979 (iii).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 5973 (iii).
Dominion Lands:
Gratuity to Mrs. Thomas Young, 6245 (iv).
Salaries, Outside Service, 6244 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 6243, 7257 (iv).
Timber Protection, 7265 (iv).
Dominion Police, 6761, 6900 (iv).
Excise :
Methylated Spirits, 6626 (iv).
Provisional Allowances, 6626 (iv).
Stamps for Tobacco, 6630, 7294 (iv).
Weights and Measures :
Inspectors' Salaries, &c., 6626 (iv).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 6627 (iv).
Fisheries :
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 5908 (iii).
Cold Storage for Bait, 5910 (iii).
Dog-fish, Reduction Work *re*, 5920 (iii).
Expenses of Fishery Commissions, 5941, 5971 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, 5892 (iii).
Fish Curing Establishments, 5923 (iii).
Fish Transportation, &c., 5932 (iii).
Legal Services *re* Provl. Claims, 5970 (iii).
Marine Biological Stations, 5932 (iii).
Oyster Culture, 5909 (iii).
Protection Service, 5905, 5960 (iii).
Cruiser for B.C., 5906 (iii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5890 (iii).
Geological Survey :
Boring for Minerals, &c., 3159 (ii).
Engraving Maps, &c., 3163 (ii).
General Vote, 3159 (ii).
Nicolas, F., Salary, 3163 (ii).
Translation, &c., 3166 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 3167 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
General Vote, 7272 (iv).
Salary, F. W. White, 7273 (iv).
Govt. of the Yukon Territory :
General Vote, 6249, 7278 (iv).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, &c., 6706, 7277 (iv).
C. F. Just's Salary, 6242 (iv).
Deporting Immigrants, 7278 (iv).
Freight Blockade in N.W., Relief, 7278 (iv)
Indians :
British Columbia :
Babine Investigation, 7286, 7293 (iv).
Industrial Schools, 7291 (iv).
Generally :
Supt. N.S., 7293 (iv).
Timber Inspector, Georgian Bay, 7294 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Relief, &c., 7291 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 7286 (iv).
Grant to Mississaguas, 7292 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 7291 (iv).
Relief, &c., 7279, 7288 (iv).
Yukon:
Grant to Godefrey Madore, M.D., 7293.
Justice:
Supreme Court, 7693 (iv).
Yukon:
Judges' Allowances, 7968 (iv).
Legislation:
Generally, Printing, &c., 6763 (iv).
House of Commons:
Generally, 6900 (iv).
Promotion of Third Class Clerk, 7972 (iv).
Translators, 7972 (iv).
Library, 6763 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5867 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5869 (iii).
Bookkeeping Reorganization, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5867 (iii).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, 5874 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5864 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Can. and Australia, 7121 (iv).
Can. and G. B., 7106 (iv).
Can. and Mexico, 7122 (iv).
Can. and South Africa, 7119 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Campbellton, &c., 7120 (iv).
Halifax and Nfld., 7118 (iv).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7116 (iv).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 7118 (iv).
Montreal to Manchester, 7118 (iv).
Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin, 7122 (iv).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7118 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7118 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, &c, 7120 (iv).
Quebec and River Ouelle, &c., 7121 (iv).
St. John and Digby, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Dublin and Belfast, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Halifax, 7118 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7116 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies, &c.—*Con.*
St. John, Hfx., and W. I. and South America, 7117 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh, 7120 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7117 (iv).
Marine Hospitals:
Care of Sick Seamen, 5880 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5735, 5765 (iii).
Clothing, &c., 5740 (iii).
Contingencies, 5763 (iii).
Customs Dues, 5765 (iii).
Dom. Arsenal, 5764 (iii).
General Vote, 7981 (iv).
Military Properties, 5736, 5765 (iii).
Ordnance, &c., 5764 (iii).
Pay and Allowance, 5647 (iii).
Provisions and Supplies, 5763 (iii).
Royal Military College, 5763 (iii).
Salaries and Wages, 5736 (iii).
Surveys, 5723 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Banff Park, 7273, 7279 (iv).
Bell Telephone Dispute, Toronto, 6620 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Expenses, 7982 (iv).
Compensation to R. Wainwright, 6901 (iv).
Insurance Commission, 6280, 6379 (iv).
Printing of Evidence, 7972 (iv).
Jamaica Earthquake, Relief, 2726 (ii).
Labour Dept., 3579 (ii).
'Labour Gazette,' 6618 (iv).
Litigation *re* Pere Marquette Ry., Alien Labour Act, 6620 (iv).
Litigation, 7274 (iv).
Litigation, Dom. and Ont. and Quebec, 7971 (iv).
Maps, Engraving, &c., 7275 (iv).
Pacific Cable, 7971 (iv).
Revised Statutes, 7972 (iv).
Sunday Legislation, Expenses *re*, 6902 (iv).
Visit of Prince Arthur of Connaught, 6901 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, &c., 7274 (iv).
Mounted Police:
Compensation for Injuries, 7837 (iv).
General Vote, 7834 (iv).
Ocean and River Service:
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, 5766, 5946.
Naval Militia, 5773 (iii).
Patrol Boat, Northern Canada, 5772, 5946 (iii).
Quebec Coal Co.'s Claim, 5946 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, &c., 5767 (iii) 7678 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, 5771 (iii).
Penitentiaries:
General Vote, 7971 (iv).
Post Office :
Mail Service, 3141 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 3158 (ii), 7982 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, 3141 (ii).
Yukon Territory, 3158 (ii).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 3580, 3588 (ii).
Eastern Deptl. Block, Addition, 3616, 3950 (ii).
New Deptl. Buildings, Site, 3617, 3951 (ii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 3605 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rideau Hall, Improvements, 3615 (ii).
Royal Mint, 3603 (ii).
Supreme Court Library, 3625 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 3616 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers :
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 6000 (iii).
Ontario :
Port Arthur, &c., 5982 (iii).
Quebec :
Cap à la Roche, Plant, 5776 (iii).
Quebec Harbour, 5979 (iii).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5773 (iii).
Signal Service, Montreal and Quebec, 5776 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, &c., 6001 (iii); 7819 (iv).
Port Colborne, 6004 (iii).
St. Mary's Current, 6001 (iii).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings:
British Columbia :
Fernie, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
New Westminster, 4042 (iii).
Vancouver, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
Generally :
Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 4044 (iii).
Salaries, Resident Clerks of Works, 4043 (iii).
Manitoba :
Brandon Drill Hall, 4035 (iii).
Dauphin, Public Buildings, 7822 (iv).
Neepawa, Public Buildings, 4599 (iii).
St. Boniface Public Buildings, 4600.
Selkirk, Public Buildings, 4600 (iii).
Winnipeg, New Immigration Building, 4600 (iii).
——— New Post Office, 4601 (iii).
——— Postal Station, 4602 (iii).
New Brunswick :
General Vote, 3974 (ii).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, Public Building, 3973 (ii).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 3973 (ii).
Inverness, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Westville, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Ontario :
Alexandria, Public Building, 4018 (iii).
Belleville Armoury, 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv)
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 4019 (iii).
Guelph Armoury, 4020 (iii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, 4021 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4021 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, 4022 (iii), 7820 (iv).
Leamington, Public Building, 7820 (iv).
London, Military Buildings, 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4022 (iii).
North Bay, Public Building, 4023 (iii).
Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, 4023 (iii, 7820 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 4025 (iii)
Parkhill, Building, 7822 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Peterborough, Armoury, 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7822 (iv).
St. Catharines, Public Building, 4026 (iii).
St. Mary's Public Building, 4026 (iii).
St. Thomas, Drill Hall, 4027 (iii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 4028 (iii).
Stratford Armoury, 4028 (iii).
Toronto, Customs House, 4028 (iii).
——— Drill Hall, 4031, 4598 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, 4031 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4035 (iii).
Wingham, Public Building, 7822 (iv).
Quebec :
Grosse Isle, 4009 (iii).
Immigrant Buildings, 4009 (iii).
Lachute, Public Building, 4010 (iii).
Levis, Public Building, 4010 (iii).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 4010 (iii).
——— Post Office, 7820 (iv).
——— Postal Station, 4011 (iii).
——— Postal Station, Pt. St. Charles, 7820 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 4011 (iii).
Quebec, Immigration Buildings, &c., 4011 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, 4012 (iii).
St. John's Military Buildings, 4012, 4015 (iii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 4014 (iii).
Three Rivers, Drill Hall, 4015 (iii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta :
Alameda Land Office, 4035 (iii).
Barracks for Permanent Corps, 4035 (iii).
Battleford, Public Building, 7823 (iv).
Calgary, Public Building, 4036 (iii).
Edmonton, Public Buildings, 4036 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Humboldt, Public Building, 7823 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 4039.
Regina, Post Office, &c., 4040 (iii).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 4041 (iii).
Yukon :
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson, 7824 (iv).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, &c., 4605 (iii).
Ottawa, Public Buildings:
——— Elevators, 4609 (iii).
——— Gas and Electric Light, 4609 (iii).
——— Heating, 4608 (iii).
——— Repairs, Ventilation, &c., 4602 (iii).
——— Telephones, 4609 (iii).
——— Major's Hill Park, 4609 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4608 (iii).
——— Rideau Hall, 4607 (iii).
Yukon, Buildings, Rents, &c., 4605 (iii)
Dredging :
Maritime Provs., 7000 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson, &c., Lakes, 6996 (iv).
Columbia River, 6996 (iv).
Coquitlam River, 6996 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Fraser River, 6997 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, 6997 (iv).
Williams Head Station, 6999 (iv).
Manitoba:
General Vote, 6991 (iv).
Red River, Bank Protection, 7833 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 6073.
Caraquet Wharf, 6074 (iv).
Chockfish, Improvement, 6075 (iv).
Clifton, Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 6076 (iv).
Dorchester, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Dover, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Great Salmon River, 7824 (iv).
Lincoln, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Mispec, Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
Oak Point, Wharf, 6077 (iv).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 6077, 7825 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, 6077 (iv).
Richibucto, 7825 (iv).
River St. John, including tributaries, 6077 (iv).
River St. John, Wharfs, 6079 (iv).
St. Andrews, Dredging, 6080 (iv).
St John Harbour, 6081 (iv).
Shippegan Harbour, 6082 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis, Repairs, 6017 (iv).
Baddeck, Wharf, 6019 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour, 6020 (iv).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging, 6020 (iv).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 6020 (iv).
Church Point, Extension of Groyne, 6021 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Repairs, 6022 (iv).
Culloden, Breakwater, 6023 (iv).
Digby, Harbour Improvements, 6024 (iv).
Eskasoni, Wharf, 6029 (iv).
Glass Bay, Assistance towards Harbour Improvements, 6032 (iv).
Grand Etang, Repairs, Protection Works, 6037 (iv).
Half Island Cove, Breakwater, 6041 (iv).
Hall's Harbour, 6042 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines, Harbour, 6043 (iv).
Jersey Cove, Wharf, 6048 (iv).
Mabou, Repairs, 6050 (iv).
Marble Mountain, Wharf, 6050 (iv).
Middle Country Harbour, Wharf, 6051 (iv).
Moose Harbour, Breakwater, 6052 (iv).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 6053 (iv).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 6054 (iv).
Parrsboro', Harbour, 6054 (iv).
Petite Rivière, Improvements, 6056 (iv).
Pinney's Cove, Breakwater, 6057 (iv).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 6057 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 6059 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour, 6063 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf, 6065 (iv).
Scotch Cove, Breakwater, 6066 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Wharf, 6066 (iv).
West Head, Wharf, 6067 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 6067 (iv).
Ontario:
Beaverton, Harbour, 6933 (iv).
Belle River, Dredging Entrance, &c., 6932 (iv).
Blanche River, Improvements, 6933.
Bronté, Dredging, 6933 (iv).
Colborne Harbour, Wharf, 6933 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 6933 (iv).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 6950 (iv).
Harbours, Generally, 7833 (iv).
Hamilton Harbour, 6954 (iv).
Kincardine Harbour, 6954 (iv).
Little Current, 6954 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, 6961 (iv).
Midland Harbour, 6963 (iv).
Owen Sound Harbour, 6964 (iv).
Point Edward, 6964 (iv).
Port Burwell, 6965 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour, 6967 (iv).
River Otonabee, Dredging, 6980 (iv).
River Thames, Wharfs at Mouth, 6980 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour, 6984 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, 6985 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, 6986 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Higgins' Shore Pier, 6070 (iv).
Miminegash Harbour, 6070 (iv).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, 6071 (iv).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 6071 (iv).
Quebec:
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 6083 (iv).
Anse du Cap, Breakwater, 6092 (iv).
Baie St. Paul, Improvements to Wharf, 6093 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 6093 (iv).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 6094 (iv).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 6095 (iv).
Chicoutimi Pier, 6096 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, 6096 (iv).
Doucet's Landing, Pile Wharf, 6097 (iv).
Escoumains Pier, 6098 (iv).
Father Point, Wharf, 6099 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré, Wharf, 6101 (iv).
Grands Méchins, Breakwater, 6101 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 6109 (iv).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers, 7826 (iv).
Lake St. John, Wharfs, 6110 (iv).
Lake St. Francis, Wharfs, 6111 (iv).
Lavaltrie, Wharf, 6111 (iv).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rock, 6113 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lotbinière, Wharf, 6114 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, &c., 6114 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf, 6115 (iv).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, 6115.
Percé Wharf, 6115 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders, 6115 (iv).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 6116 (iv).
Rimouski, Wharf, 6120 (iv).
Rivers Ashouapmouchouan, &c., 6121 (iv).
Rivière Batiscan, Dredging, 6121 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, (Fraserville), Harbour, 6122 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (en haut), 6123 (iv).
Rivière Maskinongé, Dredging, 6124 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Pier, 6124 (iv).
Rivière à la Pipe, Wharf, 6121 (iv).
Rivière Saguenay, Dredging, 6124 (iv).
Rivière St. Maurice, Channel, 6126 (iv).
Ste. Anne des Monts, 6128 (iv).
St. Charles de Limoilou, 6130 (iv).
St. François, Island of Orleans, 6130 (iv).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 6132 (iv).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 6132 (iv).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 6132 (iv).
Three Rivers Harbour, 6134 (iv).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 6134 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Last Mountain Lake, 7833 (iv).
Old Man's River, 7834 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, 7001 (iv).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 7668 (iv).
Chambly:
Conduit at St. John's, 7536 (iv).
Improvements, St. John's Harbour, 5548 (iii).
Cornwall:
Enlargement, 5552 (iii).
Gate Lifter, 7533 (iv).
Galops:
Final Estimate, 7530, 7531 (iv).
Retaining Walls, 7533 (iv).
Shoals in River, Removal, 7530 (iv).
Generally:
Staff and Repairs, 7534 (iv).
Lachine:
Rebuilding Slope Walls, 5548 (iii).
Murray:
Concrete Piers, 7533 (iv).
North Channel, 7530 (iv).
Quebec Canals, Cement, 5551 (iii).
Rideau:
Generally, 7669 (iv).
To pay J. O'Toole, 7538 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie:
Construction, 7533 (iv).
Soulanges:
Bridge at Clement's Gully, 5548 (iii).
Generally, 7539 (iv).
Improvements, 5548 (iii).
Manny's Gate Bars, 5548 (iii).
Staff, 7535, 7666 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Trent:
Construction, 7531, 7667 (iv).
Improvements, 7534 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Road, 7669 (iv).
New Boat, 7534 (iv).
To pay Curtis Bros., Damages, 7538.
Welland:
Port Colborne Elevator, 7531 (iv).
Retaining Wall, &c., 7533 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Ry. Commission, 7534 (iv).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 7539 (iv).
Railways:
Intercolonial Railway:
Amherst, Improvements, 7298 (iv).
Antigonish Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
Bridges, Strengthening, 7523 (iv).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7307 (iv).
General Vote, 7534 (iv).
Halifax Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 7521 (iv).
Indiantown and Blackville, 7663 (iv).
Moncton, Shops, &c., 7301, 7521 (iv).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 7297 (iv).
Newcastle, Improvements, 7299 (iv).
New Glasgow, Improvements, 7663 (iv).
Pictou Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Rolling Stock, 7664 (iv).
St. John, Accommodation, 7663 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 7522 (iv).
Sackville, Improvements, 7298 (iv).
Stellarton Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Sydney Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Truro Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys, &c., 7530, 7670 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Charlottetown, Accommodation, 7524 (iv).
Generally, 7665 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch, 7524 (iv).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 7269 (iv).
General Vote, 7684 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 5878 (iii).
Steamer for B.C., 5879 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Gratuity to Widow of Thomas Harrison, 5960 (iii).
Surveys, &c., 7270 (iv).
Trade and Commerce:
General Vote, 6903, 7095 (iv).
Grain Commission, 7983 (iv).
Unprovided Items, 6902 (iv).
CONCURRENCE:
Agriculture, Live Stock Products, 7988 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 7987 (iv).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, 7987 (iv).

Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).

Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).

——— Reorganization, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 3641 (ii).

Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Cor., &c., *re* Vacancy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).

——— Complaint from Chief Justice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2998 (ii).

——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 840 (i).

Supreme Court Vacancy in N.S.: Cor., &c., Read, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3916; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 83) 3949 (ii).

——— Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).

Supreme Court Judges of Saskatchewan: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 6377 (iv).
See 'Judges.'

Surveys, &c.: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Surveys of Dom. Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

Surveys, &c., of Public Lands: *See* 'B. No. 59'. 'B. No. 172'.

Sussex, N.B., Customs Port: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Sussex St. Properties: *See* 'Mackenzie Avenue.'

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 719 (i).

Swamp Lands near Lake Manitoba, Leasing, of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Schaffner) 1564 (i).

——— Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1842 (i).

——— Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1388 (i).

Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 946 (i).

Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2830 (ii).

Sydney Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Sydney and Whycocomagh SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).

'Tagish' Charlie, Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 890 (i).

Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332, 1360 1858, 1879 (i), 2044, 2106, 2346, 2986 (ii).

——— Amended Resolutions: M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 2986 (ii).

——— Combinations, and Conspiracies, Proceedings *re*: in Com., 1230 (i).

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 709 (i).

Tariff, Customs Act, Repeal, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4547 (iii).

Tariff Index, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 424 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 513 (i).

Tariff, Inter-Imperial, Preference, and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 892 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Tariff, Intermediate, Application of Foreign Countries *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 489 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pourparlers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7938 (iv).
——— Relation to, Ref. to in Budget Speech (Mr. R. L. Borden) 297 (i).
Tariff Items, Allowed to stand, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1868 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2405 (ii).
——— Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 514 (i); (Mr. Foster) 3889 (ii).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 891 (i).
Tariff, Preferential and Intermediate Effects of, Ref. to in debate on Budget Speech (Mr. Foster) 296 (i).
Tariff Resolutions: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
——— Clerical Errors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 513; Statement (Mr. Fielding) 524 (i).
——— Operation, Date of: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4439 (iii).
See 'Customs', 'German Surtax', 'Colonial Conference,' 'Preferential.'
——— Unenumerated Items: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2411 (ii).
TARIFF—THE :
(In Com. on Ways and Means).
Acetone, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352, 1375 (i); 4402 (iii).
Agricultural Products: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Alum Cake: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Animals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1254 (i).
Animals for Breeding Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4597 (iii).
Apples, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1892 (i).
Automobiles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2398 (ii).
Axes, Scythes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4418 (iii).
Bain, Mr. John, Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5977 (iii).
Barley: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Beeswax: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332 (i)
Beet Root Sugar: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Berries : in Com. on Ways and Means, 1894 (i)
TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Binder Twine: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1208 (i), 4438 (iii).
Binder Twine Materials: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2368 (ii).
Binders for Harvesting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).
Biscuits, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1865 (i).
Blackberries, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Books: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
Boots and Shoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4558 (iii).
Boots and Shoes and Tanners Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).
Brass Band Instruments : in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Brass Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2129 (ii).
Brass, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).
Brass, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Porter), 4554 (iii).
Bridging Material: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Britannia Metal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
British Gum., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Bronze Works of Art: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).
Brushes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Butter: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Button Blanks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Cant Dogs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Casket Trimmings, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
Caustic Soda: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Cements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Cereals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Chains, Sprockets and Coils: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Cheese: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1333 (i).
Chicory: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Coal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Coal, Bituminous, for Smelting Purposes : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Cocoa Nibs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1359 (i).
Collars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Combinations, and Conspiracies, Proceedings *re*: in Com., 1230 (i).
Condensed Milk: in Com., 1361 (i).
Confectionery Sugar, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Cordage Lines, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Corks, &c: in Com, on Ways and Means, 2136 (ii).
Cotton Fabrics: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Cream Separators: Remarks in Com., 1190 (i).
Crucibles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Curling Stones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Customs Act, Repeal, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4547 (iii).
Dates, Figs, &c.: in Com. in Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Denatured Alcohol, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2045 (ii).
Diamond Dust, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Disinfectants, Non-alcoholic Liquids: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Drawbacks on Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Drugs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Dumping Clause: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1000; (Amts.) 1186 (i).
Excise Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
Felloes of Hickory, &c.: in Com., 1190 (i).
Fire Brick: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Fish, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Flax Seed: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1348 (i), 4143 (iii).
Florist Stock, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii).
Fruit, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1903 (i).
Fur Skins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Galvanized Iron: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Garden Seeds, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4145, 4389 (iii).
German Silver: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4389 (iii).
German Silver, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
German Treaties, and Tariff, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (i).
Glass Ware, Cut, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4193 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Glass, Raw, &c. for Plate Glass: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4435 (iii).
Gloves, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Glue, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2118 (ii).
Glucose, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4181 (iii).
Glycerine, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Gold and Silver Coins, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Granite Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Gypsum, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Hay, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1867 (i).
Hops: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Horses, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2414 (ii).
Horse Powers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419, 4549 (iii).
Indian Corn: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— *re* German Treaties, &c: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
——— *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 993 (i).
Iron Angles for Bedsteads: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Iron Piping: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Iron, Rolled, or Rolled Steel: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
Iron or Steel Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Iron or Steel Beams, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron or Steel Billets: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron and Steel Ry. Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2131 (ii).
Iron or Steel Scrap, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4206 (iii).
Iron or Steel Nuts: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Iron Tubing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2132 (ii), 4549 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Iron, Wrought, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Lamp Black, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Lamp Springs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4391 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Lime Juices: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2044 (ii).
Liquid Fillers for Varnishes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (iii).
Locomotives: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Mackintosh Clothing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
McDougald, Mr. J., Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
Macaroni: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1866 (i).
Machinery, Packed, &c., from G.B., Preferential Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Machinery for Sugar Refining: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).
Magazines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Malleable Chains, Sprockets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4390 (iii).
Malt Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Manila Rope, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Marble: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Marble, Tombstones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4191 (iii).
Matrices, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
Matrices for Printing Newspapers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
—— Canada Newspaper Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
Medicines, Patent, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2116 (ii).
Melons, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1909 (i).
Metallic Trading Checks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii).
Metals, Tariff Changes: Read in Budget Speech (Mr. Fielding) 313 (i).
Military Stores, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2408 (ii).
Mining Machinery: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4420 (iii).
Molasses: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4180 (iii).
Monotypes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4401 (iii).
Mould Boards: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Nuts, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Oatmeal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1374

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Oats: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1372 (i).
Oils, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Oils, for Paints, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Opium: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Paper, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
Paris Green: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Pease: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).
Pickles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1886 (i).
Pig Iron used in Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).
Plums, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Portable Engines *re* Agricultural Implements, &c.: in Com on Ways and Means, 4407, 4414 (iii).
Potash: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Preferential Tariff, British: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
Printing Materials, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
Printing Paper: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).
Proof Spirits: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
Pullman Cars, Duty *re:* Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Pulp Wood: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2063 (ii).
Quebracho: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Rice, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Rice, Sago, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Roofing, &c. in Com. on Ways and Means, 2127 (ii).
Roofing Slate, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).
Rye, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
Sago: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
Seeds, Timothy and Clover: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4144 (iii).
Settlers' Effects: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Spirits: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2106 (ii).
Springs and Axles for Vehicles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4429 (iii).
Stallions, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii).
Starch: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Starch, Potato Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Steels Bowls, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).
Steel used in Cutlery, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Steel Shafting, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4209 (iii).
Steel Wire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Stove Urns: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419 (iii).
Structural Steel for Cars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Sugar, 16 Dutch Standard: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4149 (iii).
Tariff, Customs Act.: in Com., 524 (i).
——— Clerical Errors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 513; Statement (Mr. Fielding) 524 (i).
——— Operation, Date of: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4439 (iii).
——— Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
——— Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 514 (i).
Tariff: *See* 'Preferential.'
Time Tables, Pamphlets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Tinplate: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4426 (iii).
Tomatoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i), 4148 (iii).
Trees: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i).
Trunks, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2405 (ii).
Typewriters, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4549 (iii).
Unenumerated Items: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2411 (ii).
U.S. Duties, Comparison, &c.: in Com., 1196 (i).
Vegetables and Garden Produce: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1881 (i).
Vessels, Scows, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2389 (ii).
Wagons, Farm, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Wax, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Whale Oil Soaps: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Whips, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2402 (ii).
White Lead Oil: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Wines, medicated, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2048 (ii).
Wire Cables, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4421 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Wire Fencing, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Wood Veneers: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2404 (ii).
Wool Batting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Wool grown in Canada: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2369 (ii).
Zinc Dust: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2128 (ii).
Tatamagouche Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Telegraph Companies and Ry Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Telegraph Lines (Govt.) Number of Miles, &c., Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1469 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Telegraph Service, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
Telephone Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Telephone Cos., Expropriation by Provincial Authorities: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3180 (ii).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).
Temiscaming and North Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 239 (i).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Temporary Loans since 1st Jan., 1906, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 234 (i).
Territorial Boundaries, O.Cs. *re* &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sifton) 239 (i).
Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Wharfs at Mouth: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Jeannette's Creek Wharf.'
Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships; Names, Dates of Sailing, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6696 (iv).
Three Rivers, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
Three Rivers Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3101 (ii).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4044 (iii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3635 (ii).
Ticket Scalping: *See* 'B. No. 7.'

Timber Berths Nos. 824, 1062, 1107, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, Memoranda *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 6010 (iv).
Timber Inspector, Manitoulin Islands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Timber Lands sold or leased, Subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4458 (iii).
Timber Limits, Indian Reserves, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Timber and Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).
Timber Protection and Tree Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7265 (iv).
Timber Regulations of 1897, Permits under Clause 17, Number granted, &c.: Ques (Mr. Burrows) 7007 (iv).
Time-tables, Pamphlets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Tinplate: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4426 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5861 (iii).
——— Total Amount collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1612 (i).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 6140 (iv).
Tobacco Industry in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1924 (i).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S., 1906: Ques: (Mr. Clements) 2141 (ii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Tomatoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i), 4148 (iii).
Topographical Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6243 (iv).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4031, 4598 (iii).
——— Fort, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Breakwater (eastern entrance): in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c., M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).
——— Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
——— Life Saving Stations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 487 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Works, Govt. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 7 (i).
Toronto Mails to East, Cost of Carrying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1121 (i).
Toronto Postal Branch, in Centre Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 4861 (iii).
——— Station 'F": in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 224 (i).
Tower, Collapse, Investigation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3616, 3972 (ii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13, Topographical Surveys, &c., Reps.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1066 (i).
Trachoma Hospital, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE:
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).
Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 241 (i).
'Favoured Nations' Treaties, between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1123 (i).
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).
See 'Tariff,' &c.
Grain exported from Can. and U.S. Ports, &c.* Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 475 (i).
Grain Trade Commission, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7983 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2979 (ii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1140 (i).
Leather Goods, Increase in Shipments to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 6903, 7095 (iv).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 2824 (ii).
Trade and Commerce Agents (Messrs. Jackson and Preston): Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7096 (iv).
Trade and Nav. Rets.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
Traders' Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 110'.
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
——— Misprint as to Years: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 278 (i).
——— Typographical Error in Rep.: Statement (Mr. Paterson) 424 (i).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Transportation Commission's Rep. (Mr. J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1564 (i); Resuming adjnd. debate, 3698 (ii); 4092, Amt. (Mr. Campbell) 4115 (iii).
Transportation Commission's Recommendations, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).
——— Suggestion to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 6083; Members remarks checked (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6001 (iii).
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7819 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'B. Nos. 159, 166.'
Travellers Indemnity Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Treaties, Commercial: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Trees: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i).
Trent Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7667 (iv).
——— Curtis Bros'. Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Lake Simcoe Section, ref. to, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways (Mr. Bennett) 497 (i).
——— McLaren's Creek Road: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
——— Outlet, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Ward) 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake Section, Reps. &c.: (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1929 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par. in Toronto Globe: Remarks (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4839 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 4664 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).
——— Tow Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Water Powers, leased, owned, by Govt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 565 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Trunks, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2405 (ii).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Two-Cent Passenger Rate: *See* 'B. Nos. 6 and 82.'
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295; Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2324 (ii); Amt. to Amt. Agreed to (Y. 96; N. 36) 7576 (iv).
Typewriters, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4549 (iii).
United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provs.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
U.S. Duties, Comparison, &c.: in Com., 1196 (i).
Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2977 (ii).
Vacancies: *See* 'Electoral Districts.'
Valleyfield, Canal Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
See 'Beauharnois.'
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 579 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Vancouver Post Office Building, O.Cs., Specifications, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1066 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 894 (i).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Vaulvagnas Beach Post Office, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1066 (i).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).
Vegetables and Farm Produce: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1881 (i).
Ventilation in Chamber: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3605 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 582 (i).
——— Statement *re* Information asked (Mr. Fisher) 617 (i).
Ventilation of Ottawa Offices, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Vessels, Scows, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2389 (ii).
Victoria, B.C., Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7117 (iv).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2979 (ii).
Visit of Prince Arthur: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).
Wage-Earners, Bulletin No. 1: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7780 (iv).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
Wagons, Farm, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Wainwright, R., Compensation *re* N. W. M. Police, Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Walberg, E. A., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1051 (i).

Walker, Mr. Bruce, Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).
Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c., I.C.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).
Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2582 (ii).
Warburton Property, P.E.I., Purchase of for Rifle Range, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2584 (ii).
Warships on Great Lakes, from U.S., Rumours *re*, Par. in Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6279 (iv).
——— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6378, 6618, 6910 (iv).
Water Powers near Grand Falls, &c., Applications for Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3373 (ii).
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, Transfers, &c., by Govt., Contracts, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 241 (i).
Water Power: *See* 'Electric,' 'Niagara,' 'Welland,' &c.
Water Reserves in Lethbridge, Sale of, Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4216 (iii).
Waubaushene Light: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).
Wax, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).
——— for Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 1097 (i).
——— M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, Customs Act: in Com., 524 (i).
——— Tariff Resolutions: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
Ways and Means: *See* 'Tariff.'
Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 219 (i).
Weights and Measures, Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 3187 (ii).
Welland Canal, Port Maitland Wall: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Water Power, Amount contracted for by Cataract Power Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1923 (i).
Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 896 (i).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
West Head, Cape Sable, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
Whale Oil Soaps: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Wharfingers, Apptmnt. of in Muskoka, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1063 (i).
Wharfs and Docks, Ont., Govt. Assistance to: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Whips, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2402 (ii).
Whip's Rooms, H. of C., Better Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Conc., 7987 (iv).
White Lead Oil: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Wiarton Fish Hatchery: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).
Wiggins, Widow James, and Charles Malley, Property burned, Cor. with Govt. *re:* M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 4458 (iii).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector, and Customs Collector: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6999 (iv).
Willson, Thos., & Co., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Wilson, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 87,' 'B. No. 147.'
Wines, medicated, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2048 (ii).
Wingham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Windsor Branch of the Dom. Atlantic Ry., I.C.R., Expiration of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 615, 1141 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. 129.'
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Tenders, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. 128.'
Wire Cables, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4421 (iii).
Wire Fencing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Wire Fencing on Boundary between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract, Prices, &c.: Ques (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
Women's Art Assoc'n. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
'Women, Wine and Graft' Charges against Minister (Mr. Fowler) 3316 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission,' 'Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa).'
Wood Alcohol: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. John's Customs Collectorship, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Wood Veneers: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2404 (ii).
Wool Batting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1125 (i).
Wool grown in Canada: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2369 (ii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
See 'Golspie', &c.
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 5771 (iii).
Yamaska River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 2971 (ii).
——— French Edition, Publication of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1987 (ii).
——— Omissions from: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kemp) 3641 (ii).
——— Translation into French: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).
Year-book: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
Yoho Park Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).
Yukon Act (actg. commissioner) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4272 (iii).
Yukon Boundaries, Delimitation, &c.: M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 3102 (ii).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
Yukon Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 95.
Yukon, Charges *re* Administration of Hon. Wm. McInnes: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2978 (ii).
——— Commissioner's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
——— Concessions, Bronson and Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheimers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3425 (ii).
Yukon, Council Grant, Audit of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6008 (iv).
——— Dawson Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re* for 1901-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1562 (i).
——— Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1135 (i).
——— Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) on M. for Ways and Means, 4519 (iii).
——— Indians, Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).
——— Judges, Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
——— Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3158 (ii).
——— McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Resignation as Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
Yukon Mining Claims owned by Canadian Cos. and U.S. Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1560 (i).
——— Concessions, Cancellation *re* Failure to comply with Conditions, Names of Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 889 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence from Duties: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 887, 1062 (i).
——— Absence of Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Liemieux) 888 (i).
Yukon Placer Mines owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 892 (i).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).
Yukon Ter., Grant to Council: in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).
——— Salaries and Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
——— Ordinances: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 274 (i).
——— Wheat Raising, Samples laid on Table (Mr. Thompson) 3548 (ii).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4212 (iii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 889 (i).
Zinc Dust: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2128 (ii).